

EUROPEAN INLAND FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMISSION

**METHODOLOGIES FOR ASSESSING SOCIO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS
OF EUROPEAN INLAND RECREATIONAL FISHERIES**



Cover picture: Sunset at Lake Päijänne.
Courtesy of Mr. Veli-Matti Paananen (2004)

Copies of FAO publications can be requested from:
Sales and Marketing Group
Communication Division
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy
E-mail: publications-sales@fao.org
Fax: +39 06 57053360
Web site: <http://www.fao.org>

EUROPEAN INLAND FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMISSION

**METHODOLOGIES FOR ASSESSING SOCIO-ECONOMIC
BENEFITS OF EUROPEAN INLAND RECREATIONAL
FISHERIES**

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

ISBN 978-92-5-106636-2

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to:

Chief
Electronic Publishing Policy and Support Branch
Communication Division
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
or by e-mail to:
copyright@fao.org

© FAO 2010

PREPARATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

Upon request by the European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission (EIFAC), the present “Methodologies for assessing socio-economic benefits of European inland recreational fisheries” has been prepared by the EIFAC Working Party on Socio-Economic Aspects of Inland Fisheries. An expert workshop was held on 12-15 January 2009 in Helsinki, Finland, to discuss the methodologies available and the structure of this document. Selected stakeholders from academia, national and international fisheries bodies, fisheries governmental and non-governmental organizations were invited to this workshop and 21 experts attended. Financial and logistic support to host this workshop were provided by the Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment for Central Finland (former Employment and Economic Development Centre for Central Finland), the Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

The Technical Secretary of EIFAC Sub-Commission IV on “Social and economic aspects of inland fisheries”, Mr. Raymon van Anrooy (FAO) coordinated, jointly with the convener of the EIFAC Ad Hoc Working Party on Socio-Economic Aspects of Inland Fisheries, Mr. Matti Sipponen, the preparation and participatory discussion of this document. The document passed several rounds of comments from the Working Party experts and was shared with EIFAC national correspondents for comments in April 2010. The document was technically edited by Mr. Brad Gentner.

The following persons deserve special credits for their feedback on the various stages of the draft document: Boisneau, Philippe (France); Bolland, Jon (UK); Castelnaud, Gérard (France); Hickley, Phil (UK); Håkansson, Cecilia (Sweden); Kappel, Jan (European Anglers Alliance); Lees, Janek (Estonia); Mikkola, Heimo (Finland); Marmulla, Gerd (FAO), Metzner, Rebecca (FAO), Mitchell Mark (USA/Finland); Nykänen Mari (Finland); Peirson, Graeme (UK); Penttinen, Antti (Finland); Riekstins, Normunds (Latvia); Toivonen, Anna-Liisa (Finland); Treer, Tomislav (Croatia), Turkowski, Konrad (Poland); Vanberg Johan (Sweden/Finland) and Wawrzyniak, Igor (Poland).

The “Methodologies for assessing socio-economic benefits of European inland recreational fisheries” was officially endorsed by the twenty-sixth session of EIFAC, which was held in Zagreb, Croatia in the period 17-20 May 2010.

The publication of this document was made possible with funding from the FAO Sub-regional Office for Central Asia (SEC), based in Ankara, Turkey.

Note to the readership of this EIFAC Occasional Paper:

The views expressed in this document are those of its authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

Parkkila, K.; Arlinghaus, R.; Artell, J.; Gentner, B.; Haider, W.; Aas, Ø.; Barton, D.; Roth, E.; and Sipponen, M.

Methodologies for assessing socio-economic benefits of European inland recreational fisheries

EIFAC Occasional Paper No. 46. Ankara, FAO. 2010. 112p.

ABSTRACT

The EIFAC Methodologies for assessing socio-economic benefits of European inland recreational fisheries were prepared in 2009 by the European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission (EIFAC) Ad Hoc Working Party on Socio-Economic Aspects of Inland Fisheries. EIFAC considered that the implementation of fisheries policy and management would benefit from a more compatible, comparable and scientifically rigorous application of benefit evaluation methods. To reach this goal, the Working Party prepared guidelines to conduct surveys focusing on social and economic benefits of inland recreational fishing in EIFAC member countries. Due to institutional aspects and management traditions, these guidelines are confined to Europe. By means of this Occasional Paper, the Working Party tries to highlight both the methodological and practical viewpoints when assessing the monetary value of social net benefits or other societal benefits from recreational fishing. The purpose is to make societal and economic valuation more accessible and to give insight to best current practices and black spots related to these tools.

Disclaimer

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of FAO.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Social and economic approaches to benefits.....	4
2.1. A joint framework for the human dimensions and economic research paradigms.....	4
2.2 Benefits of fishing from the human dimensions (HD) perspective	8
2.2.1 Psychological benefits	9
2.2.2 Physiological benefits	10
2.2.3 Social and cultural benefits	10
2.2.4 Ecological benefits	10
2.2.5 Summary of HD benefits research.....	11
2.3 Benefits of fishing from an economic perspective.....	11
2.3.1 Economic value versus economic impact.....	11
2.3.2 Total economic value	12
2.3.2.1 Economics of resource allocation	13
2.3.2.2 Economic value of recreational fishing: consumer side	14
2.3.2.3 Economic value of recreational fishing: producer side.....	17
2.3.3 Total economic impact.....	20
2.4 An integrative framework joining the HD and economic approaches to fisheries benefits	21
3. Methods for assessment	22
3.1. Human dimensions methods for assessing benefits of inland fisheries.....	22
3.1.1. Study designs: quantitative versus qualitative methods and cross sectional versus longitudinal designs	22
3.1.2. Measurement approaches	23
3.1.2.1. Psychometric approaches to assess the benefits of fishing	23
3.1.2.2. Quantitative methods from sports and health sciences to assess physiological benefits	26
3.1.2.3. Demographic/behavioural measures	27
3.1.2.4. Measures to assess ecological benefits	27
3.1.3. Qualitative methods to assess benefits of recreational fishing	28
3. 2. Economic value: non-market and market valuation methods.....	29
3.2.1. Stated preference methods	30
3.2.1.1. Contingent valuation method	30
3.2.1.2. Choice experiment method	33
3.2.1.3. Stated preference methods - pros and cons.....	36
3.2.2. Revealed preference methods	38
3.2.2.1. Travel cost method.....	38
3.2.2.2. Hedonic pricing method.....	40
3.2.2.3. Revealed preference methods - pros and cons	42
3.2.3. Benefit transfer.....	42
3.2.3.1. Benefit transfer - different approaches.....	43
3.2.3.2. Benefit transfer method - pros and cons	48
3.3. Economic impact analysis.....	48
3.4. Market studies and resource rent	51
4. Sampling issues and survey implementation	52
4.1 Observational methods.....	53
4.2 Questionnaire surveys.....	53
4.2.1 Sampling	53
4.2.2 Potential sources of error	55
4.3. Survey implementation	56
5. Guidelines for assessing benefits	59
5.1. Suitability of different methods	61
5.1.1 Revealed preference vs. stated preference suitability	61

5.1.2 Decision settings	62
5.2 Discussion	66
6. Recommendations	68
References	70
List of abbreviations:	80
Glossary	81

Appendices

Appendix 1: Examples of used methodology associated to fishery and preservation of fish stocks in the Nordic countries and the Central Europe.	84
Appendix 2: Major steps when conducting a contingent valuation (CV) study.	85
Appendix 3: Major steps when conducting a choice experiment (CE) study.	89
Appendix 4: Major steps when conducting a travel cost (TC) study.	92
Appendix 5: Table of total economic value (TEV) of recreational fishing in the Nordic countries.	94
Appendix 6: The Questionnaire used in the study “Economic value of recreational fishery in the Nordic countries”.	95

List of Figures

Figure 1. Relationship of HD and economics as they relate to examining human behaviour.
Figure 2. Categorization of benefits of fishing from a non-economic human dimensions perspective.
Figure 3. Categorization of total economic values (modified from Bateman et al., 2002).
Figure 4: Demand for recreational fishing trips for a given location.
Figure 5. Illustration of the effects of altered demands curves on consumer surplus.
Figure 6: Consumer surplus (CS) and producer surplus (PS) as a measure of economic benefit for individual (CS) and for producer (PS).
Figure 7. Economic rent for owner of fishing rights and total surplus.
Figure 8. Benefit transfer approaches (Rosenberger & Loomis, 2001).
Figure 9. A continuum of benefits transfer approaches (Barton, 1999).
Figure 10. Relationship between economic and human dimension research.
Figure 11. A continuum of decision settings associated to accuracy, costs and time (adapted from Brookshire, 1992).
Figure 12. Suitability of different non-market valuation methods, both SP and RP, for various policy and management needs.

List of Tables

Table 1. Some Broad Criteria for Choosing a Survey Type for Economics and Human Dimensions Research in Inland Fisheries (Source: Vaske 2008).
Table 2. Completed Sample Sizes Needed for Population Sizes and Characteristics at Three Levels of Precision (Dillman 2000; Table 5.1 p. 207).

List of Boxes

Box 1. The REP inventory applied to measuring general social psychological recreational fishing benefits.
Box 2. A study documenting differences in benefits from angling among anglers with and without disabilities (Freudenberg & Arlinghaus, 2010).
Box 3. An exploratory study on exercise effects of small game hunting in Eastern Norway (Kleiven & Bekkevold, 1994).
Box 4. A study on social inclusion benefits of angling in England (Wightman et al., 2008).
Box 5. Costs and Benefits of Improving Wild Salmon Passage in a Regulated River (Håkansson, 2007; Håkansson, 2006).
Box 6. Winner and losers of conservation policies for European eel: an economic welfare analysis for differently specialised eel anglers (Dorow et al., 2010).
Box 7. Water clarity effects on near-home water recreation value (Vesterinen & Pouta, 2009).

- Box 8. Value of Water Quality in Summer House Markets (Vesterinen, 2009).
- Box 9. Environmental Valuation Reference InventoryTM (EVRITM) – An example of a general benefits transfer database.
- Box 10. Wildlife Habitat Benefits Estimation Toolkit – An example of a specialised benefits transfer database.
- Box 11. Valuing international marine resources – a meta-analysis on the Baltic Sea (Ahtiainen, 2009).
- Box 12. Economic impact of inland fisheries (Mawle & Peirson, 2009; Radford, Riddington & Gibson, 2007).
- Box 13. The economic value of recreational fishery in the Nordic countries. Case study of a multinational survey (Toivonen et al., 2000).
- Box 14. Decision support tool for eel management (Dorow et al., 2010).

FOREWORD

The fisheries sector comprises commercial, subsistence and recreational fisheries. In the past, commercial activity has predominated marine and inland capture fisheries in Europe. However, in response to societal change, the importance of commercial capture fishing is decreasing and recreation is becoming the more important beneficiary of fish stocks. In many developed countries, recreational fishing is now the primary fishing activity in most inland and many coastal waters. For the competent and sustainable management of recreational fisheries it is essential that the sector recognizes its responsibilities and considers all environmental, economic and social aspects in its management measures and decision making.

The European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission (EIFAC) provides an inter-governmental forum for collaboration and information exchange on inland fisheries and aquaculture across European countries. Scientific work is undertaken in Working Parties by specialists from member countries. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries states that users of living and aquatic resources should conserve aquatic ecosystems and that the right to fish carries with it the obligation to do so in a responsible manner so as to ensure effective conservation and management of the living aquatic resources. Accordingly, EIFAC Working Party activity has included the recent publication of the Code of Practice for Recreational Fisheries and the production of these Methodologies as a sequel.

It is now generally recognized that recreational fishing is an important and highly valued leisure activity that provides a myriad of economic, social and ecological benefits to society. Nonetheless, the exact dimensions and value are often poorly known or difficult to quantify. Benefit evaluation is more complex than just counting the number of anglers and working out how much they spend. Indeed, the assessment of recreational fishing quality can depend as much upon subjective evaluation by the angler of the perceived fulfillment that the fishing experience provides, as it does upon rigorous objective appraisal. These new Methodologies will assist fisheries authorities and managers to understand how to properly value their recreational resource and thus will aid policy creation and decision making.

Policy guidance documents produced by EIFAC traditionally tended to focus upon the more conventional aspects of fishery management but times are changing and the challenges of the present day need to be embraced. There is increasing pressure on stakeholder authorities to pay due regard to the economic, social and human dimensions aspects of the sustainable management of the recreational fisheries resource; hence, this guidance could not be issued at a better time.



Phil Hickley
EIFAC Chairperson

1. Introduction

This document is a sequel to the EIFAC code of practice for recreational fisheries (EIFAC Occasional Paper No 42, Rome 2008), which suggests that the comprehensive value of inland fishing, including social and economic values, be taken into account when analyzing and managing these fisheries. The EIFAC Methodologies for assessing social and economic benefits of European inland recreational fisheries were prepared in 2009 by the EIFAC Working Party on Socio-Economic Aspects of Inland Fisheries, upon request of the Commission.

It is essential that state-of-the-art knowledge and tools are applied in economic and social analysis of recreational fishing. This document reviews and demonstrates the state-of-the-art.

For the best and most efficient, long term management of recreational fisheries, it is essential that the sector recognizes its responsibilities. The sector should:

- promote high quality recreational fishing experiences within the limits set by ecology, economics and society;
- adopt measures for the long term conservation and sustainable use of recreational fisheries resources, and base such on the best available knowledge;
- adopt the ecosystem approach as the guiding philosophy and exercise the precautionary principle/approach;
- identify all relevant parties having a legitimate interest in the use, conservation, management and development of recreational fisheries resources and engage them in the management process;
- base recreational fisheries management action on pre-defined management objectives, formulated as a recreational fisheries management plan; and
- consider all environmental, economic and social values and impacts in the appraisal of management measures.

Fisheries management and recreational fisheries management of inland waters should follow the ecosystem approach, which “strives to balance diverse societal objectives, by taking into account the knowledge and uncertainties about biotic, abiotic and human components of ecosystems, and their interactions, and applying an integrated approach to fisheries within ecologically meaningful boundaries”.¹ This includes the evaluation of the biological impacts and benefits of recreational fishing across all fisheries subsystems.

European inland fish stocks are exploited by about 30 million recreational anglers in 36 countries (Tillner, 2007). Consequently there is a need for comprehensive understanding of the benefits that recreational fisheries provide to societies and individual anglers in order to improve societal resource allocation. Knowledge is needed and can be produced on national, regional and local scale depending on the issue in question. Fishery authorities and managers, when exercising their powers, need to consider the wider socio-economic consequences of their actions on a local, regional, national and sometimes transboundary scale. They should also be aware of the preferences and values of the current and, importantly, the potential recreational anglers in order to better manage existing and planned fisheries.

The purpose of this document is to suggest methods and tools for assessing social and economic benefits of fishing, and to facilitate decision-making about issues fisheries authorities and managers

¹ <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/005/Y4470E/Y4470E00.HTM>

are faced with in their daily routines. The baseline is the anglers and their fishing activity, which may be analysed from different social and economic perspectives. The costs incurred by anglers for transport, food, tackle, equipment, and other goods and services tied to their hobby generates economic activity in other sectors. How these expenditures generate economic activities directly and indirectly can be estimated. However, sometimes the value of the fishery itself cannot be captured using market transactions. Sometimes recreational activities are not traded directly in a market where a market price would determine the access to the fishery. Sometimes recreational activities are sold at nominal prices that are less than what the market would bear as in particular lake fisheries. Different types of valuation methods have been developed to equalise the valuation of these non-market goods and services with commercial activities where values are established through market forces.

Often, it is beneficial to know in more detail what anglers demand when they want to go fishing, including the manner in which they make choices and the trade-offs between different attributes in the fishery. Distance to the fishing site, species available, company of other anglers, or type of gear may determine demand patterns. Such information may aide decisions on most efficient investment in development of new fishing sites, and it may be used to inform the tourism industry about which fishing products tourist anglers value the highest so marketing efforts can be targeted toward these anglers. Additionally, more specific studies may reveal specific effects of recreational fishing, such as health related benefits of the fishing activities.

Questions posed by managers are often tied to policy changes which have a wide range of implications. The overarching question is often related to allocation of scarce resources. This is both allocation between sectors (transport, infrastructure, recreational or commercial fishery, aquaculture, tourism, etc.) and between stakeholder groups and individuals. Changes in management may be aimed at reducing harmful effects from overutilization of the resource, conservation of vulnerable habitats, environmental investments aimed at improving the quality of the environment or re-establishing former lost habitats. All management decisions require informed knowledge, for example assessments of costs and benefits of planned changes.

The human dimension of management encompasses the study of human behaviour. The empowerment of people through stakeholder involvement in the management process is established as a key factor for compliance and social control mechanisms in the management system. Participatory approaches where relevant stakeholders, such as recreational anglers and owners of fishing rights, are involved in goal setting are often essential for achieving widely accepted managerial solutions. Adaptive management, in turn, involves experimental trials of management approaches that have been jointly designed by managers and researchers, using stakeholder input.

Introduction of the ecosystem approach as the new paradigm within management of natural resources poses a specific challenge to present and future managers. The implementation of the ecosystem approach to management has not found a commonly accepted methodology, but aims to include both goods and services made available for humans (as part of the ecosystem), but also the intermediate ecosystem goods and services preserving ecosystem integrity and reproduction. The questions tied to regulatory ecosystem services (i.e., carbon cycle, food webs, decomposition of nutrients) are relevant also when managing recreational fishing.

This EIFAC Occasional Paper provides guidance on how social and economic benefits of inland recreational fishing can be described, assessed and measured. It reviews and provides the descriptions of the most commonly used concepts and methods to assess social and economic benefits and costs associated with recreational fisheries. Economic benefits focus on (market and non-market) valuation and (local) economic impact. Social benefits are described using a Human Dimensions approach. Due to the role of EIFAC, emphasis in this Occasional Paper will be on inland fisheries.

This document is mainly targeted to policy managers and fisheries authorities. It is also targeted to people who commission or manage valuation studies and need to understand more about valuation or human dimension methods and underlying principles. It does not aspire to, and cannot function as, a manual for those who undertake valuation studies.

2. Social and economic approaches to benefits

A critique of European inland fishery management has been the limited amount of economic and social research (Aas & Ditton, 1998; Arlinghaus, Bork & Fladung, 2008). Inland fisheries management is about making choices using many types of information to meet established goals and objectives for fisheries resources (Krueger & Decker, 1999). From this definition, it follows that inland fisheries management is as much about people management as it is fish stock management because management goals and objectives are socially constructed. The general aim of fisheries management is to maintain, and if possible increase, the total sum of benefits fisheries provide to fishing communities and society at large, including conservation of biodiversity. To manage sustainably, it is thus paramount to understand the nature and diversity of benefits generated by inland fishing to anglers, communities and society at large as a basis for decision making and to defend the sector against other social priorities. It appears, however, that there is some confusion among fisheries professionals as to how to develop a complete picture of the benefits of fishing. This stems, in part, from the fact that there are varying approaches used to determine what constitutes fishing benefits and how to best measure and assess those benefits. There is currently no comprehensive framework which captures all types of social and economic benefits generated by fisheries. Thus, a major aim of this section is to explain benefits that arise from fisheries and to incorporate them into a common framework.

2.1. A joint framework for the human dimensions and economic research paradigms

Social and economic approaches to research in recreational fishing have a long tradition in both economics and other social sciences. In order to bring some clarity into the complexity of these research fields, Figure 1 presents a rough framework which elaborates on the fundamental stages of human behaviour (top row), and positions the major research activities by economics and the human dimensions (HD) paradigms in terms of their assumptions, theories and research questions by these stages. Referring to Figure 1, row two captures the economic approach to benefits measurement and row three captures the HD paradigm while row four lists the appropriate data collection methods. It is hoped that this integrated framework adds to the clarity of the fundamental objectives of each discipline as well as the relationships between them.

Human behaviour is the foundation of both economics and the other social sciences. One can observe human behaviour in association with all areas of life, and, in effect, each behaviour is associated with an act of choice. In other words, any behaviour must be predated by a decision or choice. Countless behavioural theories have posited various concepts and mental processes that guide or precede behaviour. For example, before one makes an actual decision, a person might typically go through a state of behavioural intention; depending on the choice this state might only last a split second (e.g. choosing a candy), or it might rely on months of investigative or search behaviour (e.g. choosing a car or house).

While economic research puts its main emphasis on these two stages of the behavioural process, other social sciences have focused their research on explaining the various cognitive phenomena that influence or lead up to behaviour. Much of this research revolves around the concepts of preferences and attitudes. Psychology defines attitudes as long-lasting predispositions to behaviour. The term preference(s) cannot be located as precisely in this framework, and psychology does not provide a clear definition. Depending on the application of a specific study, preferences may be positioned anywhere between attitudes and a location falling just short of the actual choice. The concept of stated and revealed preference research makes it clear that preferences may be inferred from overt (actual) behaviour, or may be elicited by means of various survey methods. In economics and other social sciences, preference refers to the set of assumptions relating to a real or imagined "choice" between alternatives and the possibility of rank ordering of these alternatives, based on the degree of happiness, satisfaction, gratification, enjoyment, or utility they provide. The

reference to real or hypothetical behaviour leads to the distinction between revealed and stated preference research, which is fundamental for large sections of this EIFAC Occasional Paper.




Figure 1. Relationship of HD and economics as they relate to examining human behaviour.

Around these fundamental principles of human behaviour, many different theories have been developed. The discussion of economics and the more general human dimensions paradigm below will make it apparent quickly that each approach places its major emphasis on different stages of the behavioural model.

Utility is a concept developed in the field of economics to describe the enjoyment received from consuming goods and services. Economics assumes that humans are utility maximizers and this objective is reflected in every choice made. For example, if a recreational angler selects one lake over other lakes, it is assumed that this one lake possesses some characteristics that make it preferable over other lakes. Thus, the act of actual (overt) choice provides the best insights about human behaviour and much of economic modeling focuses on choice. Most goods and services are exchanged in a market, and the interplay between supply and demand determines its price and consequently its value. For many European inland fisheries, access to fishing is traded in a typical market transaction. However, in the context of recreational fishing and other activities that rely on public goods or services, such markets do not exist. Therefore economists have developed a suite of methods to infer the value of such goods or services, which will be presented later in this Occasional Paper. At the moment we only want to mention that economics focuses largely on data representing the actual behaviour (travel cost analysis, hedonic modeling) or, in some cases, collects information about intended behaviour (contingent valuation). Much of this Paper will elaborate further on these economic approaches.

The various disciplines in the social sciences regard human behaviour as a more complex phenomenon. Led by psychology and social psychology, the emphasis of these research directions

is on explaining a suite of behavioural antecedents, i.e. which cognitive aspects contribute to the eventual behaviour, and how do they contribute to the choice process. Other research questions focus on the relationship of these components to actual behaviour, and whether any of these components can be influenced for the purpose of eventually influencing behaviour. The HD approach was introduced in the early 1970s by Hendee & Potter (1971) and has continued to follow a social-psychological research tradition (Manfredo, 2008). In this tradition, the social benefits generated by fisheries are measured by both quantitative and qualitative methods. Human dimensions research focuses predominantly on the behavioural antecedents in the behavioural model. Although the term human dimensions originated in recreational fisheries research, it is now used much wider, and may very well span the entire phenomenon of social sciences in resource management.

While this HD research does not rely on one single convenient unit of measurement, like money as economics does, an important component of human dimensions research are the many theories and concepts that have been developed using social psychology and structural sociology, which provide more in-depth explanations of the benefits of fishing, and have enriched many managerial discussions in that way. General concepts and theories of social psychology have found their applications in recreation research in general and recreational fisheries research in particular by focusing on satisfaction, motivation, perceived crowding, norms and standards, and many more.

Over time, recreation and fisheries specific theories and concepts have emerged, which now guide much of the work. Undoubtedly the most prominent of all theories is the specialization theory (Bryan, 1977; Bryan, 2000), which has since been applied across many outdoor recreation activities (Hvenegaard, 2002; Kuentzel & Heberlein, 2006; Kuentzel, 2001), and has been used as a lens to explain the diversity of preferences associated with the level of experience in an activity (Kuentzel & Heberlein, 2006).

Another branch of HD research has focused on the reasons anglers give for going fishing (Fedler & Ditton, 1994). Motives are the underlying forces that act on a tendency to engage in an activity with an expected outcome (Atkinson, 1969), while satisfaction refers to the difference between the expected outcome and its perceived fulfillment (Holland and Ditton, 1992). While most empirical studies on the motivation for fishing show that catch motivations may not be the primary motivations for anglers to fish, these catch aspects may also constrain angler satisfaction (Arlinghaus, 2006).

Other topics regularly investigated with the guidance of various theories are recruitment to a recreation activity, spatial displacement from one location, or product shift, explaining how users might need to adjust their personal perception of a product when some characteristics of the product change, but they prefer to remain in the same location for whatever reason; these arguments are based on cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957).

An approach that guides much of the HD research is the Theory of Planned Behavior (also referred to as Theory of Reasoned Action) (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980), which postulates a relationship between the various behaviour stages similar to the sequence in Figure 1: Attitudes are thought to influence intended behaviour and therefore in turn also behaviour. In many applications of this theory the concepts of attitudes themselves has been refined into various more specific components, such as a cognitive component, an affective component, personal importance attitudes, an attitude towards the target of behaviour (e.g. Bright and Manfredo, 1996). While the theory of planned behaviour has been applied frequently in the HD of wildlife management, no complete application is known in recreational fishing although many recreational fisheries studies use its components.²

² For example, the detailed conceptualization of attitudes, which may be used for designing education campaigns, or other public outreach programs, and, occasionally, models are developed to predict from attitudes to actual behaviour.

Placing the main research activities of economics and the other social sciences into this framework shows that despite these many shared commonalities, to a large extent the respective disciplines focus on different stages of the behavioural process: economic research focuses predominantly on behaviour, while the various social science approaches focus more on behavioural antecedents. Given this divergent emphasis, combined with the very different paradigmatic backgrounds and somewhat different research methods, economics and the other social sciences are usually perceived as more different than they actually should be. It is one of the goals of this Paper to explain each approach in its own right, as well as to explain overlaps and possible synergies, which are recently emerging. While some researchers and other experts would argue that economics is or should be part of the 'human dimensions paradigm' and while we might agree with the concept, we will keep the two concepts separate for this Occasional Paper as it facilitates the required explanations. Nevertheless, potential overlaps and synergies will be identified in the appropriate locations of the Paper.

What kind of data collection is suitable and feasible depends to a large extent on the respective stage of the behavioural model that the research question is positioned. Data about actual behaviour are collected by simple observation (e.g. creel surveys, or more general counting by observers, by automatic counters, etc.). Data about behaviour may also be collected by simple on-site surveys, or by surveys mailed later (e.g. at the end of a trip respondents explain what they did, or they are asked to recall their angling behaviour over the past season, or the past year). Clearly, recall problems and biases may become an issue when the recall covers a longer period of time.

If the management goal requires quantitative analysis, data collections for the other stages of the behavioural process preceding the actual choice depend primarily on questionnaire surveys. The types of questions in the survey instruments range enormously across the stages of choice being examined, specific research approach, research questions, and theories applied. These details will become apparent throughout the remainder of this document.

Broadly defined, the economic tradition uses two different concepts to examine the implications of policy decisions on society: economic value and economic impacts. The first, economic value, also known as economic benefit or welfare, monetizes the value society places on resources or activities. Welfare analysis first came into use in the early 20th century and gained mathematical rigor and wider use mid-century (Samuelson, 1947). Economic value should be the metric used to decide between one course of action and another (e.g., Edwards, 1990; Freeman, 1993; Samuelson, 1947).

Economic value however is not the only criterion that should be examined when analyzing resource policies. Equity, fairness, distributional concerns, and other social impacts are important (Edwards, 1990). Economic impact analysis, also known as input-output analysis, is useful in addressing distributional concerns. However, equity, fairness and other social impact questions are best addressed in the HD tradition (Miller & Blair, 1985). Economic impact analysis, while often confused with societal welfare measures, is a method that addresses distributional concerns within an economy. The economy in question can be defined as a city, region, or an entire nation. Economic impact analysis traces the flow of economic transactions through the researcher defined economy and answers the research question on what specific economic sectors win or lose as the result of a policy change.

Economic metrics are often intuitive to decision makers, which is why the economic approach to fisheries policy analysis appeals to decision makers. When properly measured, economic value measures capture all individually held values for resource use or preservation including psychological, health, and cultural benefits. However many detractors doubt that some of these more intangible concepts can be captured monetarily. On the other hand, economic impact tools

only trace the flow of economic activity in a community and cannot capture the full set of cultural and social benefits of fishing.

For example, while development of a tourism fishery at a large inland water body might be valued in terms of how a sample of local residents prefer this development over alternatives (economic value) or in terms of the additional income and jobs generated by the development over alternatives (economic impact), the social impacts of tourism development or the cultural value of traditional fisheries is likely to be only partly captured in such assessments unless surveys are designed that specifically assess cultural values in economic terms. It is also doubtful to what degree monetary values can be assessed in every situation in a complete way, which is why there is a role for alternative ways of assessing the benefits and costs of fish resources and fisheries management policies.

The economic valuation of environmental and other non-market goods and services such as fishing experiences is useful because all decision making involves choices and tradeoffs in allocating scarce resources. Hence, valuation provides explicit and comparable information for policy-makers and insight to social effects (benefits and costs) of different management policies or projects and their subsequent economic or social impacts. In this context, assessment of economic value is the correct measurement in many cases (Edwards, 1991), e.g. when valuing the impact of water quality changes for recreational fisheries.

The context in which fisheries authorities and managers are faced with economic valuation or economic impact analysis is usually related to fisheries damage assessment, defining various management options (e.g., stocking versus doing something else) and ultimately defining the total benefits that recreational fisheries provide to society to safeguard satisfactory allocation of societal resources for the sector. Economic valuation of fisheries is also needed because cost-benefit analysis (CBA) is generally used for assessment of societal profitability of certain projects or policies. This approach applies efficiency criteria and assesses whether the value of benefits overrun that of costs regarding the policy. Therefore, application of CBA presumes that commensurate measures, i.e. monetary units for values of benefits and costs related to environmental change, are available.

In the following, the different components of benefits of fishing will be described from both the HD and the economic research perspectives. This section will conclude by suggesting a combined framework that highlights the overlap of these two different traditions. In later parts of this Occasional Paper, the particular methods to assess the various benefit components will be presented in detail.

2.2 Benefits of fishing from the human dimensions (HD) perspective

Benefits of fishing from a HD perspective focus on direct and indirect benefits. The direct perspective revolves around the individual angler emphasizing how fishing generates benefits that satisfy the wishes, needs and expectations of anglers (psychological benefits) and how fishing generates ancillary benefits, e.g. improved health (physiological benefits). Indirectly, fishing is a cultural asset and makes important contributions to the social structure of societies in many parts of the world. HD researchers ask questions about the benefits of fishing for social communities and as an expression of culture in fishing-dependent areas (social and cultural benefits). Finally, anglers often have an incentive to conserve fishable stocks, and fishing provides a means for enhancing traditional ecological knowledge that is of value for meeting overarching societal goals for sustainable exploitation (ecological benefits). Figure 2 characterizes the grouping of this diverse set of benefits. The value of assessing the full range of benefits from a non-economic HD approach perspective is the ability to examine the disaggregated benefits that fishing generates for society and

to assess the individual components of total benefit that the economic approach to benefit measurement typically aggregates into one measure.




Figure 2. Categorization of benefits of fishing from a non-economic human dimensions perspective.

2.2.1 Psychological benefits

Research studying the psychological benefits of inland fishing, particularly recreational fishing, has progressed from an activity approach to a behavioural approach. The activity approach defines fishing as an individual recreational activity. The behavioural approach focuses on why people are motivated to participate in recreation activities and the benefits sought by participation in a particular outdoor recreation activity (Manning, 1999; termed “experiential approach” by Manfredi, Driver & Tarrant, 1996). Based on psychological expectancy and motivational theory, it is assumed that human behaviour in outdoor recreation is generally goal-oriented and aimed at meeting particular psychological needs (Hendee, 1974; Manfredi et al., 1996). More specifically, Driver and colleagues have applied social psychological expectancy theory to suggest that people engage in activities in specific settings to realize a group of psychological outcomes that are known, expected and valued (Driver & Cooksey, 1977; Driver & Knopf, 1976; Fedler & Ditton, 1994; Manfredi et al., 1996; Manning, 1999). Thus, people select and participate in recreation activities, such as recreational fishing, to meet personal goals or satisfy certain needs. Leisure theory holds that participation in recreational activities is self-rewarding when it occurs during free-time and engaged in by free choice (Manfredi et al., 1996). Personal benefits, which range from values associated with the catch to personal experiences of the catch, ultimately result in social benefits of improved relations with significant others and physiological benefits related to stress relaxation and improved health.

Generally, psychological outcomes related to fish are categorized as activity-general (e.g., nature experiences) and activity-specific (e.g., fish catch and consumption) outcomes, both of which result in or contribute to a satisfying fishing experience. Satisfaction is assumed to be the ultimate product of the fishing experience, at least for recreational anglers (Hendee, 1974). Manning (1999) distinguishes four levels in the behavioural approach to outdoor recreation. Level 1 represents the general demand for a given activity such as fishing. Level 2 represents the setting in which the activities take place (e.g., remote or urban). Level 3 emphasizes the underlying reasons (motivations) for people to participate in a given activity (Level 1) in a given setting (Level 2). Level 4 refers to the ultimate higher-order benefits (alternatively referred to by various researchers from different research traditions as utilities, welfare, satisfactions, benefits or value) that the participant experiences as the end-result of the outdoor experience (e.g., enhanced self-esteem,

enhanced personal health) (Manning, 1999). In the context of psychological benefits of fishing, spiritual benefits may be the benefits of recreational fishing which is most difficult to define. This aspect of the fishing experience enriches humans' relations with fish, water and nature. In the seminal work of Driver et al. (1996), spiritual experiences in outdoor recreation are defined as reflection on deep personal values, respect, wonder, awe, mystery and sense of humility and connectedness to nature.

2.2.2 Physiological benefits

In addition to meeting psychologically defined expectations, fishing can consciously or unconsciously create physiological benefits and benefits for human health. For example, Pretty, Hine & Peacock (2006) found that negative feelings and depression were relaxed after fishing experiences. Moreover, objective indicators of improved physiological state (e.g., heart rate, skin conductivity) and general health can be expected to be related to fishing (Pretty et al., 2007). It will be argued through this document that fishing is a vehicle for improved health although further research is needed to justify this assertion. Despite the obvious physiological benefits that participating in an active outdoor recreational activity such as fishing can have, the research on this area is rudimentary. However, if physiological benefits are not conscious to the respondents, it is unlikely that these benefits can be measured by economic analyses based on surveys of individuals. Instead, other techniques can be used to develop the economic value of physiological and health benefits.

2.2.3 Social and cultural benefits

Describing and documenting social and cultural benefits of fishing is challenging but needed for inland fisheries, and for recreational fishing more generally. The idea is that fishing is valued in social terms as a cultural asset because fishing is important for social systems, for generating wealth, for social identity and for improving the quality of life. Cultural benefits are a separate aspect of social benefits, but focus more on how an activity, such as recreational fishing, provides meaning, is represented in the community, and gradually materialize in established discourses, social groups and events of a society. This, then, creates references in terms of space and time (geographical names, specific dates for instance related to the opening of the fishing season, ceremonies etc.). Little research has been done on these benefits of recreational fishing compared to subsistence fishing, and there is a need to apply approaches from fields such as history and anthropology to reveal and clarify such benefits. In the context of social impacts, the Social Impact Assessment research tradition aims to assess broad community benefits from fishing activities in their widest sense (Schirmer & Casey, 2005). This assessment tradition is explicitly linked to landscape planning and decision making processes, and is highly applied and flexible in terms of methods, measures and degree of complexity and rigidity.

2.2.4 Ecological benefits

Inland fishing creates a wide range of ecological benefits for society. The benefits range from the engagement of anglers in management and governance of natural resources, funding of fisheries management programs, an increase of traditional ecological knowledge, environmental legislation for preservation, and the socialization of young people in the sustainable use of renewable social resources. In some instances, compensation claims for pollution events, which could effectively reduce the likelihood of undesirable ecological changes, are possible because of the structure of property right systems in specific fisheries. In other cases, anglers are ambassadors and lobbyists for the health of the resource, fighting for better protection and conservation of habitat and fish stocks. There are large, undervalued ecological benefits for society associated with this social movement. Moreover, under private fishing right regimes, angler organizations or landowners are generally required by law to manage fisheries. Thus, fisheries management obligations are transferred to the

local level, and anglers or other rights holders generally invest private funds or engage voluntarily during free time to engage in such activities as stock fisheries, clean shorelines, or even undertake habitat conservation projects. Also, angler organizations have sometimes been instrumental in partnering with nature conservationists, resource management agencies and land owners to create fish passage facilities and other habitat improvements (Granek et al., 2008). All these ecological impacts of recreational fishing are directly or indirectly amenable to objective assessment and quantification using a range of methods from comparative case studies, history or economics, but limited research has been conducted.

2.2.5 Summary of HD benefits research

The variety of benefits from recreational fishing are obviously measured in different units providing a challenge for comparing benefit categories or summing them to provide an overall measure of total benefits. HD separates benefits accrued by an individual person in the process of engaging in fishing (e.g., physiological and physiological/health benefits) and benefits accruing to larger units of the system (e.g., social and cultural benefits) (Weithman, 1999). In addition, ecological benefits are conceivable both at the individual level (e.g., increased awareness and knowledge of ecological issues among practitioners) or at the societal scale (e.g., increased level of engagement in conservation through incentives and property rights by fishing communities) (Arlinghaus, Mehner & Cowx, 2002; Granek et al., 2008). However, ecological benefits have not been emphasized in the traditional HD literature to date.

2.3 Benefits of fishing from an economic perspective

A complimentary, yet often separately considered approach to benefit assessment of fisheries originates from the economic sciences. Economic studies and HD research have considerable, if not complete, overlap in estimate of benefits, but each uses different jargon and definitions which hamper a common approach. Economists take two general approaches to estimating value. One, economists estimate a single value that incorporates the value of the good in use, including ancillary benefits (psychological, physiological, etc.) and non-use values such as the value of access to or the existence of a resource (Gentner & Lowther, 2002). Two, economists will focus directly on a single attribute of an experience, such as the value of one additional fish in an angler's catch (Gentner, 2007). Recently there has been additional interest in using techniques such as hedonic valuation or stated preference choice experiments (also known as conjoint analysis) to decompose the value of a good or service into all, or the relevant portion, of its constituent parts (Gentner, 2004; Louviere, Hensher & Swait, 2000).

2.3.1 Economic value versus economic impact

Economists distinguish two types of outcomes created by fisheries, economic value and economic impact. Economic value refers to the net benefits received by society, while economic impacts trace the flow of economic activity through a local economy (Miller & Blair, 1985). While policy makers often confuse the two, the concepts of value and impact refer to fundamentally different economic frameworks (Edwards, 1991). The use of each of these approaches in decision-making depends on the objectives of the decision makers. If overall economic efficiency is the objective, value metrics are the clear choice. With value, a positive increase in value strictly means society is better off and conversely a loss in value as the result of a policy, a cost, is strictly negative.

In contrast, the concept of economic impacts examines the flow of expenditures on fishery resource activities and products, and how this spending filters through a community. While economic impact measures should not be used to choose a specific course of action, they can be used to examine what particular sectors in the economy are affected positively or negatively by a particular policy and to what degree. Economic impact analysis examines the distribution of value changes identified

when comparing benefits, making both types of analysis complementary. Economic impacts cannot be used to select the most efficient use of resource. Economic impact analysis is driven by consumer or producer spending on the goods. As a result, economic impacts are maximized when spending is maximized. Maximizing impacts violates basic economic principles of maximizing profits for a given level of output for firms, or minimizing expenditures for a given level of utility for consumers or anglers (Edwards, 1991). That is, the most efficient level of fishery production involves keeping costs down in order to keep profits up. If the goal were maximizing economic impacts, the suggestion would be to maximize costs. Often advocacy groups will use economic impact metrics to bolster their arguments in the policy process and this is incorrect. Additionally, it is impossible to add value estimates to economic impact estimates as both concepts are fundamentally different.

2.3.2 Total economic value

A central concept of environmental and welfare economics is total economic value (TEV), which has proven useful as a conceptual framework for analysis of policy choices and their impact on social welfare. It is measured by the preferences of individuals (recreational anglers, fishery owners, commercial fishermen and the public) for aspects of fishing and reflects the benefits humans gain from the direct or indirect use and non-use of the natural environment. Figure 3 illustrates the various types of values included within TEV, which can be broadly categorized into use and non-use values. The discussion is here focused on recreational fishing for simplicity and draws from Edwards (1990), Freeman (1979), Haab & McConnell (2002), and Mitchell & Carson (1989).

Use value is the current use value derived by recreational fishing, which may be direct or indirect.

Direct use value: Individuals make use of a resource in either a consumptive or extractive way, such as harvest by recreational anglers, or in a non-consumptive way. For example, sight-seeing, enjoyment of nature and other ecosystem services generated by a fishery that do not deplete the fishery resources are non-consumptive direct uses of a fishery (e.g., viewing fishing activity by others, and enjoyment of wild salmon jumping in their native river).

Indirect use value: Individuals benefit from ecosystem services supported by a fishery resource without actually using it. Indirect use value may include activities away from the site, including reading about the fishery or special activities at the fishery location. All of this indirect use of a fishery may provide value to people that are enjoyed and thus can be valued formally in monetary terms.

In addition to current use values, individuals may hold value for preserving the option to use the resource in the future. If this option refers to own use, it is called *option value*.

Non-use value (also called passive use value): Non-use value derived from a fishery without directly or indirectly using it. It involves the benefits from simply knowing that the environmental resource or service is maintained without any actual, planned or possible use. Non-use value can be partitioned into three basic components: *existence value*, *altruistic value* and *bequest value*. *Altruistic value* is derived from knowing that the environmental resource or service is available to the current generation, while *bequest value* arises from knowing that, for instance, certain fish stock will be passed on to next and future generations. *Existence value* is purely associated to the personal satisfaction of knowing that, for example, fish stock or an ecosystem with all its organisms will be maintained and continues to exist.

Various methods have been developed to quantify the use and non-use value of a recreational fishery. These can be broadly categorized into stated and revealed preference methods (see section 3.2.).




Figure 3. Categorization of total economic values (modified from Bateman et al., 2002).

2.3.2.1 Economics of resource allocation

Economics, particularly the study of economic value, provides an excellent tool for allocating scarce resources among competing user groups. In essence, every fisheries policy change is an allocation question: allocating fish between commercial fishermen and recreational fishermen, allocating stocks between consumption and conservation, allocating water behind a damn for power generation or for coldwater fisheries, etc. From an economic perspective, allocations between uses should be set at the level that maximizes total benefit from the resources.

For both the recreational and commercial sectors, total value is the sum of consumer and producer surplus. Producer surplus is measured by examining the supply curves for commercial producers of seafood, including harvesters, processors, wholesalers, and distributors, as well as the supply curves for for-hire recreational service providers. Essentially, producer surplus is the difference between the cost of producing the good and the euro value generated by the sale of the good and is similar to the concept of business profit. While the concept of producer surplus as profit is intuitive and easily understood, consumer surplus is less intuitive. Sometimes it helps to think of consumer surplus as a consumer's profit. Consumer surplus is measured by examining the demand for goods at the consumer level including the demand for fish at markets and restaurants and the demand for

recreational fishing trips. Consumer surplus is the difference between the amount actually paid and the amount consumer would have been willing to pay for the good in question. In the case of recreational fishing, or any other environmental good that is not traded in a market, special techniques are needed to estimate consumer surplus or willingness to pay.

In the case of allocating fish between commercial and recreational sectors, total value or net benefits for the recreational sector is the sum of the consumer surplus from recreational fishing participants and producer surplus from fishing guides and resource owners. For the commercial sector, total value is the sum of consumer surplus from the purchase of seafood products in markets and restaurants and the producer surplus from harvesters, processors, wholesalers, and distributors of those fishery products.

Value is not static across all allocations, and, as any consumer obtains more of a good, the marginal value of obtaining the next unit of that good falls. That is, there are diminishing returns to additional consumption of any good and this is a fundamental tenet of consumer demand, which has important implications for allocation decisions. A similar tenet exists for producers, but does not always hold depending on the character of the industry. As a result, it is important to examine the schedule of these marginal values in each sector. Societal benefits are maximized at the allocation where marginal value from one use is equal to the marginal value from a competing use. This is known in economics as the equimarginal principle. Using the equimarginal principle is widely recognized as the best way to maximize societal value in an allocation analysis (Edwards, 1990; Freeman, 1993). The equimarginal principle is particularly useful when there are multiple competing user groups. Often, it is difficult to develop a complete schedule of marginal values across all possible allocations. In this case, it is appropriate to examine total value, recognizing, however, that total value may not take diminishing marginal returns into account.

2.3.2.2 Economic value of recreational fishing: consumer side

Utility is a general term used by economists to capture all benefits derived from a good or service by an individual. Utility can be thought of as the pleasure or satisfaction an individual experiences from being in a particular situation or from consuming goods and services. The most basic tenet of consumer theory is that consumers seek to maximize their utility in every choice and across all choices, given their budget constraint. In general, consumers reveal their utility preferences for goods through the choices they make in the marketplace for the goods they prefer. Consumers always choose to purchase a good or a service because they perceive it to be a good deal or worth the investment. That is, they hold a valuation for that good that is at least as high as the price the good is offered for sale in the marketplace. As a result, there is always some amount more the consumer would have been willing to pay to acquire that good, but did not have to pay. That excess willingness to pay is value or consumer surplus.

Through an examination of demand and supply, consumer surplus (CS) or willingness to pay (WTP) can be estimated. By examining the choices consumers make, demand curves for the individual can be developed for each good. Because of the principle of diminishing marginal utility discussed above, demand curves are generally downward sloping. Figure 4 displays a typical downward sloping demand for recreational fishing trips. The demand curve for an individual is the locus of all utility maximizing units of consumption at each price level and therefore contains all of an individual's preferences for the good in question. This is an important point that bears further explanation. An individual's choice to participate in an activity contains their valuation for all the attributes that make participation an attractive option. That is if an angler believes fishing is worth participating in because of physiological, psychological, social, harvest or a myriad of other reasons, their valuation of that choice to take a fishing trip contains the value for those attributes. Typically, however, economists do not disaggregate those attributes.

Similar to the consumer side, producers seek to maximize profits for a given cost structure. In many ways, it is much easier to conceptualize profit than it is utility. In Figure 4, it is assumed that supply is horizontal for fishing trips, as is often the case. The horizontal slope is due to the constant marginal cost of providing recreational experiences in many cases. That is the cost to produce one or one million fishing trips to a given location is assumed the same to the producer of those trips. In this case the producer of fishing experiences is the government or the landowner. Producer surplus will be discussed in greater detail below.




Figure 4: Demand for recreational fishing trips for a given location.

Where demand and supply intersect is the equilibrium market price (P) and quantity demanded (Q) for fishing trips. Consumer surplus, or WTP, is the area PCB in Figure 4. It is the amount above and beyond what the consumer is currently paying (area $PCQO$) that the consumer would be willing to pay for the good. Many things can change the size of triangle PCB . Shifts in supply can increase or decrease CS. If the marginal costs of the supplier of fishing trips increase, supply shifts upwards, fewer trips will be taken, and CS shrinks. If the marginal costs of the supplier shrink, the supply curve shifts downward, more trips will be taken and CS increases.

Demand shifts can also change CS. Figure 5 displays both an increase in demand (D') and a decrease in demand (D''). Demand shifts can be driven by any number of factors, other than changing price, including changing preferences or tastes, changes in income impacting the budget constraint, or changes in the prices of related goods. For an increase in the stock size at this site through increased water quality or stock enhancement, the demand curve would shift outward to D' . At D' , the CS increases from PCB to PAD . The amount of the increase in CS is $BCAD$. CS might also shrink as a result of a fishery policy change. For example, if a new planned harvesting policy reduces the potential for harvest by anglers (e.g., reduced daily bag limit) at this site, this change reduces the relative attractiveness of fishing at this site compared to other fishing sites or other sources of recreation. This regulatory policy shifts the demand curve inward, moving demand from D to D'' . Consequently the size of CS shrinks to PGH corresponding to a welfare loss of $HGCB$ (Figure 5). This change in welfare measures the social impacts of different policy alternatives and

allows the comparison of the effects of different policies to identify the policy that provides the best benefit-cost ratio or to analyse the degree of compensation for the loss of utility.




Figure 5. Illustration of the effects of altered demands curves on consumer surplus.

In Figures 4 and 5, demand for recreational fishing is expressed on a two-dimensional graph as a function of price of fishing. While many goods are traded in a market, many recreational activities and most environmental goods are not. In some cases, like trips on private property, price can be characterized using the price of access, in many cases there is no defined good traded in the marketplace when one takes a fishing trip. Goods like fish flesh are traded in the market and it is relatively straightforward to use market purchase data to construct demand curves and estimate CS/WTP. Recreation and environmental goods are considered non-market goods as there is no defined market for water quality or fishing trips. These goods are not traded in the market as a whole unit, but instead, in the case of fishing, are composed of expenditures on travel, tackle and other trip expenditures. Special survey based techniques are necessary to value non-market goods in most cases and those methods will be discussed in greater depth in section 3.2.

There are many factors that determine the cost of taking a fishing trip and many attributes of the trip including regulations, size of the fish, harvest size, scenic beauty, access, facilities etc. (Hunt, 2005). Economists interested in valuing recreational fishing experiences would therefore estimate demand functions as a function of a bundle of attributes (e.g., fish size, aesthetic quality, regulation in place, catch rate, water quality). Functions based on multiple attributes can then be used to estimate change in CS stemming from changes in the attributes affected by the policy. This approach values what happens to the individual angler and these individual values can be aggregated to the population of all recreational anglers impacted by the policy, provided that estimates of total number of anglers in a region are available. These value or benefit estimates would then be used to identify optimal policies in a cost/benefit analysis framework.

2.3.2.3 Economic value of recreational fishing: producer side

On the production side, the supply curve traces the locus of all profit maximizing production points for a given set of production costs. Unlike on the consumer side, the industry supply curve can be upward, horizontally or vertically sloped depending on the structure of the industry. An industry characterized by constant marginal costs will have a horizontal supply curve, an industry with infinite marginal costs will have a vertical supply curve (the rare case of a good with a completely fixed supply), and an industry with increasing marginal costs will have an upwards sloping supply curve (most typical case). For the purpose of this EIFAC Occasional Paper, producers include recreational opportunity providers such as landowners and for-hire recreational providers and commercial fishermen.

While a production decision is always the result of a market transaction, calculating producer surplus requires detailed data on the costs and earnings structure of individual firms in the fishery. Figure 6 contains a representation of a producer surplus under the typical upward sloping supply function. Under perfect competition, the output supply function is equal to the marginal cost function of the firm. In most cases, perfectly competitive firms face increasing marginal industry costs and therefore have upward sloping supply functions.

To illustrate producer surplus in a competitive market, in Figure 6, the price of a good such as fish flesh is a function of its supply and demand in the market where producers supply their products. In Figure 6, the quantity of good demanded is shown to decrease as price increases, as is typical under diminishing marginal utility as described above. The supply of the good relates to the costs of its production (e.g., fuel to catch fish). At low prices only the most efficient producers are able to operate, but as the price increases, less efficient producers enter the industry, resulting in increased supply. As a result, the supply of the good increases with increasing price and marginal cost is an increasing function of quantity supplied. In perfectly competitive markets, market price is set at the intersection of supply and demand at price P and quantity demanded Q . As above, consumer surplus is the darker shaded triangle PCB .

Total revenue in Figure 6 is the rectangle $OPCQ$. The total cost of producing the good by all producers is given by the area under the supply curve, $OACQ$. The difference between the total revenue generated from sales and the total costs of production, given by the area APC , is a surplus accruing to the production industry. This producer surplus (PS) represents benefits accruing to the producers from being able to sell the good at market price P . In essence, it is the return earned by the firm selling fish products, providing recreational access, for-hire recreational services or hatchery fish for stocking.

Landowners that provide access to fishing on private property are considered producers of recreational fishing trips and estimation of their producer surplus deserves particular attention. This is only relevant in privately governed recreational fisheries or inland fisheries (which is common in Central and Northern Europe). For an owner of a fishery, this return may be economically important, depending on the quality of the fishing site and resource costs necessary to maintain the fishery. Marginal cost for the production of fishing access, in cases where the landowner does not invest in stock enhancement, access provision nor other maintenance costs, is simply the cost of the resource. If the land in question is not mortgaged, the resource cost is simply the opportunity cost of using that property for another income generating purpose like timber production, agriculture, or development. Often, in the case of inland fisheries in central and northern Europe, the opportunity costs are assumed to zero (see chapter 3.4). That is, the landowner could not generate income from his land in any other fashion than the provision of fishing access.




Figure 6: Consumer surplus (CS) and producer surplus (PS) as a measure of economic benefit for individual (CS) and for producer (PS).

In economic theory, the portion of producer surplus that accrues to the resource is called resource rent. Under perfectly competitive markets, resource rents are typically driven to zero unless the producer can exercise non-competitive market power. In the case of providing access to a lake or other water body entirely owned by a single owner or producer, that owner can act as a monopolistic producer if his holdings are unique from any other resources. It is not hard to imagine that owners of fishing resources could easily position themselves with this type of market power. Resource rent (also called economic rent) will exist when the owner can set price above marginal costs, as in monopolistic pricing. For this to occur, the landowner has to act as a monopolist in the provision of access to the property. Under perfect competition, supply equals marginal cost.

Under a monopoly, the producer sets his price higher than the competitive price using the intersection of the firm's marginal revenue and marginal cost curves. Figure 7 highlights these concepts visually assuming the owner of the fishing right has a fixed marginal cost (P_0) regardless of the number of permits issued. This generates the horizontal supply curve. Additionally, because demand is downward sloping, the landowner's marginal revenue function is also downward sloping. Following monopolistic pricing rules, the landowner would charge price P for a permit, where his marginal revenue and marginal cost curves intersect (marginal cost is horizontal). At price P , demand for fishing trip is Q .

Because of the landowner's monopolistic power, resource rent is indicated by the area ABCD in Figure 7 as the difference between the actual price charged (P) in the market and the cost of providing a fishing permit (P_0). At price level P , the total economic surplus of the fishery is the sum of CS (DCE) and resource rent (ABCD), with CS being a measure of value for the anglers and resource rent being a measure of value accruing to the owner of a fishery. If the permit price equals the marginal cost of providing permits (P_0), as would be the case under perfect competition, the resource rent accruing to fishing rights owner is zero. In this case the total surplus coincides with CS (AFE), and the number of sold permits is Q_1 .

Economic rent can, in principle, be estimated from market data using fishing permit prices and landowner expenditure data. Owners of fishing rights receive at least a net income flow (payments from anglers in excess of fishery operating and maintenance costs) and they can sell the right to this flow. In theory, the market value of fishing rights will be such that the annual net income flow from fishing right ownership is broadly equivalent to the return expected from other forms of wealth holding. Briefly, the market value of fishing rights represents a capitalisation of the net income flow, and this net flow is a good approximation to economic rent in private inland recreational fisheries. This also implies that changes in market value are measures of change in economic rent (Radford et al., 2001). Basically, the resource rent relates to the richness (i.e., attractiveness) of the resource to the consumer (the angler), and can be assumed to differ, for example, between a salmon river and a typical lake coarse fishery, depending on the preferences of the consumer.




Figure 7. Economic rent for owner of fishing rights and total surplus.

The owner or manager would normally work to increase demand for recreational fishing in his fishery, thereby increasing economic returns up to the point where negative attributes affecting demand (e.g., crowding, overfishing, decrease in fish size, etc.) begin to impact demand negatively. At a given price, this can be done by increasing the quality of the fishing experience to a level that would support higher prices for access.

In summary, producer surplus is the business corollary to consumer surplus and it is a firm's willingness to pay to produce goods (e.g., access) or services (e.g., guided fishing). As a reminder, TEV is the sum of consumer surplus and the producer surplus of all industries providing goods or services from a resource. If Figure 6 was the market for guided fishing trips, the TEV of guided fishing trips would be the sum of the two shaded triangles. In an examination of the allocation of a fish stock between commercial harvest and recreational uses, when the use of the stock included guided fishing opportunities, recreational TEV would include:

- Private recreational angler consumer surplus
- Landowner producer surplus or rent
- Guided recreational angler consumer surplus
- Fishing guide producer surplus

In the same example, the TEV of the commercial harvesting industry would include:

- Commercial harvester producer surplus
- Fish purchaser consumer surplus

Generation of PS will ensure that production resources are used in the way that maximizes value to all of society, not just one particular sector.

2.3.3 Total economic impact

In contrast to economic value, economic impact analysis traces the flow of goods and services through an economy and can be used to assess changes in the economy as the result of a change in final demand such as fishing trip expenditures. Economic impact models are representations of all the transactions in an economy and allow analysts to outline the relationships between the production of goods and their final consumers. Economic impact models, also called input/output models, are built by tracing the flow of purchases from the consumer to the final producer using economic accounts by industrial sector. Economic impact models require large amounts of data and input/output tables are usually produced for general use by the government and/or private businesses specializing in the construction of such models. It is rarely cost effective to build an input/output model for a single policy analysis task if a readymade model does not already exist.

Economic impacts begin with a consumer purchase or final demand. These initial expenditures constitute the direct impact. For recreational fisheries, these include purchases of fishing access, fishing equipment, bait, food and other goods necessary to the enjoyment of the fishing trip. For commercial fisheries, this includes a consumer purchase of seafood. From this initial purchase, the store purchases its inventory and labour, as do the suppliers of those goods and services required by the store. When business and suppliers import goods from outside the economy (the boundaries defined in the analysis model used), that money, called a leakage, leaves the economy and is not considered in further calculations. Tracking purchases of supplies and labour by business continues until all the original purchase amount is exhausted by leakages. The sum of all this activity is called the indirect impact. The portion of labourer's income and business owner's profits from the indirect phase that is then re-spent on goods and services in the normal course of that consumer's life is considered the induced impact. The sum of direct, indirect and induced impacts describes the total impact of consumer expenditures in an economy. These impacts can be denominated by the number of jobs supported, value added, or contribution to Gross Domestic Product, income or the total output in an economy.

In addition to changes in individual and producer benefits (values) resulting from changes in recreational environment, economic impacts can also be estimated. To clearly illustrate the difference between economic value and economic impact, assume that Figure 4 represents typical demand and supply curves for fishing trips. The intersection of the demand and supply curves indicate the current price of fishing licences and the corresponding demand for angling trips. While CS would be the triangle (PCB) over and above the price anglers would be willing to pay, the rectangle OPCQ indicates the total expenditure by anglers; its area is equal to price times the total number of trips taken. This total expenditure represents the final demand expenditure that generates a cascading chain of economic transactions in the economy. These expenditures generate the direct, indirect and induced impacts described above. Economic impacts are ways to estimate the effects of

expenditures in regional and national economies and detail how those expenditures are distributed to the industrial sectors in the economy.

In terms of economic impacts of commercial fishing, the arguments would be identical to those mentioned for recreational fisheries. The interesting metric in this context is the effect of this economic activity on local and regional economies. For example, commercial fishing in the production of a good sold on markets demands goods and services from other enterprises (direct expenditure), which again demand good and services from other industries (indirect expenditures). Moreover, salaries of employees in commercial fishing enterprises and in those branches that depend on commercial fishing enterprises, engage in economic activities. The total impact of such activities can be measured in money circulating in an economy and generating jobs and income.

2.4 An integrative framework joining the HD and economic approaches to fisheries benefits

The structure of Figure 1 documents clearly that each one of two paradigms focuses on one of the stages of the behavioural process. Economics focuses on the realm of revealed preferences, and to a lesser extent on stated preferences, while the HD approaches focus on the behavioural antecedents, but always have the larger picture of the behavioural stages of human behaviour in mind. A large body of research undertaken in all the various research traditions has in the past informed fisheries management.

The economic branch of the social sciences estimates benefits accruing to the individual person, but unlike the HD tradition, those benefits can be readily aggregated to total societal benefits because monetization provides a common platform across individuals. This is the major advantage of the economic approach to measuring fisheries benefits. It represents a cohesive framework measuring individual and societal benefits in a common currency, i.e. monetary values. This allows its relatively straightforward integration into cost/benefit analysis of different options for allocating resources and developing policies that maximize social welfare (economic value).

Economic value is the paramount measure for quantitative policy analysis when efficiency and maximization of societal value is the primary goal. From this brief examination, economic value is the only technique cohesive enough to provide consistent advice across multiple users and multiple projects because value is always denominated by a unified measure: currency. That is not to say that other criteria should not be used to assess policies. However, the concepts of economic value, economic impact and HD techniques are all important elements of a complete policy analysis package. Additionally, HD concepts of value contain significant overlap with economic concepts of value, and, in many cases, HD analysts use the same theory and models as economists to explore their conceptualization of value.

In many countries and for many resource uses, maximizing economic value or minimizing societal costs is legally mandated as the primary management concern. However, economic value cannot address fairness, equity, societal well being, social identity, social capital or distributional concerns. When making policy decisions, the examination of HD concepts of value and economic impacts provides the human context in contrast to the sharpness of the efficiency only criteria found in economic value. In many nations that use cost/benefit analysis as primary criteria, secondary criteria involve economic impacts to small businesses, community impacts and other measures that fall under the HD rubric. For instance, if a policy maker is considering several fishery management policy options with similar policy outcomes and economic value profiles, it is the economic impact and HD information that can be used as secondary criteria to determine which policy has a lesser social impact, is more equitable and has the least distributional impacts. Additionally, there may be situations where efficiency or value is not the primary goal of policy makers. Instead, the focus may be on maximizing health benefits, maximizing employment or other rural/community development

goals. In those cases, HD or economic impact approaches will be suited equally for its examination.

Overall, the economic approach to benefits seems to be more coherent and conceptually grounded in one theory compared to a HD approach. This makes the economic approach initially appear easier to integrate into policy choice assessments. Economic value is always denominated in currency, whereas the HD approach to benefits does not allow derivation of a consistent monetary measure to be included in cost benefit analysis. The HD perspective, on the other hand, can add decisional context which the various economic approaches to benefits capture only minimally. The HD approach emphasizes multi-disciplinary concepts of benefit, while the economic concept of value is rigid and narrowly focused on efficiency and cost/benefit analysis. The latter point is both a positive and a negative aspect for economic value measures.

On one hand, economic valuation produces a consistent measure that is comparable across very diverse policy contexts, but on the other hand, it does not incorporate the complete policy impact on society. Consequently, the question emerges whether cost benefit analysis is warranted in every case, and considerably divergent opinions exist in this respect because of the obvious limitations of monetizing all benefits of fishing in the same currency. Therefore, it is prudent and responsible to choose the particular benefit approach based on the particular problem at hand. In some instances, an economic approach may be the best tool. In other instances, a combination of methods and metrics may provide a better and more complete picture about the pros and cons of fisheries resource allocations. In the next sections, the various methods will be presented in more detail.

3. Methods for assessment

3.1. Human dimensions methods for assessing benefits of inland fisheries

Human dimensions (HD) research has increased our understanding of the diversity in angler behaviour, preferences and attitudes (Aas & Ditton, 1998; Arlinghaus, 2004b; Ditton, 2004; Ditton, 1996). HD research documenting psychological, physiological, social, cultural and ecological benefits of recreational fishing is still in its infancy and will benefit from further studies, utilizing standardized methods and measurement techniques, both quantitative and qualitative. Currently, the research on benefits of related outdoor recreation activities (Driver, 2009) and low-intensity outdoor sports provides platform for informed studies of the benefits of recreational fishing.

3.1.1. Study designs: quantitative versus qualitative methods and cross sectional versus longitudinal designs

Within HD, data gathering techniques are commonly divided into quantitative and qualitative techniques (Graziano & Raulin, 1989; Smith, 1983). Surveys are the quantitative technique most often used in HD (Guthrie et al., 1991; Pollock, Jones & Brown, 1994), and participant observations and in-depth face-to-face interviews are the most common qualitative approaches (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Similar to economic research, the main body of research within the HD tradition in recreational fisheries is quantitative, using mail, phone, on-site and internet based surveys (Dillman, 2000; Guthrie et al., 1991; Pollock et al., 1994; Smith, 1983). Consequently, the quantitative approach will be emphasized here. However, both quantitative and qualitative approaches have their strengths, and the choice of an approach depends on such thing as the nature of the project, hypotheses and research questions, population studied, budget opportunities and time frame for the project (see Brown, 1991; Dillman 2000; Guthrie et al. 1991; Pollock et al., 1994; Smith 1983 for reviews).

For an HD study of inland fishing benefits, it is important to design the study appropriately. Frequently, time and budget constraints make cross-sectional case studies the only feasible course

of action. However, there are many potential benefits for using experimental designs³ when comparing benefits across sub-samples, such as participating in different activities (which experimentally would be referred to as different treatments). Longitudinal designs, using population or panel studies, although more costly and complex, often provide data that better answers HD questions. With this method, groups are followed over time to gain a better understanding of recreational benefits (Graziano & Raulin, 1989). For instance to examine how recreational fishing can reduce depressive and criminal behaviour among youth, a longitudinal panel study could be undertaken in which participants taking part in a fishing program would be compared with a similar group not taking part in such a program (Wightman et al., 2008). A further example includes assessing how recreational fishing could contribute to self esteem and better social relations among elderly or disabled using a longitudinal panel study or a cross sectional case study based on self reported changes (See the Box 1 below).

3.1.2. Measurement approaches

A difference between the economic and HD approaches to the study of benefits of recreational fishing is that the HD approach relies on a wide range of measurements and indicators of benefits. Quantitative studies generally identify three main measurement approaches: psychometric scale measures, physiological and health measures, and demographic/behavioural measures.

3.1.2.1. Psychometric approaches to assess the benefits of fishing

Much of the quantitative research within the HD tradition is based on self reporting and self-evaluation through questionnaires. In particular, psychometric scales are developed to measure different, yet related aspects of leisure experiences, such as experience preferences, motivations, satisfaction, outcomes and benefits. These scales are built on general advancements in psychology and social psychology, and may then be applied to leisure situations. For example, Knopf, Driver and Bassett (1973) developed a fundamental scale for motivation research in outdoor recreation that found repeated adaptation in recreational fishing studies, culminating in a meta-analysis of motivation for recreational fishing, presenting a scale with 16 items (Fedler and Ditton, 1994).

It is important to rely on already developed scales for at least two reasons. First, it increases the opportunities for comparing studies across time and space, including a possible future meta-analysis; Second, the inventories or scales that have already been tested by other researchers (in HD research and in social psychology in general) have proven to be reliable and to measure what they intend to measure. Additionally, several conceptual scales offer a choice between a longer and detailed or a shorter and more general item list, depending on the purpose of the study and available budget. Such psychometric scales can be used to assess all types of benefits of fishing, including psychological, physiological, social, cultural and ecological benefits. For many concepts of interest, such as motivation, satisfaction, and specialization, methodological research in HD has been done and the appropriate tools, such as scales, have been published in social science journals (see Box 1 and Box 2).

To produce rigorous HD research results, it is important to distinguish the specific aspects of benefits that can be objectively assessed. For example, when examining how recreational fishing generally contributes to an individual's well-being the researcher should take advantage of research into quality of life (QOL) scales, and how leisure time and the activities pursued during leisure (e.g., recreational fishing) contributes to QOL (Iwasaki, 2006; Lloyd & Auld, 2002). Several measurement scales are developed that measure general QOL and how leisure contribute to this. By

³ The definition of a "true" experimental design differs somewhat between different texts on methods. Some textbooks prefer to call experiments that take place in the "real" world as "quasi" experiments as there might be confounding and uncontrollable factors inferring the field experiment (Graziano & Raulin, 1989).

making some adjustments to these scales, they can be used to assess the contribution of inland fishing to overall QOL, or to more specific areas of QOL.

The most often used approach to measure the psychological benefits of recreational fishing is based on expectancy theory (Manfredo et al., 1996). This theory says that people pursue activities to meet specific psychological goals. One way to indirectly measure the underlying goals of an angler is to measure motivations to participate in the activity. Motivations or experience preferences (alternatively termed preferred psychological outcomes (Driver, Brown & Peterson, 1991)) are considered to be a measure of potential or preferred outcomes and benefits of fishing, that is, a simple surrogate of benefits. However, some limitations apply because benefits experienced per se are not measured by motivations (Manning, 1999). In other words, by measuring how important a specific motive (e.g., experiencing nature) is for engaging in an activity, it is not clear whether a respective benefit is actually experienced (i.e., the degree or quality of the nature experience). Experience preferences or motivations are thus not equivalent to the actual benefits experienced by the recreationist. There are fundamental differences in the concepts of expected outcomes (i.e. motivations) and the satisfaction with these outcomes (Arlinghaus, 2006) and more generally the benefits experienced.

Box 1. The REP inventory applied to measuring general social psychological recreational fishing benefits.

The Recreation Experience Preference (REP) Scales (Driver et al., 1991; Manfredo et al., 1996) is a psychometric inventory that has been widely used in HD studies of outdoor recreation, including angling (Fedler & Ditton, 1994). The inventory and the rationale behind it make it flexible and usable for a variety of purposes, situations and samples. First, variants of the scales can be used to investigate experiences (perceived or actual) both at a general (all social and psychological aspects) as well as at a specific level (for instance learning). To what extent the inventory is useful to measure (perceived) benefits as it is often referred to as measuring motivations or preferred outcomes depend on design (after or during the activity rather than before) and wording of the question and items.

A short and generic variant of the REP scale used in angling surveys is this one (Fedler & Ditton, 1994). By asking anglers if they agree or disagree about the following potential benefits of fishing, and having them respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree can elicit what benefits they experience from fishing.

Domain	Items
<i>Psychological – physiological</i>	To get away from daily routine For relaxation To experience new and different things For physical exercise
<i>Natural environment</i>	To be outdoors To experience natural surroundings To be close to sea/water
<i>Social</i>	To get away from other people For family recreation To be with friends
<i>Fishery resource</i>	For the challenge or sport of fishing For the experience of the catch To obtain fish for eating To obtain a trophy fish
<i>Skill and equipment</i>	To develop skills To test my equipment

Most HD research has focused on studying the general structure of the motivation of anglers to infer the variety of benefits sought in principle. When studying larger samples and broad questions about the general motivations to fish, usually catch-related aspects of the fishing experience tend to be of lower importance compared to some non-catch related motives by most angler populations (Fedler & Ditton, 1994). In fact, the non-catch aspects of the fishing experience (e.g., relaxation, to be outdoors, to get away from the regular routine, to be with friends and family) appear to be almost universal motivations desired by most recreational anglers to some degree (Ditton, 2004), while investigations of the heterogeneity of angler (i.e., by segments) shows significant variability in the importance attached to the various catch-related aspects of the fishing experience (Aas & Kaltenborn, 1995; Bryan, 1977; Fedler & Ditton, 1986; Fisher, 1997; Wilde et al., 1996).

Interestingly, despite the salient importance for a good fishing experience (Arlinghaus, 2006), catch motives are comparatively less studied in recreational fishing compared to non-catch motives (Finn & Loomis, 2001). However, because non-catch related motivations seem to be more easily satisfied than catch-related expected outcomes, catch aspects were found to constrain overall angler satisfaction to a greater degree than non-catch related aspects (Arlinghaus, 2006; Arlinghaus et al., 2008; Arlinghaus & Mehner, 2005), although this is not always the case (Holland & Ditton, 1992). With satisfaction constituting the ultimate product of the fishing experience for the individual angler, these recent findings emphasize the importance of quality catch opportunities for enhancing the total benefits realized by angler. Other research has also revealed that the importance of catch motivations increases strongly if motivations for a particular setting or experience (e.g., fishing for species A at locality B) rather than when general motivations are assessed (Beardmore et al., under review). Thus, even in the area of angler motivations much more research is needed to better study the specific motivations and expectations anglers have for particular fishing experiences and localities.

Box 2. A study documenting differences in benefits from angling among anglers with and without disabilities (Freudenberg & Arlinghaus, 2010).

A recently published study from Germany documents similarities and differences in benefits of fishing among anglers with and without disabilities. A paired sample of anglers with and without a disability of the German Anglers Association were given a questionnaire with a 27-item Likert scale of experienced benefits from fishing (see above box on REP scale). The study provided valuable insight into differences and similarities between the two groups. The 27 items on perceived benefits were developed in close contact with anglers with a disability to ensure their perspectives were taken into account. These items were used:

- Sharing nice experiences with others
- Having contact with other people
- Colleagueship, supporting each other
- Being together with friends
- Making new friends
- Development of tight social bonding
- Training of mental abilities
- Enhancement of self-esteem/self confidence
- Training of physical abilities
- Self-determination
- Self-conquest
- Relaxation and recreation
- Understanding nature
- Experiencing silence
- Nature experience
- Feeling of success
- Thrill
- Feeling of acceptance
- Experience the catch of fish
- Getting away from everyday life
- Experiencing new and different things
- Enjoying solitude

Family experiences
Self-supply with fresh fish
Tolerance by others
Positive outcome for my daily work

Fishing seemed to provide more and different benefits to anglers with a disability than to those without a disability. Social benefits and self-improvement benefits were reported as more important to anglers with a disability. Many anglers with a disability relied on fishing as their sole recreational activity. In comparison, anglers without a disability participated in more varied types of activities.

To document such differences in benefits might be irrelevant or insignificant in an economic valuation perspective, but, due to general societal goals concerning equal opportunities, it provides highly relevant information on benefits for people with disability and is an important contribution to understanding diversity of values achieved among different groups.

3.1.2.2. Quantitative methods from sports and health sciences to assess physiological benefits

While most of the HD research tradition is based on self-report and self-evaluations, health effects such as reduced illness, stress release and improved fitness can be measured for effectively using objective physiological indicators (e.g., blood pressure, skin conductivity) routinely applied in health and sports sciences. Some of these are physical measures such as fitness and lung capacity (e.g., Lacy & Hastad, 2006), and general health issues are often investigated applying methods of epidemiology, where large populations are analysed and effects of lifestyle and exercise on overall health, life length and QOL can be investigated.

It is important to not overemphasize or simplify the potential physical and physiological health benefits from fishing, as it is a complex area involving issues such as heredity, lifestyle, living environment as well as physiology, diseases and ageing. Given the sensitivity of the measures and the large number of confounding factors it is essential to apply methods and study designs that are capable of documenting such effects (e.g., choosing appropriate control groups, and applying longitudinal designs where groups are followed over time). That said, it would be interesting to study, for instance, if fishing offers physical activity to groups who are not able to participate in more active physical exercise, similar to those benefits achieved from mild exercise such as moderate walking.

Typical fitness measures include lung capacity (O₂) measured on a tread mill and a range of cardiovascular measures including hearth capacity, size, and functions (Froelicher & Froelicher, 1991). Such measures can be used to study whether a population of anglers differs from other groups with similar sociodemographic characteristics, or by comparing fitness measures of a group before and after they have taken part in a fishing trip.

In addition, physiological measures can be used to assess human response to emotional, stressful and arousal-increasing stimulation (Ulrich et al., 1991). Such measures are based on four major bodily response systems: electrocardial, autonomic, sceleto-muscular and endocrine. Measurements of the first three systems are commonly performed with skin surface electrodes, while measures in the endocrine system are biochemical (e.g., measures of stress hormones). While it is anecdotally well known that fishing can be relaxing and induce arousal, to date, there are no known studies which have investigated the benefits of fishing from such a methodological perspective.

As said above, few studies have explicitly researched the health benefits from inland fishing using biological measures. On the other hand, there have been studies using questionnaires on which anglers self-report on such things as exercise effects, stress release and increased well-being (Pretty et al., 2007). However, studies applying methods from medicine and sport sciences are needed, and should be conducted by applying general methods from the sports and health sciences. A challenge

with, for instance, studying lasting health improvements is that costly, long time panel studies may be needed.

Box 3. An exploratory study on exercise effects of small game hunting in Eastern Norway (Kleiven & Bekkevold, 1994).

Small game hunting, primarily for willow ptarmigan, is the most popular form of hunting in Norway. In a pilot study, Kleiven & Bekkevold (1994) explored how five or six days of active hunting affected the hunter's oxygen uptake capacity. Hunting for ptarmigan includes long walks in mountainous terrain at relatively low intensity, not unlike that of fishing in the mountains where you will have to walk to the lake.

The study applied a standardized method for measuring maximum oxygen capacity (VO₂max) on study participants jogging on a treadmill. An automatized procedure for measuring capacity that has been validated against other methods was applied. The tests showed that the hunters had average physical capacity, with variations among the test persons. The performance tests showed that VO₂max on average changed from 46,81 before the hunting (ml/kg pr. min) to 48,21 after.

The improvement was in accordance with the hunters own assessments of their fitness improvement. About half assessed their improvement as modest, and somewhat fewer assessed their fitness as better than before the hunting trip.

Interestingly, the study showed that exercise was not an important motivation for hunting. Instead, aspects related to psychological, social and natural environment domains of the REP scale were rated high. The low rank of exercise as a motivation for hunting are in accordance with the rather modest effect measured, but might also be an indication that recreationists are not always motivated by all relevant benefits.

3.1.2.3. Demographic/behavioural measures

A range of concrete measures can be applied to study potential benefits of angling. More objective measures could preferably supplement the self-evaluation character of survey data. Demographic, economic and performance indicators from different sources can assist in assessing potential benefits from recreational fishing on targeted segments or sub-populations across a range of benefits.

Box 4. A study on social inclusion benefits of angling in England (Wightman et al., 2008).

In a project in England, angling has been used as a means to help return disadvantaged and troubled young people to society (Wightman et al., 2008). Angling was used to enhance self-esteem and self-confidence. Evaluation reports document that if only 1 in 300 participants is saved from prison, the benefits equals the costs. Using measures of offensive behaviour, school attendance and educational achievements, an evaluation report showed that anti-social behaviour fell by 70 %, school attendance rose by 70 % and that educational achievements rose "dramatically" (Macgill & Bradley-Nicholson, 2001 as cited in Wightman et al., 2008). Evaluation reports also used qualitative techniques, interviewing social workers, and as such used a variety of methodological approaches, including economic, behavioural and qualitative.

"I don't know what it is about fishing, but this lad supposedly had ADHD. A nightmare most of the time. Goes fishing, he sits there for four hours without catching anything and doesn't move. He has to be practically dragged away and can't wait to go again." Social worker cited in Wightman et al., 2008.

3.1.2.4. Measures to assess ecological benefits

Straightforward approaches to map and describe the ecological benefits of recreational fishing in social terms are largely lacking. Most available research has been narrative and qualitative (Rolston III, 1991) or used methods from environmental or legal history to exemplify how recreational fishing has contributed to development of water legislation, e.g. in Switzerland (Kirchhofer, 2002) and how recreational fishing organizations have been instrumental in fighting formally (i.e., legally) and informally against pollution of aquatic habits (Rolston III, 1991; Bate, 2001). A case study

approach has also been used to show how recreational anglers have contributed globally to fish conservation projects (Granek et al., 2008). In some jurisdictions, such as in North America and Norway, licence sales and taxes on fishing tackle are instrumental in financing public fisheries agencies and fisheries management and conservation programs. Political scientists and economists could use a replacement approach to quantify the costs that would accrue to society for fish management and fish habitat conservation if the contribution of anglers would suddenly stop.

Another aspect around ecological benefits that lacks research is the value of learning about nature through fishing experiences. One could compare ecological knowledge and awareness between subpopulations that fish versus those that do not, ideally in a quantitative study. There exist several psychometric scales to measure the extent of learning benefits among users (see Box 1), for example, the REP scale has learning as a domain. Ecological benefits could also be measured by comparing fish population structure, management costs or the educational performance of environmental programs designed specifically for anglers compared to other types of environmental programs not involving anglers.

3.1.3. Qualitative methods to assess benefits of recreational fishing

Qualitative studies often focus on how an activity, such as recreational fishing, provides meaning for the informant and his or her network, is represented in the community and gradually materializes into established discourses, social groups and events in a society, as well as how the resource use create references in terms of space and time (geographical names, specific dates for instance related to the opening of the fishing season, ceremonies etc). In recreational fishing, hardly any research has been conducted with these methods. These approaches have found wide application to document the values and attitudes of subsistence fisheries, especially of indigenous people (e.g., Holthaus, 2008).

Qualitative methods and qualitative researchers aim to produce a more contextual understanding of human behaviour and the benefits and impacts associated with recreational fishing compared to quantitative approaches (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Qualitative techniques allow a richer insight into what drives humans within the complex web of the institutions, norms and structures of social systems, and their relationship to the attitudes and behaviours of the agents within these social systems. The disadvantage associated with qualitative techniques is the reduced ability to generalize because sample sizes are usually small, and interpretation of qualitative data often entails a greater subjectivity on the side of the researcher. However, techniques to circumvent these challenges exist. Rooted in the standard participatory observation methods in anthropology and ethnography, qualitative methods have, in recent decades, gained growing reputation within basic disciplines, such as sociology and psychology, but even more so in applied multidisciplinary research fields such as gender studies, leisure research, natural resource management research and evaluation studies.

Qualitative methods often rely on purposive rather than random sampling. The researcher is not seen as objective and does influence the interviewee. Instead, qualitative research acknowledges the influence and role of the researcher. The focus of the research is on content validity, rather than reliability (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The primary methods are participant observation, in-depth face-to-face interviewing, document review and content analyses, with a range of supplementary data collection techniques, such as narratives, historical analysis, films, videos and photographs (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). It is well established that methodological pluralism across the quantitative – qualitative spectrum is needed to enhance and gain further insight (Aas, 2002; Smith 1983) and is referred to as ‘triangulation’. Especially when theory is lacking, qualitative research can help to develop an insight into proposed relationships between variables and quantitative approaches can provide a conclusive test of the assumed relationships.

When the concern is about social impacts of fishing policies, the Social Impact Assessment approach (Burdge, 2004; Schirmer & Casey, 2005) provides a framework to evaluate broad community benefits from fishing activities in their widest sense. This assessment tradition is explicitly linked to landscape planning and decision making processes, is highly applied and flexible in terms of methods, measures and degree of complexity/rigidity of the study/assessment. This approach ensures that social aspects are incorporated into planning processes or management decisions. It also exemplifies how social impact assessments can be undertaken with few resources, often combining existing statistics and databases (i.e., secondary data) with novel quantitative and qualitative primary data gathering procedures. For instance, the meaning and importance of fishing can be assessed by comparing its role with substitutes or alternatives (both in a commercial and recreational perspective).

Appropriate guidelines are now widely available on the Internet (e.g., Schirmer & Casey, 2005) which explain how general social and economic indicators and measures can be applied to assess social impacts and social benefits connected to fisheries, such as social profiles, quality of life and work/leisure satisfaction indicators, indexes of dependency of different activities, educational level etc., and of course a range of economic measures. Schirmer and Casey (2005) show that social assessments can be performed without the costs of primary research. A challenge for many social impact assessments is the often very descriptive and case-specific nature of available data, and the associated challenges of combining data and findings of very different origin and characteristics. The use of matrix analyses, maps and construction of indexes is advisable and insightful.

3. 2. Economic value: non-market and market valuation methods

Economic valuation refers to the assignment of monetary values to non-market goods and services, where the monetary values may be either marginal or total in nature. Marginal values are the most often used, since the value for an incremental, often only minor, change in quality or quantity of a particular good or service (e.g., when number of daily catch increases from 2 to 4 fish) is easier to attain than the total value (e.g., the value of all 4 fish). More importantly, for many policy decisions, the marginal value is the only essential information. Research offers three main approaches towards economic valuation, depending on the type of data used (Freeman, 1993; Haab and McConnell, 2002):

- stated preference methods (contingent valuation and choice experiment methods),
- revealed preference methods (actual market data, hedonic property pricing and travel cost method), and
- market price proxies.

In this section, information is presented on how to carry out economic valuation with stated and revealed preference techniques. The following is based on Bateman et al. (2002) and Champ, Boyle and Brown (2003), as well as the authors' personal experiences.

Market analysis in this context refers to the analysis of economic value derived by businesses that provide recreation opportunities for hire or that supply the inputs to the recreational experience. Market analysis can also be used to assess consumer values, but in the majority of cases a recreational fishing trip is not traded in a market and is considered a non-market good. The various quantitative methods and fundamental technical aspects associated with the implementation of each approach are explained below. Examples for each of the methods, as well as for benefit transfer, will illustrate potential uses in the fisheries policy context. These examples detail the application methods and resources required to accomplish each of the economic valuation methods.

3.2.1. Stated preference methods

The two main stated preference (SP) approaches are the contingent valuation method (CVM) and the choice experiment method⁴ (CE), which may be applied to estimate use and non-use values associated with environmental goods and services (see Figure 3 section 2.3.2). The CVM and the CE methods share many similarities. For example, they are consistent with the underlying theory of welfare economics and both employ carefully designed survey questions. The WTP measure derived from SP methods is formed by the anglers' capacity to make trade-offs between the attributes of the good and changes in income as the result of a change in activity cost. The main difference between the CVM and the CE method is that in a CVM study the respondent is asked to reveal his/her WTP for a single policy change as a whole good, while the CE method elicits the WTP for several attributes of the good, including policy attributes, simultaneously by simply choosing one good over the other in a series of choices. Both methods are accepted as the workhorses for valuation research in resources economics, but have not seen widespread application in recreational fishing in Europe. Appendix 1 includes examples of SP and RP methodology (see section 3.2.2) associated with fishery and preservation of fish stocks in Nordic countries and Central Europe.

Stated preference (SP) methods are widely used for valuation of non-market goods and services where other methods fail. SP methods elicit values directly via constructed (hypothetical/simulated) markets in which survey respondents state their willingness to pay (WTP) for attaining a certain good(s) or service(s), or changes in the amount or quality of a good or a service, induced through a change in policy, the outcome of a public program, or other exogenous shock. Ecosystem services can also be valued with these methods. While surveys are costly to implement, surveys designed for valuation can also collect expenditure and HD data providing a wealth of complementary information.

SP methods are extremely versatile. Their results can be applied to cost-benefit analysis, used in legal damage assessment, investigate public policy by quantifying trade-offs between competing resource uses where the comparative metric is now the 'part-worth utility' or preference, or be used to segment clienteles and determine their respective market shares under different management regimes. Obviously, choice experiments are also excellent HD tools, even though they are discussed within this economics section. See Aas et al. (2000) for one such non-economic application in Scandinavia.

3.2.1.1. Contingent valuation method

In contingent valuation method (CVM) survey respondents are asked to choose between the current situation and a future policy situation, for instance, with an improved quality of fishing, which will incur an additional cost to the respondent. Based on the responses, willingness to pay (WTP) for an entirety of policy change (one policy scenario) is estimated and the determinants of the WTP are explained. This method can be used to estimate both use and non-use value components.

The CVM is the most frequently used technique for estimating the total economic value for project or policies changing the supply of environmental good or services, such as qualitative or quantitative changes in quality of recreational fishing. CVM defines the environmental goods and services as a bundle of different characteristics (quality, quantity, different services etc.) and seeks to elicit the WTP for the entirety of the bundle. A CVM study can be used, for instance, to estimate values that people place on improved recreational fishing experience currently (actual use) and in future (potential use) or on avoiding the extinction of endangered species (existence values), in relation to the current situation without new policy. Moreover, this method is widely used for

⁴ It should be noted that in various niches of research, choice experiments are also referred to as stated choice models or discrete choice experiments.

various policy analyses and damage claims (Bateman et al., 2002; EVRI inventory). Typically CVM studies are local or regional in scale, but can be done on a national scale, as well.

According to Champ et al. (2003) there are 10 major steps in the CVM design and implementation process including:

1. Identify the change(s) in quantity or quality to be valued.
2. Identify whose values are to be valued.
3. Select data collection mode.
4. Choose a sample size.
5. Design the information component of the survey instrument.
6. Design the contingent valuation question.
7. Design the auxiliary questions.
8. Pre-testing and implementation of the survey.
9. Data and statistical analysis
10. Interpretation of results.

These steps are examined more closely in Appendix 2.

Each of these steps poses its own challenges. For instance, knowledge of the theory of non-market valuation is required in the first step. In the scenarios presented in the Appendix, the environmental conditions with and without the recreational policy are described with details based on the current decision problem. Income taxes, admission fees and donations can be used as a payment vehicle to pay for the new policy. The sampling protocol must be selected carefully because improper sampling protocols can lead to various biases including aggregation biases when the total value lost (gained) from a particular policy. Selection of the WTP format among discrete choices, open-ended and payment card formats, for the CVM question are a fundamental step and affect to the sampling issues and approach to be used for welfare estimation. Less frequently, people are asked the amount of compensation they would be willing to accept (WTA) to give up a specified good or service (see Appendix 2 and 5).

A detailed knowledge of survey design, survey administration and econometric skills for data analysis are needed. Once the policy change of interest has been identified, the survey instrument must be developed and pre-tested. The data must be collected, coded and entered into a database, unless data is entered by participants in the case of internet surveys. Finally, the survey responses must be analysed. Every step in the research process is crucial to produce credible welfare (valuation) estimates.

The CVM method has a long history of providing reliable value estimates. Detailed recommendations for designing a CVM study are available (e.g., Champ et al., 2003). The problems associated with this method are well known and documented, allowing the researcher to address criticisms. The main criticism of CVM is its hypothetical nature, and this needs to be taken into account during the survey design phase particularly when respondents are unfamiliar with the valued item (e.g. ecosystem services). In the case of fisheries, however, anglers and others are typically informed and aware of the valued good: improved fishing quality, water quality or other attributes of the recreational fishing experience. Therefore, the CVM method is suitable for estimating both user and non-use benefit and potential damages associated to fishing. The extensive literature, including scientific articles and unpublished studies, provides various examples of CVM applications. Previous applications can be utilized for designing a new CVM study.

Box 5. presents a study of improving wild salmon passages which utilizes the CVM method.

Box 5. Costs and Benefits of Improving Wild Salmon Passage in a Regulated River (Håkansson, 2007; Håkansson, 2006).

Policy question

Does it make economic sense to adopt measures that would increase the number of wild salmon in the Vindel River in northern Sweden, while at the same time reducing electricity production by a major hydropower plant that uses water from the river? This is an in-stream water allocation problem.

Method(s)

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA); Contingent Valuation (CVM); bioeconomic models

Background

On their way to their spawning grounds the wild salmon from the Vindel River, northern Sweden, enter an area in which the water from the turbines from Stornorrfors hydropower plant and the bypass channel merge. The amount of water in each pathway depends on the amount of electricity being generated. Since the water flow in the channel is relatively minor, the salmon have difficulties finding the pathway and only about 30 per cent succeed.

The Economic Problem

A diversion of water from electricity production has two effects. First, it has an immediate, negative impact on electricity production. Second, it indirectly results in an increase in salmon numbers in the future. The CBA considers these benefits and costs.

River-specific data were used to generate estimates of changes in the resource conditions that would accompany the measures considered. A model that predicts the effects of changes in water flow on the number of salmon that can pass the hydropower plant was used to obtain estimates of the cost of increasing the numbers of salmon in the Vindel River (in terms of lost electricity production). Concerning the benefits, a salmon population model for the river, was used to develop the valuation question scenario and a willingness to pay (WTP) question.

Valuation question

Respondents were asked about their WTP for an increased number of wild salmon that reach the spawning grounds in the Vindel River each year. The average number of salmon per year that reached the spawning grounds between 1995-2004, which was approximately 3000, was used as a baseline.

The respondents could choose between expressing their WTP for increasing the number of wild salmon from 3000/year to 4000/year as an amount or as an interval, where it is assumed that if a respondent has valuation uncertainty he/she will express an interval.

For example:

Try to state what you are willing to pay, either as an interval between two amounts or as an exact amount.

Option 1:

I am willing to pay between and this year as a lump sum.

Option 2:

I am willing to paySEK this year as a lump sum.

Survey

Following two pilot surveys, the full-scale survey was carried out in 2004 to obtain more information about Swedes' sentiments towards the wild salmon in the Vindel River. The survey was tailored to fit the theoretical framework as well as existing biological knowledge concerning the wild salmon in the river. The survey initially provided general information about the current situation for wild salmon globally and specific information concerning the wild salmon in the Vindel River. The respondents were also made aware that increasing the number of wild salmon typically comes at a cost. In addition, the background part of the questionnaire included information about the present and future fishing situation in the river. In addition to the WTP question, the questionnaire included questions in three main categories: general questions about angling and sentiments towards wild salmon, questions designed to acquire information regarding explanatory variables about why (or why not) the respondent would be WTP, and some general socioeconomic questions about respondents' age, gender, etc.

Sampling

A total of 1 192 Swedes received a questionnaire and the response rate was 59 percent. The individuals in the survey were sampled from a general population register of the Swedish population (SPAR). All individuals less than 18 years of age were excluded.

Results

The findings suggest that non use values are the major benefits (96-517 million Swedish kronor) accruing from increasing the stock of wild salmon in the Vindel River to 4000/year. The estimated value per person is 6-7 € as a lump sum. The sensitivity analysis suggests that the opportunity costs in terms of lost electricity are typically higher than the estimated benefits.

Policy implication and concluding remarks

Even if allocating more water to facilitate passage of the salmon would be socially beneficial, which the results indicate that it is not, this might not be the most cost-efficient approach for carrying out the project. Only if one or more management options could be identified that would be able to increase the number of salmon to 4000/year without exceeding the total benefit, 96-517 million Swedish kronor, it could be argued that the project would be beneficial for the Swedish society.

Note that the results from the valuation study show that the respondents' revealed WTP is mainly due to non-use values. The net present benefits for increasing the number of wild salmon to 4000/year would have been considerably lower if only use values were considered. Furthermore, if only people that fish in the river were included in the analysis, as in many valuation studies of fish management/recovery, the estimated total net present benefits would have been even lower.

Costs

About 10 000 Euros (only for the questionnaire, not for working time)

Time

6 month for the work with questionnaire and the data

5 month reporting the results

3.2.1.2. Choice experiment method

In a choice experiment (CE) survey the respondent is asked to choose their preferred alternative from a choice situation with several alternatives, which are described by various attributes and attribute levels. Several choice situations are included in the CE survey and respondents make repeated choices. The alternatives are designed in such a way that based on the respondents' answers the marginal rate of substitution between each attribute and payment (cost is always one of the attributes for a valuation CE) is revealed. CEs can be used to estimate all value components of total economic value. Thus, one definite advantage of CEs is their ability to forecast changes in fishing effort or participation as well as changes in welfare.

In the 1980's choice experiments⁵ emerged out of the conjoint approach in transportation economics and market research, and it was not until the mid 1990's that resource economists started to adopt this method for valuation purposes (e.g., Adamowicz, Louviere & Williams, 1994; Hensher, Rose & Greene, 2005). The good or service under valuation is now constructed as a multivariate profile of several attributes, including a payment vehicle, and the levels of each attribute are varied systematically. For example, a lake may be described in terms of its ecological quality, chemical water quality, number and type of species it provides habitat for, and so on.

The CE method can be used to estimate the monetary values of benefits and damages associated with all kinds of policy changes affecting fisheries. For instance, regulatory changes may improve fishing quality or prevent environmental degradation (e.g. eutrophication) and thus benefit anglers and potentially the wider public. Or the method can be used to value damages to natural environment (certain species etc.), heritage and other attributes affected by the oil spills in certain water area. Typical examples of the CE method include valuation of characteristics of angling site, valuation of changes in angling quality, changes in water ecology and changes in

⁵ The reader should be aware of that terminology of choice experiment is dispersed and vary depending on disciplinary (environmental economics, transportation, and marketing) (e.g., Hensher et al., 2005).

management/regulation program. Given its multi-attribute nature several of these changes can be valued concomitantly, and respondents make trade-offs while providing their answers.

The design of a CE survey follows essentially the same procedures as suggested for the CVM study (Appendix 3 contains step-by-step design details for CEs and for additional information see Hensher et al., 2005). The main difference between CE and CVM is in the way the hypothetical market is provided. CE design steps include:

1. Identify relevant attributes, attribute levels and alternatives
2. Develop and generate experimental design
3. Develop survey instrument
4. Pre-test and ground truth attributes
5. Administer survey and complete data entry
6. Estimate model and interpret the results for policy analysis and decision support

First, identify all relevant attributes affecting angler's choices and have relevance to the policy question at hand. While CEs are very flexible, there is an upper limit on the number of attributes that can be included with the limit dictated by respondent burden. Therefore it is essential to use focus groups, cognitive interviews or other pre-test techniques to identify the relevant attributes and insure the total number selected does not overburden respondents. In the case of recreational fishing, size of expected catch, status of certain fish species and number of anglers (possible congestion problem) could represent the quality of angling site. Finally, ambiguity and inter-attribute (associated to cognitive perceptions) correlations must be considered when selecting attributes to be used in study.

The levels that attributes could take are described qualitatively (e.g. large, medium, small) or quantitatively (e.g. abundance of salmon could be 0.5, 1 and 1.5 million). Usually a quantitative specification will provide more precise results, but the choice depends on the nature of the problem and the nature of the attributes to be included. A range of attribute levels should encompass the whole range of value expected to enter into an angler's decision process (minimum and maximum value). Alternatives with different combinations of attribute levels can be unlabeled or labelled. In the first case alternatives are defined with generic titles (e.g. alternative 1, alternative 2.), and in later case titles are labelled with the names, which describe the alternative (e.g. bus, car, train in a travel mode study; or possible several fish species in a fisheries study). A no-choice (status quo or so called opt-out option) alternative is typically presented as one of the alternatives. Success with any SP method, but particularly CEs, lies in the design phase of the project including correctly identifying the relevant attributes and correctly specifying their levels.

The next phase is to make decisions concerning the experimental design to be used (see further e.g. Hensher et al. 2005). Statistical design theory is used to combine attribute levels into an appropriate number of different choice sets. Specialised computer software and statistical packages can be used to generate actual designs. Because each alternative combination contains price or cost as one attribute in an economic application (e.g. increase in cost of angling day or additional conservation/management fee), the subsequent analysis of respondents' choices reveals their WTP (or WTA) for each of the attributes presented to them. Through the use of econometric models, the parameters in the utility function are estimated and different values are produced. Finally, study results can be interpreted and may be used in policy analysis and to support the decision making.

As with contingent valuation, the CE method offers certain advantages over the other valuation methods. The CE method is flexible. Several potential combinations of environmental or policy changes, including those that currently don't occur, can be presented within one questionnaire (multi-dimensional response surface). One of the major strengths of the CE method is the ability to decompose values associated to policy change or environmental programs into implicit values

related to particular attributes. In addition, estimation of several policy changes described by the attributes is possible. In this way CE provides a fuller description of preferences than obtained with single scenarios used in CVM implementation. Additionally, since CEs are based on statistical experimental designs, they yield great statistical efficiency (Champ et al., 2003).

Some disadvantages associated with the CE method should also be listed. The preparation of such a study likely requires more time and more expertise for the survey design due to the statistical experimental design (e.g., Bateman et al., 2002; Bennet & Blamey, 2001; Hensher et al., 2005). Also, the CE is a relatively new method in environmental economics, and the consensus, for instance, on the process used to generate the experimental design is lacking. Finally, the use of CEs in litigation is limited compared to the long history of the use of CVM in environmental damage assessment.

The CE application is illustrated with the study of Dorow et al. (2010), and serves as an example how CE can combine research questions on valuation with more general policy concerns within the same response task.

Box 6. Winner and losers of conservation policies for European eel: an economic welfare analysis for differently specialised eel anglers (Dorow et al., 2010).

Policy question

Effective management action is needed to conserve declining eel populations. Eel stocks can be enhanced in many ways, e.g. by controlling fishing mortality, reducing mortality at hydropower facilities, and improving connectivity of the river ecosystems. However, differently specialised anglers exhibit distinct preferences for catch variables and eel angling regulations. What measures should the European inland fisheries management apply to achieve the given policy objective? Understanding which future strategies are likely to receive support from various eel angler groups can assist decision makers to match regulatory changes with angler preferences to avoid conflicts and improve rule compliance.

Background

The European eel population is considered to be outside of safe biological limits because of over-fishing, habitat loss, destruction of migrating routes, pollution and disease etc. Several political actions to support the eel population have been undertaken. Specifically each member state of the EU must develop eel management plans to achieve a target escapement rate of the 40 % adult silver eels from all river basins relative to the “undisturbed” situation.

The Economic problem

The loss of the eel resource may have considerable effect on the socio-economic state of many fishing communities in Europe. Stricter regulations are expected to reduce the quality of the angling experience and therefore may affect anglers’ behaviour and welfare (benefits from angling experience). Changes in regulation are expected to be more acceptable to specialised rather than general anglers. Also benefits may be allocated differently. Recreational fisheries constitute the most important use of the inland fish stocks in all industrialized countries, and thus must be explicitly considered in the development of eel management plans.

Objectives of study

The CE method is used to analyse trade-offs between utility-determining attributes of an eel angling experience of an angler, i.e. catch variables vs. regulations (see example of choice set). The method also allows calculation of the economic welfare changes associated to different hypothetical management policy scenarios in general or for the specialised eel angler segments.

Choice situations and experimental design

Hypothetical eel angling experiences are composed from seven attributes (see example of choice situation below), each having 3-4 levels. To combine all attributes and their levels in choice sets, a full factorial design require 84 934 656 ($4^{10} \times 3^4$) combinations. Using an orthogonal fractional factorial design the number of combination (i.e. choice set) decreased to 64. Additional orthogonal variable grouped choice sets into 16 blocks consisting of 4 choice sets, leading to 16 different versions of the questionnaire, each with four choice situations. In this study respondents choose between 2 hypothetical scenarios, without any base alternative such as ‘neither’. No base was used in order to operationalise further follow-up questions, which are not shown here.

Example of choice situation:

	Option A	Option B
Expected Catch		
Catch number	1 eel	2 eel
Average length	60 cm	65 cm
Regulations for eel angling		
Minimum-size limit	60 cm	55 cm
Daily bag limit	3 eel/day	1 eel/day
Temporal closure	7 days/month	No closure
Rod limit	1 rod	2 rods
Increase of cost for an angling day	5 € increase	No increase

1 Which eel angling option do you prefer?
Please choose only one!

↓

Angling Day A

↓

Angling Day B

Survey and sampling

In April 2007 the 14 pages questionnaire was mailed to 381 eel anglers in the state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (MV) located in the north east of Germany. Anglers participating in the study were recruited via telephone by random digit dialing, as well as random selection from a recreational fishing licence frame of MV. The total population of anglers targeting eel within MV is about 72,000. The usable number of questionnaires was 193 resulting in a response rate of 53 %.

Results

Results include part-worth-utilities for every attributes and level, representing their proportions of the utility. Relative change in net WTP for an eel angling day was estimated based on regulation changes in relation to the current situation. Three angler segments, defined along specialization, differed significantly on all management and experience attributes, documenting how important it is to account for heterogeneity. For example, contrary to the prediction of specialization theory, the casual anglers (=least experienced) preferred the largest fish, while intermediate anglers were indifferent to size, and the advanced eel anglers preferred the second largest size. Similar patterns emerged on all other attributes. All segments disliked increasing cost per trip. One additional advantage of CE results is that they can be used to build a decision support tool, in which the preferences for all possible (management) scenarios can be evaluated.

Policy implications

Alternative policy scenarios comparing the current state with possible future scenarios were developed, showing that casual eel anglers would be winners under slightly or moderately stricter eel angling regulations, advanced anglers would become losers when eel angling regulations would become overly strict compared to the status quo. When calculating total economic welfare changes associated with these respective scenarios, revealed a total welfare gain of about Eu 2.5 million with the implementation if moderately strict scenarios, while the strictest scenarios were associated with annual welfare losses of Eu 12 million and 15 million respectively.

Costs

1 fulltime researcher (or one ¼ to ½ time senior researcher and one research assistant full time)

Time

Plan / Survey preparation: at least 2, possibly 4 months or more (with knowledgeable person), depending on the complexity of the research question.

Data collection : depends on survey method (3 weeks with web-survey; 3 months for mail with follow ups and data coding.

Modelling and reporting: 4-6 months.

3.2.1.3. Stated preference methods - pros and cons

SP methods are the only techniques available to estimate both the use value and non-use value components (values held by both users and non-users) of an environmental good or service. Because these methods estimate values related to goods and attributes of interest directly, the lack

of existing market data does not limit the valuation as is the case in RP methods. In addition, in situations with only few or no substitutes for the good being valued, non-use values are relatively high and SP methods should be used for value estimation. The most challenging phase with all SP methods is the design phase. Choices in either method must be correctly framed so they: use the correct valuation method; reflect the actual decision problem; include the appropriate attributes; and, in the case of CVM, correctly define the good being valued. Designing the relevant valuation scenario/choice situation typically requires collaboration between researchers representing different fields, interaction with managers and opinions and input from the anglers themselves.

Valuation with SP methods still faces challenges. The field of SP valuation is currently evolving rapidly, particularly the CE literature, in several distinct areas of applications, such as valuation of existence value for endangered species, valuation of use value in the case of recreation, or the comparison of policy alternatives, frequently without valuation. Therefore we recommend following the ever evolving literature. It has often been argued that hypothetical questions give hypothetical answers. Despite such criticism, both CVM and CE studies can provide valuable knowledge as long as the survey instruments are designed properly, are intensively pre-tested and use focus groups, one-to-one interviews, verbal protocols and pilot surveys (post/web pilot or debriefing), before they are implemented.

The contingent valuation method is very useful for single amenity valuation, and if one clearly defined alternative exists to the current situation:

- CVM is commonly used for valuation (WTP) of a single or specific scenario;
- The mean/median WTP measures can be obtained relatively easily;
- It requires the use of rather large sample sizes. In general, samples below 1 000 are not recommended, especially when using closed-ended valuation formats;
- Designing a reliable scenario might be demanding and time consuming, if the effects of policy change are not known (e.g. improvement in water quality or status of fish stock) and only a well-designed study can provide insights to guide public (fisheries) policy. However this data requirement about the effects of change applies also to the other valuation methods.

The choice experiment (CE) method is recommended for situations, where estimation of marginal values (WTP) for all attributes of scenario is needed.

- CE is favourable for valuing environmental goods or services with multiple policy alternatives that are described with different characteristics and their varying levels, as long as respondents can differentiate these characteristics;
- Can also be used for forecasting and prediction of aggregate demand or policy support. This is particularly important for fisheries where gauging the anglers' effort response is very important;
- Is particularly suitable for policy decisions, when attributes might be conflicting, target levels are not fixed or when policy creates new goods or services that are not yet on the market;
- The separation of total economic value into its constituent parts is possible by selecting attributes in an appropriate way;
- When the study becomes larger in terms of attributes and/or levels, or the research question requires a more complex presentation than a simple generic choice of A vs B, care should be taken when selecting an experimental design, and a specialist should be consulted in order to avoid biased value estimates;
- Adequate, quantitative information is typically needed regarding the impacts of management policies affecting welfare of respondents, although the attributes and their levels can also be qualitatively described;

- The results obtained with the CE method are sensitive to the original study design and choice of attributes and levels. Hence elaborate pre-testing as described above is essential.

3.2.2. Revealed preference methods

Revealed preference (RP) methods, as the name suggests, are methods that elicit value of goods through actual consumer behaviour in markets. Indirect valuation of the environmental good is possible using the methods on market valued goods used in concert with the environmental amenity of interest. The environmental amenity constitutes a part of the marketed goods price, which is extracted using RP methods. Because of the observatory nature of RP methods, they are unable to estimate non-use values (unless a joint SP study is conducted). Additionally, they are not well-adapted to evaluate large changes in environmental services unless real-world data of such phenomena exist. Additionally, since the methods depend on observed behaviour, they do not work well on valuating sites with minor human activity (as was the case in the Exxon Valdez oil spill). Despite these shortcomings the insight RP methods give on the value of environmental amenities is important. These methods extract actual market transactions and thus give realistic picture on the least amount of money consumers are willing to pay for environmental services, and therefore the lower bound of the value or benefits. Additionally they provide information on the market structures and may present also other than value insights to policy making.

Revealed preference methods have not been extensively applied in Europe to value fishery resources, although the Travel Cost method (TC) has excellent properties to evaluate fishing benefits. Another often used revealed preference method in environmental valuation is the Hedonic Pricing method (HP). These RP methods provide different angles to environmental value estimation.

3.2.2.1. Travel cost method

The travel cost method (TC) measures benefits from recreational use of natural resources at a specific site through analysing the factors that affect demand for the recreational activity (Champ et al., 2003). To monetize the demand, costs from transportation, accommodation, lost working time, permits and equipment rentals are included in the estimation. The economic hypothesis is that, in general, the frequency of visits is lower for people with high travel costs, meaning that demand for recreational visits decreases with higher prices.

The TC method can be used to value both single and multiple sites, each having their own modelling approaches. Single site valuations are fairly simple to conduct, but they are not without caveats. Single site valuation provides an estimate of the total use value of the site, which can be used in estimating damages from drastic changes in environment, such as closing off a river from fisheries use. Since TC models estimate the recreation demand of a site, a simple demand analysis may be conducted for cases like introducing a purchasable fishing permit, which would be analogous to an increase in travel costs. Since single site models don't include substitute sites, they tend to over value a single site. An important aspect in these studies is to identify possible substitutes to the fishery. If a fishery is closed down but the recreational anglers have another site nearby, the loss in benefits is drastically less than in the case of a single viable option.

A problem that arises with single-site models is with subtler changes in site characteristics than a complete closure the fishery such as increased fish catch in rivers due to decreased pollution. Analyzing smaller quality changes in single site analysis requires time-series data on site visits and quality changes. Multiple site models handle these types of problems much more readily, and are also able to take into account many substitute sites, which would draw new visitors with the closure of one site. The strength in multiple site models is that they use the variation between sites to estimate how changes in one site affects total benefits. Thus when choosing multiple sites for

estimating the benefits from, for example, better water quality, a number of sites with good and poor quality are needed in the sample. Thus far, the most widely used multiple-site model is the random utility maximisation (RUM) model. The RUM model estimates which site an individual chooses from a bundle of different choices, including non-participation, for a given choice situation in the study period.

A sub-type of the single site model is the zonal TC model. These models are very simplistic but can use available secondary data on site visitation to generate values. These models require data on user visitation by user zone where the researcher defines the zones under consideration. All that is needed is an estimate of visitors to the site from each zone. This type of data can be taken from national recreation inventories and can therefore utilize data drawn from larger populations that can be afforded with primary data collections targeted at specific sites.

The TC method has many good properties for estimating user benefits from inland fishing. First, it is based on actual behaviour, and thus has appeal even to people with doubts on stated preference methods. Second, inland fishery sites are easy to define in most cases. Data is also quite straightforward to collect, and travel data may already be available, or possible to gather jointly through other sources, saving resources and time. The method, however, cannot estimate all benefits perceived from fishing, namely the non-use values thereby generating lower bound benefit estimate. For example, people who truly value some fishing site may purchase a property near the site, and thus the TC method would underestimate their benefits. Furthermore, since hobbies like recreational fishing, may have periods of higher and lower popularity, TC studies should be conducted frequently enough in the same area to be able to form a more trustworthy estimate of recreational fishing benefits than single studies. See Appendix 3 to discover major steps for conducting study applying the TC method. The study of Vesterinen & Pouta (2009) in Box 7 illustrates the use of a zonal TC method.

Box 7. Water clarity effects on near-home water recreation value (Vesterinen & Pouta, 2009).

Policy question

What are the effects of improved water quality imposed by the Water Framework Directive on everyday near-home water recreation value? Are the benefits comparable to the costs faced by agricultural producers for reducing eutrophication agents in surface waters.

Method(s)

Travel Cost Method (TC); Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA)

Background

The Water Framework Directive demands good ecological status for surface waters by the year 2015. Finnish agricultural producers are thus under pressure to reduce nutrient runoff to surface waters, which incurs costs. On the other hand, water recreation presents important use-values to the society and is the most obvious sufferer from increased eutrophication in both sea and inland waters.

The Economic Problem

What are the determinants that affect water recreation activity and how does water quality affect water recreation behaviour in quantifiable measures? What is the value of a single water recreation trip?

Data

The study was conducted using an existing national recreation inventory dataset, from which water recreation related parts were extracted for research. The recreation inventory contained a representative sample of 5 500 Finns. The data provided information on water recreation behaviour in general, travel cost data for the last visited water recreation site, and respondent background information. Since the recreation inventory was not specifically designed for travel cost method, some details were unattainable, making the analysis slightly more challenging. After choosing water clarity as a proxy for water quality, each respondent was connected spatially to local water clarity measure using a national surface water quality database.

Results

The results show that local water clarity, as a proxy for water quality, had a significant effect on the frequency of local, one-day swimming and fishing trips. The number of anglers was also estimated to increase with improved water clarity. The average value per one-day, near-home water recreation trip was estimated to be at a range between 6 and 19 Euros. For a one-meter increase in aggregate water clarity in Finland the estimated benefits would then increase between 31 to 92 million euros annually for swimmers, and 43 to 129 million Euros for anglers. Boaters were not found to be statistically significantly sensitive to near-home water clarity.

Policy implications

The benefits from improved near-home water quality are not very high in comparison with the current cost estimates of agricultural runoff cuts. On the other hand, making cost and benefit studies commensurable was found difficult due to the complexity of ecological functions, i.e. quantifiable cause and effect of nutrient runoff cut to water clarity is not available. The benefits from improved water clarity were, however, found significant and represent only a part of the use-values of surface waters, since out-of-home and multiple-day use-values are omitted in the study. The study shows that valuation studies can be conducted using existing datasets, if such exist, with less costs in time and money compared to designing and implementing completely new surveys.

Costs

Wages of 1 full-time researcher
Data available for free

Time

Data collection: approximately 3 months
Data preparation approximately 2 months
Modeling and reporting the results 12 months

3.2.2.2. Hedonic pricing method

Hedonic pricing method estimates economic values for environmental goods and services by examining the indirect effect those goods and services have the prices for other goods traded in the marketplace. The method decomposes the price of a marketed good between its attributes, including the valued environmental good. The most common application is associated to housing prices where price variation is expected to reflect the quality (value) of local environmental characteristics.

The Hedonic Pricing method (HP) considers marketed goods as bundles of services rather than a physical object or a simple service. When the services provided by goods, such as housing, can be quantified with enough precision, it is possible to decompose the price of the good for each service type, given that there is enough variation in the market prices and characteristics of goods sold in markets. Typically, the HP method is used in housing markets because houses have multiple characteristics that give value to and take value from the property. For example, if two summer houses would be sold at a price difference of 5 000 Euros, and the more expensive summer house would be located on the shore of a better fishing lake than the cheaper one, other things equal, the HP method would give an “implicit price” of 5 000 Euros to good fishing location (Champ et al., 2003).

If we had a market as simple as in the previous example, it would be easy to estimate benefits with the HP method. However, since it is impossible to find property sales that are identical except for their access to fishing, the HP method is heavily dependent on large amounts of property sales data. Property sales data tends to be available from governmental archives, but may be lacking details on the house attributes. To be accurate, the method requires great detail on all property attributes, from the number of rooms to types of flooring used to the primary heating system. Using less attribute rich property sales, like unbuilt lots, may provide a workaround of the problem. The more detailed data is available, the better the model should be in predicting the willingness to pay for an environmental amenity, like the vicinity of good fishing grounds.

Like any valuation method, results obtained from the HP method are largely affected by the area chosen for analysis. The researchers must decide on where to stop counting possible benefits for

property owners. Many studies have only considered waterfront properties, but these estimations ignore the benefits for properties located even slightly further away from the lake or river. Enlarging the study area quickly increases the need for data. Spatial modelling procedures have become more accessible to accommodate for missing regional data.

The HP method will, as a first-stage analysis, estimate implicit prices for property attributes, which work as point estimates, but are unsuitable to estimate large changes in environmental characteristics. In the second stage of analysis, demands for the individual housing attributes are estimated. Most environmental valuation studies using HP settle with first stage estimates due to methodological challenges in producing accurate demand curves.

The HP method, given a large and accurate database, is a good valuation method. It can be used to evaluate the benefits of inland fishing in the vicinity of a permanent or holiday residence. However, the large amount of data needed may be costly to acquire if pre-existing databases do not exist with sufficient levels of accuracy. On the other hand, HP methods do not require costly primary data collections, in most cases.

The case study for the HP method, presented in Box 8 below, is based on a study by Vesterinen (2009). Work is still in progress and results are expected to be available in 2010/2011.

Box 8. Value of Water Quality in Summer House Markets (Vesterinen, 2009).

Policy question

Will the demands for good ecological status of surface waters by the Water Framework Directive (WFD) have an effect on summer house markets? What are the most important factors of water quality to the consumer in contrast to the natural scientist's view?

Method(s)

Hedonic Pricing Method (HP)

Background

There are slightly less than 500 thousand summer houses in Finland, which typically reside near a water body. Valuation studies tend to focus current use values or willingness to pay figures for future changes in water quality. There is little information even in the European context concerning water quality effects on residential prices, which reflects the value of water invested in capital assets, something not captured in travel cost studies.

The Economic Problem

What are the significant price determinants of summer house markets in Finland? What aspects of water quality are actually valued when purchasing a summer house?

Data

The data for summer house sales were obtained from an official property sales database. Since the official database on sales was found to lack detailed information on the sold properties, the database was supplemented with a detailed survey sent to all summer house purchasers in the study year via internet and mail. The survey elicited data on the respondents' socioeconomic background, water recreation behaviour and quality opinions, details of the summer house and the lot, and carried additional questions relating to travel cost, contingent valuation and choice experiment methods to provide a chance for future joint-method analysis. Despite the survey was burdensome with 20 pages, the response rate climbed to near 45 %. Additionally a national surface water quality database was added to the two databases using computerized geographical processing (GIS).

(Anticipated) Results

The data shows summer house sales to be sensitive to water quality levels. Implicit prices for changes in water quality levels are significant. Summer house owners are interested mostly in the water quality indicators that have direct implications in water use, be it recreational fishing or for physical consumption.

Possible policy implications

Since the WFD puts weight on the ecological status of surface waters, it could overlook the use-values that summer house owners enjoy. For example, if it is deemed that a lake should be restored to its original condition, it may, in some cases where the original condition was very humid etc., decrease the use-values, and thus the property-values for the

current summer house owners. However, if the restoration of water quality improves water recreation possibilities, which is the likely case, summer house owners' property values will increase. This may lead to a positive willingness to pay for local water quality improvement schemes.

Costs

Property sales data of 4 years from official records and conversion by a third party to usable form.

Supplemental survey to the property sales data via internet and two reminder mailings:

4 to 5 Euros per person.

Wages: 24 months for one person, minimum

Time estimates

Data collection and survey implementation: 12 months

Coding and joining databases: 3 months

Analysis :12 months

3.2.2.3. Revealed preference methods - pros and cons

RP methods can be used to estimate the use-values of non-market goods through the consumption of related market goods. Due to the observational nature of RP methods, they provide conservative estimates of benefits. The travel cost method is the oldest environmental valuation method and has gained a foothold in the science of valuation. The hedonic pricing method is also applicable and has been thoroughly tested.

To evaluate the value of inland recreational fishing, revealed preference methods offer a way to study the use-values retained by anglers. The travel cost method is especially well suited for single site studies, as well as larger regional studies provided there is adequate time and financial resources to send surveys to a large study population. If, on the other hand, fishing rights are under private ownership, access to fishing grounds is restricted, or the anglers constitute a large market share of property owners or renters, hedonic pricing studies could be used to extract the value of good fishing sites with directed surveys and residential sales or rental data.

The travel cost method is a very suitable valuation method, given that the evaluated sites enjoy frequent visitors and the method:

- works for single, multiple sites and regions
- only estimates use-values, but based on observed data
- surveys are comparably easy to make

The hedonic pricing method is less suitable, since fishing tends to be a mobile activity:

- If liberal "every-man's rights" prevail, HP might not be a relevant method. On the other hand, if fishing grounds are privately owned and access is limited, prices of properties could reflect fishing values.
- The HP method may provide additional insight in assessing total economic value that the TC or SP methods may not capture.

3.2.3. Benefit transfer

Benefit transfer takes existing non-market valuation estimates obtained at a "study site" and applies them to a new "policy site" where a new study is too expensive or time consuming to carry out. Benefit transfer is cheaper, but also less accurate than on-site studies. Accuracy of benefits transfer can still be acceptable compared to accuracy of cost estimates in a number of decision settings.

Benefit transfer (BT) is the process of using information about benefit estimates from one context (the study site) and adapting these to another context, called the policy site. The information from existing valuation studies is used in the method, transferring the unit values (mean estimates of

WTP) or by altering model variables so that they coincide with the evaluated area. Thus, BT is not a valuation method in itself, but, as the name suggests, it is used to “transfer” prior benefit estimates to a new area or policy context. For example, values for recreational fishing associated with certain policy change in a particular site can be estimated by applying measures of recreational fishing values from a previously conducted study in another site. The method is applicable particularly in situations, where budget, time or lower significance of policy impacts do not require undertaking a primary valuation study for evaluating management or policy impacts. For these reasons and because conducting an original valuation study is relatively expensive and time-consuming, benefit transfer is one of the rapidly growing areas in the valuation literature.

Box 9. Environmental Valuation Reference Inventory™ (EVRI™) – An example of a general benefits transfer database.

The EVRI is a web-based database intended primarily as a tool to assist policy analysts using the benefits transfer approach to estimate economic values for changes in environmental goods and services or human health. It contains non-market valuation studies described according to a standard set of study design criteria across a wide range of environmental goods and services and health impacts.

1. **Study Reference** – basic bibliographic information
2. **Study Area and Population Characteristics** – information about the location of the study along with population and site data
3. **Environmental Focus of the Study** – fields that describe the environmental asset being valued, the stressors on the environment, and the specific purpose of the study
4. **Study Methods** – technical information on the actual study, along with the specific techniques that were used to arrive at the results
5. **Estimated Values** – the monetary values that are presented in the study as well as the specific units of measure
6. **Alternative Language Summary** – an abstract of the study available in English and French

Because of its wide coverage of topics and standardised description of studies EVRI is useful for managers in a first cut assessment of available studies in their environmental field of interest, and in devising terms of reference for benefits transfers or primary valuation studies. Despite the large number of non-market studies contained in EVRI, for any particular BT application in a particular country there might be few available studies entered in the database. The EVRI is regularly updated, but not at the pace at which non-market valuation studies are published.

Source: <http://www.evri.ca/>

Applying benefit transfer, however presumes availability of valuation studies from study sites with similar characteristics to the current policy site study (the subject of valuation). BT value estimation is always highly conditional on quality of the initial studies. Because recreational use values are relatively easy to transfer, there are a number of benefit transfer applications associated to recreational activities including recreational fishing, which are however mainly conducted in the USA (e.g., Rosenberger & Loomis, 2001).

The current Occasional Paper is focused on undertaking original primary valuation studies, so the benefit transfer method is discussed only in broad terms (for additional information see Rolfe & Bennett, 2006; Rosenberger & Loomis, 2001; Wilson & Hoehn, 2006). Further guidelines on benefit transfer can be found in several web-sites including the Environmental Value Reference Inventory (EVRI, see Box 9.) and the Wildlife Habitat Benefits Estimation Toolkit (Box 10.)

3.2.3.1. Benefit transfer - different approaches

Benefit transfer may be performed in several ways, with value unit transfer and more sophisticated value function transfer regarded as two main approaches. According to Spash & Vatn (2006) value unit transfer is further divided to three different types of estimation methods. The simple single

point “value transfer” basically records of a unit value of welfare, typically average values (consumer surplus and mean WTP and WTA estimates), from one site or sites to another directly without adjustment. In addition, value transfer involves administratively approved value estimation in which case the explicit adjustment process occurs.

Next, function transfer uses statistical models to transfer data (entire function) from an original study to another context. Functions may be based on single ‘best’ studies or meta-analysis of a number of similar studies. Using the functions one is able to explain welfare estimates with set of explanatory variables and fit the measurable characteristics among studies, original and new, which systemically differ from each others. This advantage is considerable since benefit estimates vary in the literature according to several factors (quality of site, differences among the user population characteristics, extent of the market, temporal/spatial differences, and methodologically induced differences). What is considered a “similar site”? Recent research on water quality valuation (Bateman et al. 2009) suggests that theoretically specified benefit functions have lower transfer errors than studies that estimate ad hoc statistical “best fit” functions for a site. Site characteristics justified by economic theory include the magnitude of change of provision of the environmental good (scope), the distance from the respondents household to site in question, the distance to substitute sites and income. Basic differences in these transfer methods are summarised in Figure 8 (Rosenberger & Loomis, 2001).

Basically performing the benefit transfer includes the same phases involved in other types of transfer techniques. Rosenberger and Loomis (2001) and Rolfe & Bennet (2006) provide step by step guidance for each transfer estimation technique and also represent applications for recreational use.

Box 10. Wildlife Habitat Benefits Estimation Toolkit – An example of a specialised benefits transfer database.

The Wildlife Habitat Benefits Estimation Toolkit is a set of easy-to-use spreadsheet-based valuation models, tables and databases directed at land use and wildlife planners and others interested in estimating the economic benefits associated with wildlife and habitat conservation in specific geographic regions. The toolkit comprises different models estimating

- *Open Space Property Value Premium*
- *Activity Day Value* models for hunting, fishing and wildlife viewing
- *Habitat Value* or *Habitat Improvement Value* for terrestrial and aquatic habitats and wetlands
- *Threatened, Endangered and Rare Species Value* and *Salmon Value*

The data is based on US non-market valuation studies. The authors estimated meta-analysis wildlife recreation use models for National Wildlife Refuges that are applicable to state Wildlife Management Areas, and state-level wildlife recreation use estimation models for the lower 48 states that can be applied to privately owned and public lands that represent potential habitat for game and non-game species (Kroeger T., J.Loomis and F. Casey (2008). For valuation of sport fishing specifically, all the database studies were disaggregated into three types of fishing (cold, warm, anadromous - i.e., steelhead and salmon); the meta-analysis presents average values for these types with the exception of salmon. Due to the limited number present the individual study values rather than an average so as to facilitate individuals performing point value transfers by matching their policy site to a particular study site.

Source: toolkit can be downloaded from Defenders of Wildlife website:

http://www.defenders.org/programs_and_policy/science_and_economics/conservation_economics/valuation/benefits_toolkit.php




Figure 8. Benefit transfer approaches (Rosenberger & Loomis, 2001).

Benefit transfer always starts by identifying the policy change, data needed and the accuracy of the original data. First, the site characteristics and expected impacts (on fishing site / fish stocks) of the proposed policy or program are identified and quantified. Then these impacts have to be translated to changes in recreational fishing and how fishing will be changed is measured. After that the extent and number in the affected population are identified. Next data needs are identified, including the type of benefit measure (unit, average, marginal value) to be used and the value components (use, non-use, or total value) to be estimated. Accuracy of the data needed depends on the importance of the policy change or if the impact of the policy change is large. In the next phase, source studies are identified with the help of the databases (e.g. EVRI⁶ or Envalue⁷) or directly from non-market valuation literature, and applicable benefit transfer type is selected. Provided that similar studies can be found, their reliability⁸ and correspondence⁹ with current study is evaluated. Then an applicable benefit measure estimates from study/studies is selected, and the transferability and relevancy of the data is assessed. Finally, the statistical modelling used in original study is assessed and benefit transfer is performed.

The choice of the appropriate value transfer approach depends on the information available. A conceptual example is given in Figure 9.

⁶ EVRITM — The Environmental Valuation Reference Inventory. (available at: <http://www.evri.ca/english/about.htm>)

⁷ Envalue Study database (available at: <http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/envalue/StudyCnt.asp>)

⁸ Correctness of used valuation method and empirical techniques

⁹ Similarities and differences in population, scale of policy change(s) between sites




Figure 9. A continuum of benefits transfer approaches (Barton, 1999).

With no similar studies available to the study site expert based judgement Delphi-type methods are often used, perhaps borrowing estimates from a similar field of recreation. With the large number of non-market valuation studies available, such pure expert ‘guesstimation’ is perhaps a thing of the past. Unit value transfers are now often conducted with 1-2 similar studies or when a particular study site is very similar to a policy site. When a handful of studies are available, sometimes weighted averages have been used for scoping policy benefits. Different weighting methods may be used, for example, in adjusting values between countries using purchasing power parity (PPP) factors. One study may include several independent estimates so fewer than about 20 studies are also seen in meta-analysis of willingness to pay for a particular environmental good. Once meta-analyses have a sufficient number of studies to draw from to find significant site characteristics that explain WTP, meta-analysis becomes a benefit transfer approach as well. Meta-value functions may be applied to a policy site using site specific data from a census and/or pilot studies. Often, a meta-analysis will be a precursor to identifying the ‘best’ single study for a single benefit function transfer. Function transfers are carried out using census or pilot data from the policy site. Single function transfers are also used in the literature to ‘test’ the magnitude transfer errors between two study sites. A primary valuation study is the end of the continuum regarding how much policy site specific information is collected. Generally information is increasing from left to right in Figure 9, as are valuation study costs.

Hanley et al. (2006) tested benefit transfer for the EU Water Framework Directive comparing the results from two identical choice experiments. Choice experiments initially lend themselves better to BT than contingent valuation because more site specific attributes of the environmental good can be corrected for. The authors found significant differences between the results of original studies and using benefit transfer method. They recommended future research on finding acceptable methods of benefit transfer, with emphasis on using choice experiment studies as original studies. The problem with benefit transfer is whether it can be reliable.

Meta-analysis is more data demanding than conventional benefit transfer, although it also uses already conducted benefit studies for estimation. In meta-analysis the researchers collect many similar studies together and attempt to find, using statistical methods, trends and aggregate benefit estimates for the studied environmental amenities. Thus, meta-analysis is the statistical summarization of research outcomes, while its results can be also applied to benefits transfer in order to provide value information. As one study on benefits may offer multiple estimations to be used in meta-analysis, it may be possible to conduct a meta-analysis with relatively few studies.

Meta-analysis provides aggregated results that may be used best to form a regional or national scale synthesis on, for example fishing benefits. While BT is used to transfer value estimates, the original purpose of meta-analysis was to widen the basic information (e.g. associated to the set of explanatory variables of the WTP/value estimates) and to utilize that information in new studies. Moreover, it is used to explain the differences in mean WTP estimates in different studies. More recently meta-analysis is being increasingly used particularly in the US to produce valuation estimates for regulatory assessment at national or state level (see Box 11).

Meta-analysis studies regarding economic valuation of recreational fishing have been published. For instance, Johnston et al. (2006) analysed if variation in marginal WTP per one additional salmon fish among recreational anglers could be explained by variation in resource, context and angler attributes, or whether the methodological factors would dominate. Ahtiainen (2009) have applied meta-analysis to value marine resources in the Baltic Sea, which is presented as a case study for the BT method (Box 11, see also Box 10).

Box 11. Valuing international marine resources – a meta-analysis on the Baltic Sea (Ahtiainen, 2009).

Policy question

What is the current knowledge on the monetary benefits of protecting the Baltic Sea? Are the benefits the same order of magnitude as the costs of protection measures?

Method(s)

Meta-analysis (MA), Benefit transfer (BT), Cost-benefit analysis (CBA)

Background

The state of the Baltic Sea has been adversely affected by human activities for several decades, and its protection has been called for on many occasions. There are still no binding agreements on the protection of the Baltic. Net benefits of different policies are crucial for reaching agreements on protection measures. It is likely that the costs and benefits are asymmetrically distributed between the countries involved. The available information on the benefits of protecting the Baltic Sea is fragmented. The purpose of the study was to assess the magnitude of the benefits of improving the state of the Baltic Sea using meta-analysis. The results from the meta-analysis were applied to benefit transfer to assess the distribution of benefits between countries.

The Economic Problem

Which factors affect WTP for marine water quality? How are the benefits distributed between the littoral countries? What are the total net benefits of protecting the Baltic Sea?

Data

The starting point of the data search for the primary studies was a review, which compiled information about valuation studies on the Baltic Sea from the littoral countries. In addition to the studies found in the review, the data encompassed also comparable research from the United States. The limited amount of European studies motivated the inclusion of studies from the U.S. In general, the lack of suitable data is a common problem in benefit transfers and meta-analyses in the field of environmental valuation.

The selection criteria for the studies were the following. First, the focus of the study needed to be water quality. Water quality was defined broadly to include effects from eutrophication, the state of fisheries and also other physical factors. Second, the water quality change valued had to affect recreational activities and/or biodiversity in water ecosystems. Third, the valuation methods were limited to SP methods (contingent valuation and choice experiment) and the TC method. Fourth, it was essential that the study report provide sufficient data for purposes of the analysis. Both peer-reviewed publications and “gray literature” (such as working papers, reports, master’s thesis and PhD dissertations) were included. The final data consisted of 32 studies and 54 observations.

Results

Based on the results of the meta-regression, the WTP for water quality varied systematically according to expectations. Importantly, the results indicated that the variables describing the change in water quality were statistically significant in explaining the willingness to pay estimates. The income level of the focal country, represented by its gross domestic product, had a significant effect on WTP, allowing the assessment of benefit distribution among the Baltic Sea countries. In addition, the water body type, the study methodology and the year of the study affected the value of water quality changes. The mean annual WTP for water quality based on the data was 64 Euros per person.

The distribution of the benefits of protecting the Baltic Sea was found to be asymmetric, and the magnitude of the total benefits was in line with previous research. The total benefits were around MEUR 5 000 per year for all Baltic Sea countries. The aggregate net benefits of protecting the Baltic were estimated to be positive.

Policy implications

The fact that the net benefits are distributed asymmetrically between the Baltic Sea countries is interesting from the viewpoint of international negotiations, as net benefits are decisive in determining countries' incentives to adhere to international agreements on protecting shared marine areas. Although total net benefits from the protection measures will be positive, some countries will have to bear costs that are higher than their anticipated gain, and these countries may thus be reluctant to participate in common actions. In this situation, binding agreements are difficult to reach. However, the positive aggregate net benefits noted would allow for compensation to be paid between countries, which might facilitate the conclusion of international agreements on the protection of the Baltic Sea.

Costs

Wages of at least one full-time researcher

Time estimates

Data collection: 2 months

Coding the meta-data: 3 months

Analysis and reporting: 6 months

3.2.3.2. Benefit transfer method - pros and cons

Benefit transfer is considered a rather controversial valuation method in academic circles. Comparative studies which transferred benefit estimates to actual study results have found large discrepancies between the transferred and locally estimated values, and until now the method has not been very successful (Hanley, Wright & Alvarez-Farizo, 2006). However, in project assessment it is regularly practiced due to lack of time and resources to conduct original on-site studies. The method seems to work in certain contexts better than in others, such as when transferring recreational (fishing) use values, but the reasons for this are not known at the moment (Bateman et al., 2002).

Standards for the BT, however, may vary depending on the context, i.e. lower standards may be accepted when values are used to give only preliminary information for decision making, when costs are likely to far exceed or not attain benefits (but requires documentation), or when uncertainty regarding costs of environmental measures is expected to be as high/higher than that of benefit transfer.

3.3. Economic impact analysis

Economic impact analysis examines the flow of expenditures through a community in terms of jobs, incomes, total sales, and contribution to gross domestic product (GDP). Economic impact analysis relies on a model on the local economy that translates data on the production of goods and services into multipliers that can be applied recreational angler expenditures or changes in expenditures. This type of analysis is useful for demonstrating the economic importance of the current level of an activity in the economy. It is also useful for analyzing the distributional impacts of a change in recreational fishing policies or any other external shock to recreational fishing activities. These effects can be positive or negative. Impact analysis is normally considered in terms of the actual or hypothetical introduction of new activity or the ending of existing activity, for example of a salmon fishery. These changes are peculiar to a particular region and its economic structure, and to the pattern of expenditure associated with the activity.

Recreational fishing generates economic impacts to local and regional economies, where recreational expenditure generates business revenues, jobs and personal income. Three types of

economic impacts are discernible: direct impacts, which are the purchases made by anglers, including travel, accommodation and food costs; indirect impacts, which are the purchases made by businesses to produce goods or services demanded by anglers; and induced impacts, which are the purchases of goods and services by households receiving wages from businesses producing direct or indirect goods. Households then use some of their higher income for consumption, thus increasing the income of companies. Indirect and induced impacts are sometimes referred to as secondary impacts. The summation of these three levels of impact is the total economic impact (TEI). The most common tool to analyze these impacts are the input-output models (I-O model). Its popularity has been engendered by the growth of ready-made I-O modelling systems.

The flows of commodities between the various branches of production within a given time are presented in the input-output table, those of goods and services usually being expressed in monetary terms. The description of commodity flows by means of an input-output table is characterised by their simultaneous examination from the point of view of commodity production and commodity use. Input-output analysis combines the correlations between the various forms of production even if they do not seem very close. Ease of application of an I-O model depends to a large extent on availability of existing input-output tables, either national or regional, which are usually produced by national statistical authorities.

I-O-models are based on the idea that a demand stimulus has a multiplier effect because an initial purchase circulates several times through the local economy. Multiplier impacts are reflected in practice in the form of increased demand, production and income. A multiplier is the ratio of direct, indirect and induced changes within a regional economy to the direct change itself. The output multiplier measures the effect of an extra unit of recreational anglers spending in economic activity levels in the economy. The employment multiplier measures the relationship of the direct and indirect employment generated by additional recreational anglers spending to direct employment alone. The income multiplier expresses the amount of income generated in the economy directly or indirectly as a result of increased expenditures (e.g., Martin, 1987).

It is important to recognize that economic impacts are confined to the region described in the model, such as a county or other regional unit. Leakages occur when goods and services are purchased from outside the region. This money is no longer available in the region for further spending. The magnitude of leakages from the local economy depends upon the size of the study area and the extent of internal business linkages. Other things being equal, larger regions and regions with more diversified businesses activities will experience smaller leakages in a given time period (Martin, 1987). For example, if a fishery ceases and anglers move to another county, theoretically all angler expenditure could be lost to the region. On the other hand, anglers may have substitutes for fishing: either some other type of fishing or activity in their place of residence, in which case only part of regional income and employment would be lost.

Economic impact provides a direct link between the use of the resource and the associated level of economic activity in the region. It enables managers to relate a change in the level of the activity of recreational fishing to the resulting change in the benefit to businesses and wage earnings. Thus, fisheries management decisions can be translated into sales, income and jobs (Martin, 1987).

It should be noted that economic values and economic impacts are fundamentally different measures. Economic value indicates the value of recreational fisheries to individual and further to society, while economic impact indicates the changes in income, employment and revenues a demand stimulus generates. In brief, the recreational anglers' expenditure is a measure of size only and does not answer by itself the question whether resources are appropriately allocated.

Regional impacts of recreational fishing can be remarkable, as the example from England and Wales shows (Box 12).

Box 12. Economic impact of inland fisheries (Mawle & Peirson, 2009; Radford, Riddington & Gibson, 2007).

Policy question

The study, *Economic evaluation of inland fisheries. The economic impact of freshwater angling*, had the following objectives:

- to estimate annual expenditure on different types of freshwater angling in each region of England and Wales, and
- to estimate the impact on regional economies of potential increases and decreases in different types of freshwater angling, identifying the contribution made by tourism.

Methods

Expenditure estimates were then processed in DREAM® models tailored to each regional economy. The DREAM® model is based on the incorporation and reconciliation of all current statistics on production and consumption in the UK (Detailed Regional Accounting Model developed by CogentSI Ltd).

Data

Thirty-three separate assessments were produced of the dependency of regions on the spending of anglers fishing for coarse fish, trout, salmon and sea trout. Estimates were also categorised by types of surface water, that is, rivers, stillwaters and canals.

Assessments were made for the nine Government Office Regions of England; Wales; and for England and Wales as a whole. For each of the 33 region/fish species combinations, the study estimated the economic activity supported by each species as well as the potential economic impact of their loss. Among the parameters estimated were:

- total annual income in the form of wages, profits and income from self-employment accruing to households – this is called gross value added (GVA);
- total employment (measured in full-time job equivalents (FTEs));
- GVA generated per pound of angler expenditure;
- angler expenditure necessary to generate one FTE;
- GVA generated per angler day;
- FTEs per thousand angler days.

An online internet questionnaire was used to collect information across the combinations of regions and fish species. Given that in England and Wales a licence is required to fish in freshwater, the Environment Agency holds the names and addresses of licenced anglers. A controlled sample of 3,000 anglers was drawn from these records. ADAS Ltd then managed a telephone survey of the anglers and collected observations on the average number of angling days per angler across the region/fish species combinations. Using the known total number of anglers from licence sales, these observations were scaled to population totals (angler days per region per fish species). Having established population totals, the survey generated data on average angler expenditure per day across the 33 combinations.

Results

For England and Wales as a whole, the total effort on freshwater angling by licenced anglers in England and Wales in 2005 was 30 million angler days. Coarse angling was the most popular activity, while salmon and sea trout angling was a relatively minor activity.

Angler gross expenditure across the whole of England and Wales was £1.18 billion, with coarse angling responsible for £971 million of this. Household income of £980 million and 37,386 jobs were generated across England and Wales. In the unlikely event of all forms of angling ceasing, expenditure would be diverted to other activities creating income and jobs elsewhere in England and Wales. Thus, although income and jobs would be lost in angling services, there would be increases elsewhere.

The study could not estimate the economic impact of the loss of all species; however, a substitution analysis was carried out for each species, to estimate the net expenditure loss and associated income and job effects. Taking coarse fish as an example, the gross expenditure of coarse anglers in England and Wales supported household incomes of £804 million and 30,580 FTEs. If coarse angling were to cease across England and Wales, from interviews with anglers we estimate that £161 million would be lost, resulting in a net loss of £133 million in household income and 5,060 jobs. The same interpretation can be applied to trout and salmon and sea trout.

Policy implications

In the public domain, the total expenditure of anglers and the employment generated is often used for advocacy purposes. In some instances, the findings of an impact study are used inappropriately. This inappropriate use may be deliberate but may also simply be misguided. Both culpable and innocent misuse is best tackled by ensuring that all sides are familiar with the scope and limitations of impact studies.

Costs

Total budget for the study was £ 120 000.

Time

Timescale for the research itself and production of supporting documentation was circa three years.

The application of an input-output methodology is rather straightforward provided that basic data and models exist. However, the interpretation of the results of input-output analysis presupposes that following items are considered:

- Values and impacts are incomparable: economic valuation and economic impact assessment measure different things and results of one cannot be compared with another or used as respective surrogates (Hanna et al., 2006).
- Impact analyses provide a measure of the impact of economic activity associated with fishing. Unless (regional) input-output tables have been constructed and are accessible, the application of the method may turn inappropriate for fisheries analysis only.
- Key assumptions that should be documented to ensure the accuracy of impact analysis are: size of the region modelled, existence of substitution possibilities, expenditure location, price effects and resource constraints. Often studies are conducted with the implicit assumption that no substitutes exist for the activity being analysed. However, if they do exist, loss of a given opportunity may not result in a total loss of benefits or expenditure as it would in the absence of substitute opportunities. It is also important to know whether the location of the substitute activity is within or outside the study region (Hanna et al., 2006). One should also notice that impact studies can be used to exaggerate the benefits of policies or proposals in some cases and their costs in others.

3.4. Market studies and resource rent

Market analysis, in this context, includes the analysis of the economic value derived by businesses that provide recreation opportunities for hire or that supply the inputs to the recreational experience. The value generated is measured by producer surplus (PS), which can be generalized as the profit a business generates. For hire businesses include but aren't limited to fishing guides or resource owners that provide access to fishing for a fee. Businesses that supply inputs to the recreational fishing experience include but aren't limited to tackle stores, bait providers, and hatcheries.

In a cost/benefit framework, every business that supports the provision of recreational fishing generates producer surplus (PS) that should be included along with consumer surplus (CS) in the calculation of total benefit or total economic value. To estimate a producer surplus, i.e. the total revenue generated from sales less the costs of production, regression based techniques are used to estimate production functions. Production functions can be constructed based on revenue, cost, or profit functions which are then used to derive input or output supply functions. Detailed cost and return data is needed from the businesses being examined in order to estimate these functions.

Beyond simply calculating value accruing to producers, it is important to also focus on producer behaviour in the face of changing policies or environmental conditions just as understanding consumer behaviour is important. Development of supply curves allow the examination of producer behaviour, which in turn allow the examination of business efficiency, profitability, response to environmental or policy change, and industry capacity, which has become an increasingly important concern in fisheries.

Collecting data on producers and consumers allow the development of market studies. Market studies provide vital information regarding the impact of changes in fisheries policies, changes in

environmental conditions, or the viability of increasing recreational fishing services in a particular area. Fisheries are differentiated from each other by their characteristics (average catches, length, number of pegs, access), and these characteristics influence their market price. With a sufficient number of owners' estimates of market value and details of the accompanying combinations of characteristics, an 'implicit price function' can be estimated. Given an estimated implicit price function, the market value of any fishery can theoretically be predicted from knowledge of its characteristics. More importantly, this relationship can be used to predict how the market value of fisheries would vary with overall changes in individual characteristics. The same data set can be used to estimate the total market value for each fishery type, provided that an appropriate scaling factor is available (Radford et al., 2001). Caution is warranted when transferring an implicit price function from one site to another for many of the same reason identified in the benefits transfer section (3.2.3).

For priced fisheries, as many European inland fisheries are, anglers have an additional item of expenditure because the owners of fishing rights extract permit charges from anglers. Because there is usually no opportunity costs associated with access charges, they are transfers of income from anglers to owners. Resource rent exists when payments to owners of the resources used in production exceed opportunity costs of maintaining these resources. If the opportunity costs of the resources fishery owners control are negligible, then the owner's revenue is resource rent. Net economic value could thus be estimated by summing economic rents and the remaining consumers' surplus. However, the crucial assumption is that that all payments to owners are resource rent (i.e. that the opportunity costs are zero of the resources fishing right owners control) (Radford et al., 2001). In spite of the riparian ownership of fishing grounds commonly found in Europe, research focusing on the capital value or market functions of such rights is scarce. The Finnish case has been studied by Sipponen (1999).

Examining producer behaviour requires data on individual firms that supply recreational services including landowners, hatcheries, and for-hire recreational service providers. Data collected should include detailed cost information, both variable and fixed costs, detailed revenue information, and detailed business characteristics data. The same data is also needed to construct economic impact models presented in the previous section.

4. Sampling issues and survey implementation

Both the economics and the HD paradigms rely to a large extent on the sampling of anglers at all stages of the behavioural process. While some of the measurement techniques listed above rely on secondary sources of data, the majority require a primary data collection. Primary data collection is expensive, time consuming and requires rigorous methods to produce data that both suit the analysis task at hand and is unbiased. In analogy to the stages of the behavioural process (Figure 1), primary data collection may occur at any one of the three stages. Data on actual behaviour may be obtained from simple observation, from survey questionnaires or a combination of simple observation and a follow up survey. Data collection about behavioural intention, or about other stages representing the behavioural antecedents requires some kind of questionnaire survey.

This chapter will briefly describe the main observational methods, followed by a discussion of survey questionnaires, and will conclude with a brief discussion of sampling methods and sampling biases. This chapter will not cover creel surveys, which are specific to fishing, and also represent a survey method, albeit with the primary purpose of collecting biological information about catches. Often, creel surveys have been used to collect select socio-demographic or even attitudinal information (Hicks et al., 2000). The purpose here is not to provide an authoritative treatment of survey methods. Plenty of textbooks have been written to that effect (e.g. Dillman, 2000). Instead we simply want to emphasize the main aspects of sound survey research.

4.1 Observational methods

With the emergence of sophisticated new surveying techniques, many new observational techniques have been introduced to social science research and have also found application for monitoring recreation behaviour. Cessford and Muhar (2003) described these methods (list below is modified):

- human observers
- automatic counters (magnetic, infra-red, etc.)
- triggered cameras
- video or time-lapse video
- overflight counting from aircraft

A detailed evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of these methods goes beyond the limits of this EIFAC Occasional Paper. However, biases are associated with each method, and their implementation requires constant testing and calibration. For example, Arnberger et al. (2005) systematically compared the results of video-monitoring with observer-based counting, and report biases in that video-monitoring, which depends on human extraction of information under-counts actual user numbers in low-use situations, while at high-use situations human observers become less reliable.

The applicability of methods depends on purpose and the physical setting of the angling situation. For sizeable waterbodies, or a region with many waterbodies, periodic overflights might be appropriate and efficient. The efficient use of automatic counters typically requires settings with a limited number of access points.

4.2 Questionnaire surveys

Questionnaires are undoubtedly the single most important means of primary data collection covering the antecedent stages of the behavioural process. The focus of this Occasional Paper will be on formal questionnaires that rely on probabilistic sampling approaches, as opposed to qualitative forms of data collection which also involve other types of interactions between researcher and research subject. Qualitative interviews are excellent sources of information for obtaining some initial understanding about specific issues or to delve into depth about certain behaviour or motivations by select individuals. However, if the goal is to determine the opinion, preference, or even past behaviour of a predefined population, then well designed questionnaires are the method of choice (Vaske, 2008).

Table 1 compares the four main survey methods (on-site in-person interviews, mail, telephone, and internet surveys) on the most relevant criteria. The information in this table speaks for itself and will not be repeated here in all its detail. Survey applications to recreational fishing have traditionally relied mostly on mail surveys, as the cheapest method, prone to relatively few biases. The main advantages of telephone surveys are usually outweighed by its high administration cost. Over the past few years, internet surveys have become another excellent survey method in many areas of social science research, and nowadays internet penetration might be high enough among anglers to reduce biases.

4.2.1 Sampling

Sampling is the process of selecting an unbiased subset of observations for the purpose of describing a larger population based on only a selected portion of that population. A sample is representative when all individuals in the population have a known chance of being selected (Vaske, 2008). Quantitative surveys typically rely on some form of probability sampling, as compared to a non-probability or purposive sample. The latter are applied to recruit focus group participants or for other qualitative methods.

In simple **random sampling** each member of the population has an equal chance of being selected. When a list of eligible population members (e.g. fishing licences) is available, a random sample can be selected based on a random number table. As an alternative, if work with a random numbers table becomes too cumbersome, systematic sampling involves randomly selecting the first individual, and thereafter choosing subsequent individuals based on a pre-determined interval. Many modern spreadsheets, database packages and statistical software offer random sampling tools.

Table 1. Some Broad Criteria for Choosing a Survey Type for Economics and Human Dimensions Research in Inland Fisheries (Source: Vaske 2008).

	On-site	Mail	Telephone	Internet
Questionnaire construction and design				
Allowable length of survey (minutes to complete)	5–15	30–45	10–20	15–30
Type of questions				
Allowable complexity	Medium	High	Low	High
Success with open-ended (fill-in-the-blank) questions	Low	Medium	High	Medium
Success with screening questions	Medium	Low	High	High
Success with controlling sequence of question completion	Medium	Low	High	High
Success with avoiding item nonresponse	Medium	Low	High	High
Sensitivity to design layout	High	High	Low	Medium
Accuracy of answers				
Likelihood of interviewer distortion/bias	Medium	Low	Medium	Low
Likelihood of social desirability bias	Medium	Low	Medium	Low
Administration considerations				
Cost per completed survey ¹	High	Low	Medium	Low
Anticipated response rates				
General population	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium
Specific user group or stakeholder/interest group	High	Medium	Medium	Medium
Data collection completion time after survey is developed ²	Medium	Slow	Fast	Fast
Control of survey once developed and administered	High	Low	High	Medium
Need for sample contact list from population	Low	High	High	Medium

¹ Cost is variable depending on circumstances. On-site surveys, for example, can be expensive if they require substantial out-of-state or international travel (e.g., air, vehicle) and accommodation, but can be conducted for a lower cost if these costs are not incurred. Costs for mail surveys can be variable depending on type of postage selected (e.g., bulk, business reply, first class, international).

² Completion time is variable depending on number of personnel working on survey administration.

Cluster sampling is used when "natural" groupings are evident in the population, and some groups may be very small, and would be too small for proper statistical analysis based on a regular random sample (e.g. a certain age group, or purchasers of a special fishing licence). In this case a minimum sample size is drawn for each group. Cluster sampling and stratified sampling are very similar. The main difference between the two methods involves the level of sampling. Stratified samples draw sample from each strata whereas with cluster sampling only selected clusters are sampled. Additionally, stratified sampling is typically performed to increase precision whereas cluster sampling is often performed to increase efficiency and reduce costs.

In the case of recreational fishing, **multistage sampling** is often an appropriate technique, especially for collecting observational data, or when undertaking intercept surveys. In that case, the sampling strategy considers a number of fishing locations, distinguishes between weekdays and weekend, and sampling effort may also be weighted by the proportion of effort allocated to the various locations or fishing modes (shore, private boat, for-hire).

Useful variations within random sampling are **stratified random sampling**, and cluster sampling. In stratified random sampling, the population is divided into several, mutually exclusive groups (i.e. strata), and a random sample is drawn from each stratum so that the final overall sample reflects the proportions in the overall population. If the population you are sampling is considered heterogeneous based on characteristics that can be determined from the sample frame, stratification improves representation. For instance, if possible, it is desirable to stratify between shore anglers, private boat anglers and for-hire anglers as it is expected that each of these strata would hold very different preferences, expenditures and value for the recreational experience.

4.2.2 Potential sources of error

One crucial aspect associated with any survey research is the avoidance of various errors. The textbooks typically list four types of errors that might occur when implementing survey research (Salant and Dillman, 1994; Vaske, 2008).

Coverage error occurs when the list, or sample frame, from which the sample is drawn does not include all elements of the population that researchers wish to study (Salant and Dillman, 1994). In other words, not all elements of the target population have an equal or known chance of being included in the sample. Coverage error is reduced by using up-to-date user lists, and consideration of the appropriateness of the list for the sampling purpose at hand.

Measurement error occurs when a respondent's answer to a given question is inaccurate, imprecise, or cannot be compared in any useful way to other respondent's answers (Salant and Dillman, 1994). A measurement error is associated with the actual process of data collection, and may be caused by the survey method, the question itself, the interviewer or the respondent. Any one of these reasons may lead to imprecise, inaccurate answers that cannot be compared to other respondents. For example, vague response categories to a question about frequency of fishing (never, rarely, occasionally, regularly), might be too imprecise, and eventually lead to less insightful analysis. Interviewer bias is a very important source of error for contingent valuation and other stated preference surveys (Mitchell and Carson, 1989; Arrow et al, 1993). This type of bias can arise because of improper interviewer training or improper question design.

An interviewer bias might be introduced easily during in-person or telephone interviews, and can be reduced with careful training of interviewers. Most important of all is a careful multi-stage pilot testing of a survey instrument.

Non-response error occurs when a significant number of people in the survey sample do not respond to the questionnaire and are different from those who do respond in a way that impacts the results of the study (Salant and Dillman, 1994). This bias may occur for many reasons, such as some respondents protesting the introduction of a user fee or certain regulations, and attempting to void a survey with their non-participation. Frequently, reasons for such biases may not be as obvious. Aiming for a high response rate is fundamental for reducing non-response error.

Sampling error occurs when researchers survey only a subset or sample of all the people in the population instead of conducting a census (Salant and Dillman, 1994). Obviously a certain sampling error is a fact of life with survey research, and can be controlled with increasing the sample size.

Table 2 indicates the required sample size as a function of the population size, and characteristics at the three levels of precision. In this case precision refers to: the confidence level (typically set to 95% for regular survey research); the acceptable sampling error (which depends on many factors including whether the study is exploratory or confirmatory); and the expected heterogeneity in the population. The table uses only the 95% confidence level, displays a column for three levels of sampling error ($\pm 3\%$, $\pm 5\%$ and $\pm 10\%$) and levels of heterogeneity. The heterogeneity levels describe the proportion of the sample expected to select one response from a question allowing two responses.

The main features of this table are that 1) the acceptable sampling error influences the required sample size enormously, and 2) required sample size does not increase by large amounts as the population size increases, especially once a population is above 10,000 members.

Table 2. Completed Sample Sizes Needed for Population Sizes and Characteristics at Three Levels of Precision (Dillman 2000; Table 5.1 p. 207).

	Sample size for the 95% confidence level					
	$\pm 3\%$ sampling error		$\pm 5\%$ sampling error		$\pm 10\%$ sampling error	
	50/50 split	80/20 split	50/50 split	80/20 split	50/50 split	80/20 split
100	92	87	80	71	49	38
200	169	155	132	111	65	47
400	291	253	196	153	78	53
600	384	320	234	175	83	56
800	458	369	260	188	86	57
1,000	517	406	278	198	88	58
2,000	696	509	322	219	92	60
4,000	843	584	351	232	94	61
6,000	906	613	361	236	95	61
8,000	942	629	367	239	95	61
10,000	965	640	370	240	95	61
20,000	1,013	661	377	243	96	61
40,000	1,040	672	381	244	96	61
100,000	1,056	679	383	245	96	61
1,000,000	1,066	683	384	246	96	61
1,000,000,000	1,067	683	384	246	96	61

4.3. Survey implementation

Depending on the purpose of a study, the research question, and possible sampling strategies, several survey methods are frequently combined in the context of recreational fishing. For the longest time in recreation research in general and HD research specifically, Dillman's "Tailored Design Method" (Dillman, 2000) was cited as the standard for the implementation of a mail survey. He suggested a multi-stage process, to ensure adequate information and building trust with respondents, including the following phases:

- pre-notification letter
- first questionnaire packet
- thank you / reminder postcard
- replacement questionnaire packet

As long as licence information is available, and the licences contain complete addresses, a mail survey can be administered by following the Tailored Design Method. Nowadays, many agencies have placed licence sales on the internet managing their client data base electronically. This has improved the quality of licence frames and many now contain e-mail addresses. While anglers often

come across as a conservative group skeptical of the internet, they often rely on the internet for up to the minute fishing reports, weather forecasts and other important fishing information. As a result, web-based surveys may now be the most cost effective survey method of licence holders. A well designed internet survey is appealing, allows better control of the sequence of survey questions (i.e. nesting) than a mail survey, does not require extra effort for data coding thereafter, and data collection can be completed very fast. For stated preference surveys, web based surveys allow each choice occasion to be tailored to the individual respondents characteristics and preferences.

However, some research questions need to rely at a sampling population that is not completely (or not at all) represented by licence holders. Often there are no easy solutions and a multi-stage sampling and surveying technique might be essential. Two examples highlight such situations.

Imagine an agency that is interested in surveying lapsed anglers, i.e. anglers who have not purchased a licence in a few years. One might be able to identify a sample from old records, but in many cases addresses might no longer be correct, and the fact that some of these anglers might have perished might lead to unnecessary strain on their family. The ideal approach to such a situation would be to start the research with a random digit dialing phone interview of the general population: in a few questions regular anglers, non-anglers and lapsed anglers can be identified, and recruited for full-length surveys. Unfortunately, such an approach will be very expensive, but will deliver good estimates of the relevant proportions, and the few questions asked over the telephone allow later testing for non-response bias with a later full survey by mail or internet.

Another frequently used multi-stage approach is the recruitment of anglers at specific waterbodies or regions via an intercept survey. These intercept surveys may be undertaken by researchers at access points, or while roving on the water. A cheaper version is to simply leave short intercept surveys at windshields in the parking lots, however this method will most likely produce a lower response rate and other potential biases. Such intercept surveys provide excellent information about their origin, gear carried, length of fishing on that day, or satisfaction with the angling on that day, which again can be used for later testing of non-response biases, or actually complement the full survey.

In the box below, the study of Toivonen et al. (2000) is presented as a best practise example for conducting a survey (see also Roth et al., 2000; Roth et al. 2001) on recreational fishery. See also Annex 6 for the questionnaire.

Box 13. The economic value of recreational fishery in the Nordic countries. Case study of a multinational survey (Toivonen et al., 2000).

Background

Recreational fishing is a very popular free time activity in the Nordic countries. Compared to the central European countries, there are plenty of lakes, long coast lines and many rivers. They provide natural opportunities for recreation. Additionally, there is a culture of second homes and summer cottages, and they are most often located by water bodies providing accommodation.

Method

Contingent valuation method (CVM)

Valuation question

The economic value of a non-market commodity like recreational fishing comprises of use value and non-use value. To avoid overestimating the economic value of recreational fishing, it was assumed that anglers represent the use value and non-anglers represent the non-use value. In cases where CVM results are applied to cost-benefit analyses, the WTP over and above what has actually been paid is the correct measure for the benefit, consumer surplus. We first asked the anglers to count their annual fishing expenses, and next we asked how much more they would have been willing to pay for the same fishing experience until it would have been too expensive and they would have stopped fishing. A scenario

was depicted on present and future threats to fish stocks and fishing possibilities. Both anglers and non-anglers were asked their WTP for conserving the current state of fish stocks and current quality of recreational fishing.

The Survey

The economic value of recreational fishing was measured using an identical mail survey in all five Nordic countries through October 1999 – January 2000. Since also those people who do not fish themselves can hold a value towards fishing, they were asked as well. Population registers were used as sampling frames, and systematic samples were drawn from geographically sorted registers. Every individual, man or woman, from 18 to 69 years of age had an equal chance to be chosen in the sample. The research unit was the individual person. According to national statistics the participation in recreational fishery in each country at the time was in Denmark 12.5 %, Finland 40 %, Iceland 31.5 %, Norway 50 %, and in Sweden 35 % of the population (Toivonen et al. 2000). The samples accordingly included both anglers and non-anglers.

The survey was executed centralized from Finland. In practice, however, serious difficulties were encountered due to legislation on person registers in Denmark and Norway, where export of population register samples is denied. The problem was settled by conducting the mailings nationally in Denmark and by using telephone catalogue as the sampling frame in Norway. It was checked afterwards (Roth et al. 2000) how well the response represented the populations in each country. In Norway it was found that there were less young persons, men in particular, in the response than in the population. This resulted in large weights among those groups, and that can be destructive to confidence limits in unfavourable cases.

The subcontracting print house printed the translated questionnaires and cover letters, sent out the mailings and received the return mail. The names and addresses of the receivers were printed on the questionnaires from the address files, and windowed envelopes were used. The address files were updated after the first and second wave. The second and the third contact were sent to those who had not replied by the deadline. The data were stored optically by the print house. The functions were coordinated between Finland Post Ltd and Post Denmark Ltd as the Danish return mail was routed unopened to Finland for return mail control and data storage.

The original sample size was 25 200 Nordic citizens, 5 200 from Denmark, 5 000 from Finland and Norway, 2 500 from Iceland and 7 500 from Sweden. After deletion of the unreachable, the sample size was 24 900. Since the number of replies was 11 400, the overall response rate was 45.8 %. The lowest rate was 34.2 % in Iceland, and the highest was 51.3 % in Finland. The mean of the sampling interval across the countries was 630, and the mean of the true interval, the mean of the weights at the same time, was 1 400 in regard to the response rate. The price of the survey, including only variable costs like materials, addresses, printing, mailing services, data storage and some incidental items, was 135 000 € (in 2008 value).

Results

The results (see Appendix 5) of the survey were computed by multiplying each value with a weight that was specific to the respondent. Each respondent represented several persons depending on the country, sex and age group. Additionally, the weights were calibrated to return the true participation percentage in recreational fisheries in each country. This was necessary because fishermen are more likely to respond than non-fishermen due to the interest in the topic (Dalecki, Whitehead & Blomquist, 1993).

To obtain the 95 % confidence limits of the means, standard errors of the mean were multiplied by 1.96. For confidence limits of aggregate estimates, dedicated software is needed. An experiment was conducted to see if it would have been possible to retrieve reliable results with a smaller sample size and thereby obtain savings in the survey costs. Random samples of the data set of 11 400 replies were drawn using the jackknife technique, 50 replications by country and variable. New weights, means and confidence limits were calculated for each replication. For the key variables, the pain barriers of ± 30 % in the confidence limit was exceeded in Iceland already with the full sample and in Denmark with the random sample size of 75 % of the response. In Finland, Norway and Sweden, 50 % of the response would still have ensured a decent confidence limit of under ± 30 %. These results are due to the low participation percentage in Denmark and low response rate in Iceland, moderate response rate and participation percentage in Finland, large sample in Sweden and even share of recreational anglers and non-anglers in Norway.

5. Guidelines for assessing benefits

In the previous sections various methods for assessing the social and economic benefits that recreational fisheries provide to individuals and societies have been described. In the following we will summarize this content using a complementary approach that brings the economic and the human dimension paradigms together.

At the center of the argument is the first row in Figure 10, which is a simplified representation of the various stages of human behaviour through decision making. Behavioural antecedents lead to behavioural intention, which of course is closely related to actual behaviour. There is of course a feedback mechanism from actual behaviour to behavioural antecedents, in the form of perception and other pathways.

The two paradigms, i.e. HD and economic, and the types of data that support exploration in each paradigm largely align with these specific stages. Actual behaviour provides revealed preference information (the proof is in the market) and can be captured by various monitoring or observation techniques, while intended behaviour can only be captured through survey questions. The same is true for the whole suite of behavioural antecedents.




Figure 10. Relationship between economic and human dimension research.

If we look at the focus of the various research paradigms, it becomes obvious that resource and environmental economics is focused on actual or intended behaviour, while the classical focus of human dimensions research has been on behavioural antecedents for the purpose of informing decision makers by looking at the attitudes and other social psychological concepts. Economic approaches may use antecedents to enhance some of their models, but until recently this has not been a major concern of these. The last row of Figure 10 links the behavioural process to both the

types of data and collection methods necessary to address the two paradigms presented in rows two and three.

In addition in this section, the usability, suitability, and accuracy of the various valuation methods discussed in section 3 are compared to provide policy makers with a quick reference guide summarizing extensive detail provided previously. This section presents this comparison in a tabular summary format that allows the user to select the type of analysis suitable for his or her decision setting quickly. This tabular representation is a discrete representation of what in actuality is a continuum of potential decision settings.

Figure 11 is illustrative of a qualitative continuum between accuracy, costs and time for both decision context and choice of valuation approach. Note that there is no direct correspondence between policy analysis type above the main arrow and the valuation methods below it. Fisheries specific decision settings include the following broadly defined categories that utilize both paradigms:

- Advocacy: total economic value of freshwater fishing (national/regional level) and human health benefits. Used for informational purposes and advocating for additional research or funding for particular projects. For example many countries publish periodic statistics about particular industries;
- Scoping/design: development of fisheries surveys and policy formulation, establishment of fisheries management boards/mechanisms;
- Cost- benefit analysis: fisheries projects, wetlands restoration, water quality/pollution measures, EU Water Framework Directive (derogation), industrial development permitting;
- Allocation of resources: allocation between commercial fisheries, recreation fisheries, conservation and other uses;
- Natural resource damage assessment (NRDA) and liability: oil spills, power plant (cooling/hot water, hydropower) to set compensation levels; and
- Pricing: pricing of licences, pricing of access to water bodies, market studies.

In addition to direct observation and questionnaire surveys, section 3.2.3 discusses the use of benefits estimated from other studies as a way to quickly address policy or damage assessment needs. Reliability of the benefit transfers is context dependent. Contextual factors include: level of uncertainty, acceptable level of uncertainty, required confidence of the decision context (comparability in uncertainty in costs and benefits), study site in terms of location, site quality, population characteristics, and the policy change/environmental change. Quality is highly dependent on how much uncertainty is acceptable.

To a large degree, measuring non-economic or human dimensions benefits and economic impacts follow the same sort of continuum (Figure 11). On the low accuracy/low cost end of the continuum, estimates of expenditures and impacts can come from other studies. Similarly for social, psychological, and physiological benefits, those can come from other studies as well. As with economic value benefit transfers, these transfers from other studies apply to new analysis situations best when the settings and activities are similar. For instance, a policy maker would be ill advised to transfer a trip expenditure estimate from the marine environment for the freshwater environment. For economic impacts, the policy analyst would not want to use multipliers from a study done in a country or region with an industrial structure that was vastly different.

On the high cost/high accuracy side, nothing beats a survey tailored specifically to the analysis task at hand. Fortunately, if the researcher has chosen to design and administer an original survey, it is possible to gather a wide range of data fitting the requirements of both paradigms including economic valuation, expenditure and human dimensions. For instance, asking a contingent

valuation question or conducting a choice experiment takes up very little survey space. It is often possible to also get an expenditure profile from a previous trip and/or gather human dimensions information.




Figure 11. A continuum of decision settings associated to accuracy, costs and time (adapted from Brookshire, 1992).

5.1. Suitability of different methods

Figure 12 contains some general recommendations for the use of different stated and revealed preference techniques for measuring economic value at a glance. These recommendations are provided based on their various capabilities and data requirements, which have been explained in more detailed in section 3. Figure 12 contains two broad types of analysis needs; policy development and analysis and damage assessment. Policy development and analysis is further broken down into the following decision settings; policy advocacy, resource allocation, fishing regulations, licence or access pricing, ecosystem service valuation and compensatory or punitive damages. All of these decision contexts could be framed in terms of classic benefit/cost analysis or other analysis techniques that utilize value estimates. This section is aimed primarily at the types of survey needed for economic valuation, except for the choice experiment technique which is shared across the two paradigms. Again it is important to point out that if an original data collection is planned to assess economic value it is important to also take time to gather human dimensions data.

5.1.1 Revealed preference vs. stated preference suitability

Reveal preference (RP) techniques: RP techniques utilize the observation of actual angler choices when selecting recreational opportunities. As such, estimating economic values or behaviour using actual behaviour is superior to using hypothetical techniques. However, all RP techniques require data on actual angler choices and, in some cases, data on historical choices and historical angling quality. In many cases this data is not available, obviating timely policy analysis. Also, when evaluating policies with this technique, there has to be variation in the policy variables in the observed data. For instance if one is trying to measure the value of changing a minimum size limit but the current minimum size limit is the same over the available data, it will be impossible to tease out the value of the change in the size limit.

		Valuation methods				
		Revealed preferences			Stated preferences	
Analysis Needs	Decision Setting:	Hedonic pricing	Travel cost	Multiple Site Choice Models	Contingent valuation	Choice experiment
Policy Development and Analysis	Advocacy	Yes				
	Resource Allocation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Fishing Regulations (size, bag, season limits)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Pricing: license fees/access	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Valuation of Ecosystem Services	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Damage Assessment	Compensation Punitive damages	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Yes

Depends

No

Figure 12. Suitability of different non-market valuation methods, both SP and RP, for various policy and management needs.

Stated preference (SP) techniques: SP methods are necessary when the needed information on angler choices does not exist. Usually, as stated above, data regarding historic angling quality or data that includes variation in policy variables is missing. Additionally, choice experiments are a technique that brings economic and human dimension analysis together. Typically, SP methods are required when non-use values are associated with policy change or in context that benefits are not yet implemented. Typically, if the number of substitutes is low for the good being valued, the non-use values can be significant, further recommending this technique for very unique resources. Another advantage of SP methods is that value estimates can be used to rank hypothetical but realistic management scenarios, with the base condition being status quo or opt-out (continuing the current policy in future) option. The possibility to describe new goods, limit the choice sets and posit a hypothetical market offers more alternatives for valuation than RP methods. Particularly, choice experiments are suitable when willingness to pay for individual attributes or multi-dimensional valuation is required, while contingent valuation is optimal for valuation of a single scenario situation, i.e. when the WTP for the environmental good or service in total is needed (e.g. Bateman et al., 2002). Further, SP techniques are advantageous, since the questionnaires and focus groups are major parts of the methods, and thus they have more potential to involve public in a participatory mode than RP techniques.

5.1.2 Decision settings

In the following, a set of common decisions settings is described and related to the information in Figure 12. The list presented here is by no means exhaustive but represents a set of general groupings to allow the user to quickly decide where to focus analysis funds and time. All decisions

settings presented under policy development and analysis generally conform to the concept of benefit/cost analysis introduced in Section 2. There are other guides to help policy makers design, use and interpret social science information in a policy context. The US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association has designed a very basic visual tool they call the human dimensions wheel that contains a portion of the information presented here.¹⁰

In order to gain wider acceptance for the use of economic valuation and human dimensions methods in various decision-making processes it is imperative that managers and administrators have an understanding of the concepts underlying their use in various decision settings. Those have been provided in section 2. While this section appears to focus on economic valuation, it is imperative to examine other human dimensions when assessing policies. Fortunately, when original data collections are necessary, both types of data can and should be collected. This section relates the concepts presented in section 2 to their execution presented in section 3. It is imperative that managers communicate the types of analysis they need to the staff and associated researchers that administer data collection programs so that an adequate policy analysis infrastructure is created and maintained.

Fisheries regulation: This encompasses a large number of policy assessment types including; size limits, bag limits, instream flow, seasonal closures and access restrictions to name a few. Most of these issues are framed in terms of cost-benefit analysis. Broadly speaking the SP methods are more flexible regarding the policy context and so more applicable. Often, however, cost-benefit analyses require very tight analysis schedules, obviating the use of survey based methods and underscoring the need for regular data collections aimed at recreational anglers. As internet use continues to increase, it is now becoming possible to generate and complete surveys online very rapidly. Additionally, choice experiments are excellent candidates for online administration as attribute levels can be tailored on the fly to the individual respondent, improving model fit and therefore better valuation estimates.

For fishing practice regulations, choice experiments excel. RP methods require variation in the policy attributes across either time or space to estimate the impact of changing a regulation. For example, both the travel cost method and the multiple site choice method require variation in the policy attributes within the data collected from site visitors. For instance, if the resource manager wants to evaluate a change in the size limit, the manager must collect data across similar sites with variation, either spatial or temporal, in the minimum size limit for the species of interest. Often, this is very difficult. Temporal variation requires that data be collected from the same sites across a change in minimum size limits. The limitations of that technique are obvious as these types of surveys are rarely conducted with any regularity. Spatial variation in policies requires that different sites have different minimum size limits for the same species. This can be the case; however it is more likely that an entire region or state has the same minimum size limit for a particular species. On the other hand, for choice experiments the researcher designs an experimental design containing the necessary variation in policy variables. In addition, if the researcher has adequate foresight, enough variation can be built into the experimental design such that the data collected can be used for multiple changes in policies.

Choice experiments have enjoyed wide usage in the human dimensions field as well. By allowing the researcher to include multiple attributes of the hypothetical fishing trip including regulations, preferences and other behavioural antecedents, this technique links human dimensions and economic valuation that allows forecasting angler behaviour.

¹⁰ Human dimensions wheel available here: <http://www.csc.noaa.gov/surveydesign/hdwheel.html>. Last accessed October 17, 2009.

For site accessibility evaluations the choice experiment method is the most applicable because it can account for multiple site characteristics. However, choice experiments require special purpose surveys that need extensive development and implementation time. Multiple site choice models are also excellent at assessing accessibility concerns and increments and decrements to other quality attributes, however they require extensive data on historic quality and angler use.

While requiring similar types and amounts of data, multiple site choice models are superior to travel cost models. While multiple site choice models may be the most acceptable from a legal standpoint because they involve revealed preferences, they have their limitations. Several of those have been mentioned above. To be able to assess a policy, data must contain variation in that policy variable. They require extensive data on site characteristics, including access characteristics and catch rates. As is often the case in Europe, catch information is not periodically collected. As a result, data on historical catch rates is not available and cannot be obtained. Finally, multiple site choice models require individual specific data on site visitation, necessitating a specialized survey. Because a specialized survey must be conducted for these types of models, the researcher is advised to collect SP data at the same time. Combining stated and revealed data in the same analysis strengthens both. That is, combining the non-hypothetical nature of multiple site choice models with the flexibility of choice experiments increases credibility and the ability to analyze complex policy scenarios that neither method could do alone.

Overall, the hedonic pricing method seems to be the least applicable, largely because of the data requirements regarding property characteristics near the fishing site in question. However, there has been a recent resurgence in the use of hedonic modelling in the economics valuation literature. Recently, Carter, Agar and Waters (2008) used a hedonic model of charter boat fees to develop per pound willingness to pay estimates for grouper species in Florida for use in a fishery allocation study.

Finally, cost benefit analysis requires the market analysis of industries such as commercial fishermen, processors and distributors, resource owners that provide access and businesses that provide for-hire recreational services. Generally, these types of estimates can be generated by analyzing cost and return data from individual businesses. Sometimes, this type of information is already collected by government agencies. If that data does not exist, specialized surveys need to be conducted. Market analysis techniques are not included in Figure 13 because the type of data collection required is uniform across valuation techniques. To reiterate, if original industry data collection is necessary, human dimensions data should also be collected.

Policy advocacy: Given that the need for accuracy is low and the need for rapid assessments high, benefit transfer of existing contingent valuation or choice experiment results may be sufficient to demonstrate the total economic values of recreational fishing at aggregate levels. However, until now the number of original valuation studies in Europe has been low and a need exists for more rigorously conducted studies. Unless the policy being advocated involves only one recreational site, site specific RP techniques, such as single site travel cost models are not recommended. Multiple site choice models, another RP technique, can be appropriate but have their limitations when the policy maker is seeking the total value of all sites included in the model. Multiple site choice models are limited in this regard because they value single sites or groups of sites by examining the opportunity cost of travelling to other, more distant sites. If you are trying to value access to all sites, there are no substitutes left in the model to estimate the total value of access. Regarding human dimensions analysis, it is appropriate to use studies of benefits conducted elsewhere while more studies are conducted in Europe.

Resource allocation: Because changing resource allocations may have negative impacts on existing user groups, it is important to use the most rigorous data and analysis. Additionally, because of the gravity of this type of analysis, it is important to capture impacts beyond economic

valuation. Economics can be used to explore efficiency (value) and distributional effects (economic impacts, but falls short in addressing equity and fairness. As a result, it is imperative to examine the social impacts in addition to the economic metrics. Also, due to the rigor required, benefit transfer is not an acceptable technique. For commercial valuation estimates, detailed data on cost and returns is required. For the consumers of recreational fishing, many techniques are suitable. Hedonic analysis has been used to value recreational resource values using both charter or guide fees and home price data for homes located near the resource. However, it is more typical to use revealed preference techniques as hypothetical techniques may be subject to criticism. Because allocation is often a hotly contested issue, commercial businesses are reluctant to accept valuation estimates that come from SP methods. Unfortunately, a limitation of both travel cost and multiple site choice models includes the inability to construct the entire willingness to pay schedule across all possible allocations. On the other hand, only choice experiments will allow the researcher to construct the entire recreational willingness to pay schedule across all potential allocation scenarios.

Pricing (licence fees/access fees): Most methods are applicable, except hedonic pricing because its data is retrieved from a different type of market to that for fishing visits. Again, revealed preference models are often preferred by constituents particularly when the information will be used to raise licence and access fees. As a result, multiple site choice models, travel cost and choice experiment methods are the most amenable to evaluating marginal costs of site access. The choice experiments have the added advantage that other hypothetical attributes of the visit can be evaluated.

Valuation of ecosystem services: Recreational use data can often be used to measure the use value of ecosystem services. Values for instream flow, erosion control and water quality commonly use recreational angler value as a component of the total value of those environmental amenities. The most flexible and least expensive technique utilizes choice experiment data. While it is possible to estimate values of water quality from multiple site choice models, these models require spatially explicit data on water quality that can be tied to the site chosen. This can be possible in regions with extensive periodic water quality monitoring; however the monitoring program must match up with the spatial scale used to define the recreational sites in the site choice model. For instance, suppose the researcher is interested in the value of water quality at a particular lake. If the lake has multiple access points but only one water quality monitoring point, there is no variation in water quality that can be used to estimate value. Additionally, if the lake did monitor quality at multiple locations, the researcher must also collect on-water location choice from boaters, to determine what water quality monitoring zone the angler fished, similarly for hydro-morphological issues and policies.

Compensation/punitive damages: Economic valuation techniques are extensively used in the USA in legal damage assessment and are expected to be forthcoming within the European Union (Pearce & Özdemiroglu, 2002). All non-market valuation methods can be used for calculating compensation claims. In most cases, RP techniques, such as hedonic, travel cost and multiple site choice models, are preferred by the courts in the USA over SP techniques. Early in the development of natural resource damage assessment techniques, much controversy arose over the use of hypothetical choices or SP techniques. However, because of the lack of RP data for all cases and, for some cases, the impossibility of collecting RP data for non-use values, SP techniques must be used in practice. In 1993, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), within the US Department of Commerce, convened a panel of experts to review the use of contingent valuation in the wake of the Exxon Valdez disaster; one of the largest natural resource damage cases to that point in history. That panel produced a report summarizing the expert panel's findings on the use of contingent valuation for natural resource damage assessment (Arrow et al., 1993).¹¹ The report of the expert panel included a list of guidelines that are still used to define the most accurate way to conduct contingent valuation surveys. The choice experiment method has potential, but is relatively new and untried in this legal setting, whereas contingent valuation has been widely

¹¹ Report available at <http://www.darrp.noaa.gov/library/pdf/cvblue.pdf> . Last accessed October 17, 2009.

used in damage assessment cases in USA courts. That is changing however, and one example of the use of a choice experiment used for natural resource damage assessment is a case study taken from polychlorinated biphenyl pollution in the Green Bay of Lake Michigan (USA) (Bishop et al., 2000). For more information on the suitability of each valuation method, the NOAA Damage Assessment, Remediation, and Restoration Program web site contains a library of US case law on damage assessment including many case studies.¹²

5.2 Discussion

For policy analysis scenarios with both costs and benefits, it is important that costs and benefits are measured with comparable metrics. Hence, if a formal cost benefit analysis is the final aim, funding should be provided so that both costs and benefits would be studied at the same time in collaboration.

While benefit transfer methods have their own problems, this valuation technique allows quick assessments in situations where funding or time may not exist for a more formal analysis. All techniques discussed here, with the possible exception of hedonic and market based approaches, require a specialized survey of at least resource users and possibly non-users. That said, both hedonic and market analysis may require surveys if the data needed for their execution is not periodically collected through other means.

As pointed out above, it is important to be efficient when conducting surveys. Surveys are costly and time consuming. Fortunately if a survey is designed well, it will be possible to gather revealed preference data, stated preference data, expenditure data, and human dimensions data in the same instrument thereby extending scarce management agency resources. In addition to extending budgets, collecting all four categories of data strengthens the entire policy analysis process.

Finally, designing and funding survey programs that periodically collect this information should be a priority. Multiple site choice models depend on regularly collected data, and this type of model is often the superior model when adequate data exists. Also, periodic data collection allows policy analysis to proceed more quickly. Finally having data on hand will encourage policy makers to utilize economic and human dimensions advice more often. Many times economics and human dimensions information is not included in policy formation simply because the data is not readily available.

It is clear that the economic and non-economic HD approaches to benefits have their own sets of strengths and weaknesses, and both are able to make contributions to assess the multidimensional and highly complex concept of benefits associated with recreational fishing. The major advantage of the economic approach is its comprehensive framework to fisheries benefits and its ability to assess benefits in one common currency – money. Both a positive and a negative quality of economic benefit measurement is that it produces a single value measure that encompasses many attributes of value, including many of the attributes singled out in the HD section above. Because it is neater, more compact, and denominated in a common currency, economics is more readily assimilated into the policy process. Economic value, in contrast to HD measures, is strictly an efficiency measure, and, as such, it does not incorporate all aspects of social impacts, equity or fairness. Irrespective, there is great potential to include cognitive and emotional variables measured with traditional psychometric HD approaches into revealed and stated preference methods from economics (Gentner & Sutton, 2007). This incorporation allows the elegant combination of social-psychological HD research and quantitative economics. However, only few applications combine these approaches in a recreational fishing context to date (e.g., Oh & Ditton, 2008; 2006; Dorow et al., 2010).

¹² <http://www.darrp.noaa.gov>

In the box below, the decision support tool developed by Dorow et al. (2010) is presented as a good example of combining both paradigms into an easy to use management tool.

Box 14. Decision support tool for eel management (Dorow et al., 2010).

The results of a choice experiment can be used to create a decision support tool (DST) which can be used to predict the market share or policy support for scenarios composed of the study's variables. Figure 5.1 shows the interface of the DST for the eel study (Dorow et al. 2010). The tool is laid out to compare the current eel management, an alternative eel management scenario and the 'stop fishing for eel' base alternative. The cells in the top portion of the sheet act as input buttons, in which any level of the respective variables can be chosen. The three rows below contain the market shares (percent of policy support) for the respective alternatives, which in this example have been segmented by angler specialization. The block at the bottom displays the consumer surplus that the respective alternatives would fetch compared to the current alternative.

	EEL ALT.	EEL CURR.	
Expected Catch	1 eel	1 eel	STOP FISHING FOR EEL
Expected Length	50 cm	50 cm	
Minimum Size Limit	60 cm	50 cm	
Daily Bag Limit	1 eel	3 eels	
Temporal Closure	14 days	0 days	
Maximum Number of Rods	1 Rod	3 Rods	
Price Increase Per Day	€ 0.00	€ 0.00	
Advanced	1.3%	97.5%	1.1%
Intermediate	4.4%	85.6%	10.1%
Casual	12.2%	62.2%	25.5%
Consumer Surplus* (compared to current)			
Advanced	-€ 27.09	€ 0.00	-€ 27.95
Intermediate	-€ 13.98	€ 0.00	-€ 10.05
Casual	-€ 6.90	€ 0.00	-€ 3.78

* Per day of eel fishing

Figure 5.1. Example of a decision support tool.

Method

Stated preference choice experiment.

Management question

The question at hand was how would eel fishing change if expected catch, expected length, minimum size limit, daily bag limit, seasonal closure, gear amount and cost change. These trip attributes were selected because either management action or environmental/stock conditions could impact these attributes. The model allows the user to change any of the attributes and the decision support tool supplies the predicted change in policy support (often interpreted as the potential change in effort) and the change in consumer surplus across three types of user groups; advanced, intermediate and casual (defined in the paper). The screen shot above indicates no change in expected length, catch or trip cost, a reduction in the bag limit from three to one eel, a 14 day closure and a reduction in the number of allowed rods from three to one.

Results

Based on the policy scenario described above, advance anglers lose € 27.09, intermediate anglers lose € 13.98 and casual anglers lose € 6.90 in consumer surplus (economic value) per angling day.

Discussion

This decision support tool presents the marriage of economic and human dimension paradigms in a format that allows rapid assessment of a wide range of potential recreational eel angling regulation changes. An extension, not presented here, allows the calculation of the total change in eel fishing effort. If trip expenditure profiles were collected in the survey, predicted changes in effort can be applied to the expenditure profile and economic impact multipliers applied to the change in expenditure (a loss in this example) to calculate the economic impacts stemming from this potential regulatory change.

6. Recommendations

Social and economic studies including benefit valuation of non-market goods and services tied to recreational fisheries support a range of management decisions. These studies cannot stand alone but can qualify political and management decisions to ensure more efficient allocation of both natural and financial resources.

Research takes time, and for a study of good quality, at least one year is needed if starting from scratch. Researchers are professionals, and there are usually many ways to acquire the data needed. Samples for studies should be chosen with care and they should be large enough to sufficiently represent the population studied. According to Pearce & Özdemiroglu, 2002, many studies can be criticised precisely because inadequate effort is spent on designing and testing the questionnaire employed.

Too often, however, fisheries research is conducted by biologists, who most likely lack the expertise and knowledge to confront the challenge of developing thorough social science surveys and questionnaires (Ditton 2004). In such situations, expert social science survey researchers should be included to avoid low quality surveys and to improve the theoretical groundings of the concepts to be measured in terms of HD benefits fisheries provide to society.

1. To serve the needs for decision support in Europe, there is need for original valuation studies of recreational fisheries. These studies should be designed and reported in a way that makes future benefit transfer and cost-benefit analyses possible. Present benefit studies often represent points in time and in specific location, not holistic and dynamic views. Therefore, continuous surveys and development of existing surveys are important because there is little knowledge on how values change over time.
2. In EIFAC member countries, where appropriate, a national level stated preference survey, i.e. applying contingent valuation or choice experiment, should be developed to conduct to estimate total economic value of recreational fisheries for advocacy purposes. It should be sufficiently representative to also be used for benefits transfer and to identify priorities for fisheries management purposes.
3. EIFAC members should compile national databases (frameworks) of non-market value studies (published and grey literature) for facilitating the conduct of benefit transfer and meta –analysis. EIFAC should establish a repository for this material.
4. National databases on inland recreational fishing sites and their characteristics should be enhanced to support social, economic, and other human dimensions analysis.

Specifically, there is a need to:

- amend existing, recurring surveys and databases related to recreational fisheries so that they provide information for valuation studies;
- conduct regular valuation surveys with a maximum 5 year span to map how preferences change in time;

- make studies not only on “interesting trouble-hot-spots” but also on general recreation areas, if benefit transfer should be used;
 - have policy makers and fisheries managers be involved in scenario building for the models and surveys, to maximize the benefits attained from the study results.
5. Special emphasis should be given to generating the necessary data for recreation fisheries management and research as part of the public fisheries statistics: An international protocol on classification and data are a tall order but a public accessible database on catch, participation and national classification codes (gear, water, species, geography) in the recreational fishery is the first step to include recreational fishery in the public fisheries statistics.
 6. A clear policy for vision and mission should be developed through using a “white paper for recreational fishery”. The policy objectives and management plans may be supported by clear recommendations on public data acquisition and point out the scientific knowledge gaps. It can also serve the purpose of revisiting the administrative support for compliance and control measures.

References

- Aas, Ø. 2002. The next chapter: Multicultural and cross-disciplinary progress in evaluating recreational fisheries. In T.J. Pitcher, & C.E. Hollingworth, eds. *Recreational Fisheries: Ecological, Economic and Social Evaluation*. Pp 252 – 263. Oxford, UK. Blackwell Science. Pp. 288.
- Aas, Ø., Haider, W. & Hunt, L. (2000) “Angler responses to potential harvest regulations in a Norwegian sport fishery: A conjoint-based choice modeling approach”, *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 20(4): 940-950.
- Aas, Ø. & Ditton, R.B. 1998. Human dimensions perspective on recreational fisheries management: implications for Europe. pp. 153 – 164 In P. Hickley & H. Tompkins eds. *Recreational fisheries. Social, economic and management aspects*. Oxford: Blackwell Science, Fishing News Books/Food and agriculture organization of the United Nations.
- Aas, Ø. & Kaltenborn, B. P. 1995. Consumptive orientation of anglers in Engerdal, Norway. *Environmental Management*, 19: 751 - 761.
- Adamowicz, W., Louviere, J. & Williams, M. 1994. Combining Revealed and Stated Preference Methods for Valuing Environmental Amenities. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 26 (3):271–292.
- Ahtiainen, H. 2009. *Valuing international marine resources: A meta-analysis on the Baltic Sea*. (Unpublished manuscript).
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. 1980. *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980.
- Appelblad, H. 2001. *The spawning salmon as a resource by recreational use the case of the wild Baltic salmon and conditions for angling in north Swedish rivers*. Umeå university, department of Social and Economic geography. GERUM, Kulturgeografi 2001, 3. Ph.D. thesis.
- Arlinghaus, R., Mehner, T. & Cowx, I.G. 2002. Reconciling traditional inland fisheries management with sustainability in industrialized countries, with emphasis on Europe. *Fish and Fisheries*, 3, 261-316.
- Arlinghaus, R. 2004a. Recreational fisheries in Germany – a social and economic analysis. *Berichte des IG*, 18, 1-160.
- Arlinghaus, R. 2004b. *A human dimensions approach towards sustainable recreational fisheries management*. London, Turnshare Ltd., 400 pp.
- Arlinghaus, R. & Mehner, T. 2004. Testing the reliability and construct validity of a simple and inexpensive procedure to measure the use value of recreational fishing. *Fisheries Management and Ecology*. 11, 61-64.
- Arlinghaus, R & Mehner, T. 2005. Determinants of management preferences of recreational anglers in Germany: habitat management versus fish stocking. *Limnologia* 35:2-17.
- Arlinghaus, R. 2006. On the apparently striking disconnect between motivation and satisfaction in recreational fishing: the case of catch orientation of German anglers. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 26:592-605.

- Arlinghaus, R., Bork, M. & Fladung, E. 2008. Understanding the heterogeneity of recreational anglers across an urban-rural gradient in a metropolitan area (Berlin, Germany), with implications for fisheries management. *Fisheries Research*, 92, 53-62.
- Arnberger, A., Haider, W. & Brandenburg, C. 2005. Evaluating visitor-monitoring techniques: a comparison of counting and video observation data. *Environmental Management* 36(2):317-327.
- Arrow, K., Solow, R., Portney, P.R., Leamer, E.E., Radner, R. & Schuman, H. 1993. *Report on the NOAA Panel on Contingent Valuation*. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. US Department of Commerce. Washington, DC. 67pp.
- Atkinson, J.W. 1969. Change of Activity, a new focus for the theory of motivation. In T. Mischel, Ed., *Human Action, conceptual and empirical issues*, pp.105-133. New York: Academic Press. Pp. 293.
- Barton, D.N., 1999. *The quick, the cheap and the dirty. Benefit transfer approaches to the non-market valuation of coastal water quality in Costa Rica*. Doctor Scientiarum Dissertation 1999:03, Department of Economics and Social Sciences, Agricultural University of Norway.
- Bate, Roger & Institute of Economic Affairs (Great Britain). 2001. *Saving our streams : the role of the Anglers' Conservation Association in protecting English and Welsh rivers / Roger Bate* Institute of Economic Affairs, London. (available at <http://www.iea.org.uk/files/402.pdf>)
- Bateman, I. J., Carson, R.T., Day, B., Hanemann, M., Hanley, N., Hett, T., Jones-Lee, M., Loomes, G., Mourato, S., Özdemiroglu, E., Pearse, D.W., Sugden, R. & Swanson, J. 2002. *Economic Valuation with Stated Preference Techniques: A Manual*. Edward Elgar Publishing. 458 p.
- Bateman, I.J., Brouwer, R., Ferrini, S., Schaafsma, M. Barton, D.N., Dubgaard, A., Hasler, B., Hime., S. Liekens, I., Navrud, S., DeNocker, L., Ščeponavičiūtė, R., & Semėnienė, D. 2009. Making benefit transfers work: Deriving and testing principles for value transfers for similar and dissimilar sites using a case study of the non-market benefits of water quality improvements across Europe. *CSERGE Working Paper* EDM-09-10. 47p.
- Beardmore, B. & Arlinghaus, R. (unpublished). *Motivation to fish: Importance of general versus specific motivations*. Simon Fraser University & Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries.
- Bennett, J. & Blamey, R. 2001. *The choice modelling approach to environmental valuation*. Edward Elgar Publishing. 269 p.
- Bishop, R.C., Breffle, W.S., Lazo, J.K., Rowe, R.D., & Wytinck, S.M. 2000. *Restoration Scaling Based on Total Value Equivalency: Green Bay Natural Resource Damage Assessment. Final Report*. Prepared for US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Department of the Interior, and US Department of Justice. Stratos Consulting. Boulder, CO. 199pp.
- Bright, A. D., and M. J. Manfredo. 1996. A conceptual model of attitudes toward natural resource issues: A case study of wolf reintroduction. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 1(1):1–21.
- Brookshire D.S. 1992. Issues regarding benefit transfer. *Proceedings of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists Workshop*, 1992.

- Brown, T. L. 1991. Use and abuse of mail surveys in fisheries management. *American Fisheries Society Symposium* 12, 255-261.
- Bryan, H. 1977. Leisure value system and recreation specialization: The case of trout fishermen. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 9: 174-187.
- Bryan, H. 2000. Recreation Specialization Revisited. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(1), 18.
- Burdge, R. 2004. *The Concept, Process and Methods of Social Impact Assessment*. Portland Or: Social Ecology Press. 3rd edition.
- Carter, D.W., Agar, J.J., & Waters, J.R. 2008. *Economic Framework for Fishery Allocation Decisions with an Application to Gulf of Mexico Red Grouper*. U.S. Department of Commerce. NOAA Tech Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-576.
- Cessford, G., and A. Muhar. 2003. An overview of monitoring options for visitor numbers in national parks and other protected natural and recreation areas. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 11:240–250.
- Champ P.A., Boyle, K. J., & Brown, T.C. (Eds.). 2003. *A Primer on Nonmarket Valuation*. Kluwer Academic Publishers. 576 p.
- Dalecki M.C., Whitehead J.C. & Blomquist G.C. 1993. Sample non-response bias and aggregate benefits in Contingent Valuation: an examination of early, late and non-respondents. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 38, 133-143.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y. 2005. *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*. New York: Sage Publications, Inc. pp. 1,144.
- Dillman, D.A. 2000. *Mail and Internet Surveys. The Tailored Design Method*. New York: Wiley. Pp. 464.
- Ditton, R.B. 1996. Human dimensions in fisheries. In A. Ewert, ed. *Natural Resource Management. The Human Dimension*. pp. 73-90. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press. Pp. 263.
- Ditton, R. B. 2004. Human dimensions of fisheries. In M. J. Manfredo, J. J. Vaske, B. L. Bruyere, D. R. Field, and P. J. Brown, eds. *Society and Natural Resources: A Summary of Knowledge Prepared for the 10th International Symposium on Society and Resource Management*. Pp. 199-208. Jefferson, MI. Modern Litho. PP.
- Dorow, M., Beardmore, B., Haider, W. & Arlinghaus, R. 2010. Winners and losers of conservation policies for European eel (*Anguilla anguilla* L.): an economic welfare analysis for differently specialised eel anglers. *Fisheries Management and Ecology* (17):106-125.
- Driver, B.L. & Knopf, R.C. 1976. Temporary escape: one product of sport fisheries management. *Fisheries*, 1(2), 2-29.
- Driver, B.L. & Cooksey, R.W. 1977. Preferred psychological outcomes of recreational fishing. In *Catch-and-release fishing as a management tool: a national sportfishing symposium proceedings* (pp. 27-40). Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA.
- Driver, B.L., Brown, P. & Peterson, G. (eds.) 1991. *Benefits of Leisure*. State College, Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.

- Driver, B.L., Dustin, D., Baltic, T., Elsner, G. & Peterson, G. 1996. *Nature and the Human Spirit. Towards an Expanded Land Management Ethic*. Venture Publishing, State College PA.
- Driver, B.L. 2009. *Managing to Optimize the Beneficial Outcomes of Recreation*. Venture Publishing. State College, PA.
- Edwards, S.F. 1990. An Economic Guide to Allocation of Fish Stocks between Commercial and Recreational Fisheries. *NOAA Technical Report NMFS 94*. US Department of Commerce.
- Edwards, S.F. 1991. A Critique of Three “Economics” Arguments Commonly Used to Influence Fishery Allocations. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 11 (2), 121-130.
- European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission. (2008.) *EIFAC Occasional Paper No. 42: EIFAC Code of practice for recreational fisheries*. Rome, Italy: FAO. (available at <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/011/i0363e/i0363e00.pdf>)
- Fedler, A. J., & Ditton, R. B. 1986. A Framework for Understanding the Consumptive Orientation of Recreational Fishermen. *Environmental Management* 10: 221-227.
- Fedler, A. J. & Ditton, R. B. 1994. Understanding angler motivations in fisheries management. *Fisheries*, 19(4), 6-13.
- Festinger, L. 1957. *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Finn, K.L., & Loomis, D.K. 2001. The importance of catch motives to recreational anglers: the effects of catch satiation and deprivation. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 6:173-187.
- Fisher, M.R. 1997. Segmentation of the angler population by catch preference, participation, and experience: a management oriented application of recreation specialization. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 17, 1-10.
- Freeman, A.M. *The Benefits of Environmental Improvement*. 1979. Baltimore MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Freeman, A.M. 1993. *The Measurement of Environmental and Resource Values: Theory and Methods*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.
- Freudenberg, P. & Arlinghaus, R. 2010. Benefits and constraints of outdoor recreation for people with physical disabilities: Inferences from recreational fishing. *Leisure Sciences* 32 (1), 55-71.
- Froelicher, V.F. & Froelicher, E.S. 1991. Cardiovascular benefits of physical activity. In Driver, B. L., Brown, P. and Peterson, G. (eds.), *Benefits of Leisure*. Pp. 59-72. State College, Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.
- Gentner, B. & Lowther, A. 2002. “Evaluating Marine Sport Fisheries in the USA.” In T.J. Pitcher and C.E. Hollingsworth eds. *Recreational Fisheries: Ecological, and Economic, and Social Evaluation*. Blackwell Science, Oxford. Pp. 186-206. pp. 288.
- Gentner, B. 2004. Examining target species substitution in the face of changing recreational fishing policies. In: *What are Responsible Fisheries? Proceedings of the Twelfth Biennial Conference of the International Institute of Fisheries Economics and Trade*. July 20 – 30, 2004. Tokyo, Japan.

- Gentner, B. 2007. Sensitivity of anger benefit estimates from a model of recreational demand to the definition of the substitute sites considered by the angler. *Fishery Bulletin*. 105:161-167.
- Gentner, B. & Sutton, S. 2007. Substitution in Recreational Fishing. In Ø. Aas ed., *Global Challenges in Recreational Fisheries*. Blackwell Science, Oxford.
- Granek, E.F., Madin, E.M.P., Brown, M.A., Figueira, W., Cameron, D.S., Hogan, Z., Kristianson, G., de Villiers, P., Williams, J.E., Post, J., Zahn, S. & Arlinghaus, R. 2008. Engaging recreational anglers in management and conservation: global case studies. *Conservation Biology*, 22, 1125-1134.
- Graziano, A.M. & Raulin, M.L. 1989. Research Methods. *A Process of Inquiry*. Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Guthrie, D., Hoenig, J.M., Holliday, M., Jones, C.M., Mills, M.J., Moberly, S.A., Pollock, K.H. & Talhelm, D.R. (eds). 1991. *Creel and angler surveys in fisheries management*. American Fisheries Society Symposium 12.
- Haab, T. & McConnell, K. 2002. *Valuing Environmental and Natural Resources: The Econometrics of Non-Market Valuation*. New Horizons in Environmental Economics. Edwing Elgar. Northampton, MA. pp. 326.
- Hanley, N. & Wright, R.E. & Alvarez-Farizo, B. 2006. Estimating the economic value of improvements in river ecology using choice experiments: an application to the water framework directive. *Journal of Environmental Management* 78, 183-193.
- Hanna, S., Sylvia, G., Harte, M., & Achterman, G. 2006. *Review of economic literature and recommendations for improving economic data and analysis for managing Columbia river spring chinook*. Institute of Natural resources. Oregon State University. 72 p.
- Hendee, J. C. 1974. A multiple-satisfaction approach to game management. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 2(3), 104-113.
- Hendee, J.C. & Potter, D.R. 1971. Human behaviour and wildlife management: needed research. *Transactions of the American Wildlife and Natural Resource Conference* 36, 383-396.
- Hensher, D., Rose, J., & Greene, W. 2005. *Applied Choice Analysis: A Primer*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hicks, R.L., Gautam, A.B., Van Voorhees, D., Osborn, M. & Gentner, B. 2000. Thalassorama: An Introduction to the NMFS Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey with an Emphasis on Economic Valuation. *Marine Resource Economics*. Vol. 14 pp.375-385.
- Holland, S.M. & Ditton, R.B. 1992. Fishing trip satisfaction: A typology of anglers. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 12, 28-33.
- Holthaus, G. 2008. *Learning native wisdom: What traditional cultures teach us subsistence, sustainability and spirituality*. University Press of Kentucky.
- Hunt, L. 2005. Recreational fishing site choice models: insights and future opportunities. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 10:153-172.

- Hvenegaard, G.T. 2002. Birder Specialization Differences in Conservation Involvement, Demographics, and Motivations. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 7(1), 21. doi:10.1080/108712002753574765
- Håkansson, C. 2006. *Cost-Benefit Analysis and Valuation Uncertainty: Empirical Contributions and Methodological Developments of a Study on Trade-offs between Hydropower and Wild Salmon*. Acta Universitatis Agriculturae Sueciae 2007: 41. Department of Forest Economics, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Umeå. Ph.D. thesis.
- Håkansson, C. 2007. A new valuation question: analysis of and insights from interval open-ended data in contingent valuation. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 39 (2), 175-188.
- Iwasaki, Y. 2006. Leisure and quality of life in an international and multicultural context: what are major pathways linking leisure to quality of life? *Social Indicators Research* 82, 233-264.
- Johnston, R. J., Ranson, M.H., Besedin, E.Y. & Helm, E.C. 2006. What Determines Willingness to Pay per Fish? A Meta-Analysis of Recreational Fishing Values. *Marine Resource Economics* 21, 1-32.
- Kirchhofer, A. 2002. The role of legislation, institutions and policy making in fish conservation in Switzerland: past, present and future challenges. In M.J. Collares-Pereira, I.G. Cowx and M.M. Coelho, eds., *Conservation of Freshwater Fish: Options for the Future*, pp. 389-401. Fishing News Books, Blackwell Science, Oxford.
- Kleiven, J. & Bekkevold, A. 1994. Småviltjakt, motive og mosjonseffekter. (Small game hunting; motivations and exercise effects). In *Directorate for Nature Management: proceedings from conference on outdoor recreation; effects and benefits*, Pp. 130-137. Report in Norwegian.
- Knopf, R.C., B.L. Driver & J.D. Bassett. 1973. Motivations for Fishing. Pp. 28-41 in Hende, J.C. and Schoenfeld, C. (Eds.), *Human Dimensions in Wildlife Programs*. Wildlife Management Institute.
- Kroeger, T., J. Loomis & F. Casey. 2008. Introduction to the Wildlife Habitat Benefits Estimation Toolkit. Prepared for the National Council for Science and the Environment as part of the project "Development of an Operational Benefits Estimation Tool for the U.S." Washington DC: Defenders of Wildlife. June 2008. 31 pp.
- Krueger, C.C., & Decker, D. J. 1999. The process of fisheries management. In C. C. Kohler and W. A. Hubert, ed., *Inland fisheries management in North America. 2nd edition*, pp.31-59. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland.
- Kuentzel, W. F. 2001. How Specialized is Specialization Research? *Journal of Leisure Research*, 33(3), 351. doi:Article
- Kuentzel, W.F. & Heberlein, T.A. 2006. From Novice to Expert? A Panel Study of Specialization Progression and Change. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 38(4), 496-512.
- Lacy, A.C. & Hastad, D.N. 2006. *Measurement and evaluation in physical education and exercise sciences*. Benjamin Cummings.
- Lloyd, K.M. & Auld, C.J. 2002. The role of leisure in determining quality of life: issues of content and measurement. *Social Indicators Research* 57, 43-71.

- Louviere, J.J., Hensher, D.A. & Swait, J.D. 2000. *Stated Choice Methods: Analysis and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. Pp. 402.
- Manfredo, M.J., Driver, B.L. & Tarrant, M.A. 1996. Measuring leisure motivation: a meta-analysis of the recreation experience preference scales. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28(3), 188-213.
- Manfredo, M.J. 2008. *Who cares about wildlife? Social science concepts for exploring human-wildlife relationships and conservation issues*. Springer, New York.
- Manning, R.E. 1999. *Studies in outdoor recreation: search and research for satisfaction*. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis 384.
- Marshall C. & Rossman, G.B. 2006. *Designing Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications, 4th ed.
- Martin, L.R.G. 1987. Economic Impact Analysis of a Sport Fishery on Lake Ontario: An Appraisal of the Method. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* 116, 461-468.
- Mawle, G.W. & Peirson, G. 2009. *Economic evaluation of inland fisheries*. Managers report from science report SC050026/SR2. Environment Agency. Bristol.
- Miller, R.E., & Blair, P.D. 1985. *Input-Output Analysis: Foundations and Extensions*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mitchell, R.C. & Carson, R.T. 1989. *Using Surveys to Value Public Goods: The Contingent Valuation Method*. Resources for the Future. Washington, D.C. 463 p.
- Oh, C.O. & R.B. Ditton. 2006. Using recreation specialization to understand multi-attribute management preferences. *Leisure Sciences*. 28(4). Pp. 369-384.
- Oh, C.O. & Ditton, R.B. 2008. Using Recreation Specialization to Understand Conservation Support. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 40(4). Pp. 556-573.
- Parkkila, K. 2005. *Estimating the willingness to pay for catch improvements in the river Simojoki - an application of contingent valuation method*. University of Helsinki, Department of Economics and Management, Masters' thesis. (In Finnish)
- Parkkila, K. 2009. *Estimating benefits of new Baltic salmon fisheries management programme*. (Unpublished manuscript)
- Paulrud, A. 2004. *Economic Valuation of Sport-Fishing in Sweden: Empirical Findings and Methodological Developments*. Acta Universitatis Agriculturae Sueciae, Silvestria 323. Ph.D. thesis Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Umeå.
- Paulrud, A. & Laitila, T. 2004. Valuation of management policies for sport-fishing on Sweden's Kaitum River. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 47, 863-879.
- Pearce, D. & Özdemiroglu, E. 2002. *Economic Valuation with Stated Preference Techniques. Summary Guide*. Department for Transport, local Government and the Regions: London. (available at: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/corporate/pdf/146871.pdf>)
- Peirson, G., Tingley, D., Spurgeon, J. & Radford, A. 2001. Economic evaluation of inland fisheries in England and in Wales. *Fisheries Management and Ecology* 8, 415-424.

- Pollock, K.H., Jones, C.M. & Brown, T.L. 1994. *Angler survey methods and their applications in fisheries management*. Special Publications 25, American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, MD.
- Pretty, J., Peacock, J., Hine, R., Sellens, M., South, N. & Griffin, M. 2007. Green exercise in the UK countryside: Effects on health and psychological well-being, and implications for policy and planning. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 50, 211-231.
- Pretty, J. Hine, R. & Peacock, J. 2006. Green exercise: the benefits of activities in green places. *The Biologist* 53, 143-146.
- Radford, A.F., Riddington, G., Tingley, D., Spurgeon, J. & Colarullo, G. 2001. *Economic Evaluation of Inland Fisheries*. Environment Agency R&D Technical Report W2-039/TR/1. Environment Agency, Bristol, 80 pp.
- Radford, A.F., Riddington, G. & Gibson, H. 2007. *Economic evaluation of inland fisheries: The economic impact of freshwater angling in England & Wales*. Environment Agency. Bristol. 165pp. (available at: <http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/pdf/SCHO1207BNNW-e-e.pdf>)
- Rolfe, J. & Bennett, J. 2006. *Choice Modelling and the Transfer of Environmental Values*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK.
- Rolston, III, H. 1991. Creation and recreation: Environmental benefits and human leisure. In Driver, B. L., Brown, P. and Peterson, G., eds., *Benefits of Leisure*, pp. 393 -406. State College, Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.
- Rosenberger, R.S. & Loomis, J.B. 2001. *Benefit Transfer of Outdoor Recreation Use Values: A technical document supporting the Forest Service Strategic Plan (2000 revision)*. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-72. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station.
- Roth E., Toivonen A-L., Navrud S., Bengtsson B., Gudbergsson G., Tuunainen P., Appelblad H. & Weissglas G. 2000. *Methodological, conceptual and sampling practices in surveying recreational fishery in the Nordic countries – experiences of a valuation survey*. EIFAC/XXI/2000/Symp. E27. Paper presented in the Eifac Symposium on Fisheries and Society, Hungary 1-3 June 2000.
- Roth, E., Toivonen, A.-L., Navrud, S., Bengtsson, B., Gudbergsson, G., Tuunainen, P., Appelblad, H. & Weissglas, G. 2001. Methodological, conceptual and sampling practices in surveying recreational fishery in the Nordic countries - experiences of a valuation survey. *Fisheries Management and Ecology*, 8, 355-367.
- Salant, P., & Dillman, D. A. 1994. *How to conduct your own survey*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Samuelson, P.A. 1947. *Foundations of Economic Analysis*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, CT. 604 p.
- Schirmer, J. & Casey, A.M. 2005. *Social Assessment Handbook: A guide to methods and approaches for assessing the social sustainability of fisheries in Australia*. FRDC ESD Reporting and Assessment Subprogram Publication No. 7. Fisheries Research and Development Corporation and Bureau of Rural Sciences, Canberra. 50 pp.

- Sipponen, M. 1999. *The Finnish inland fisheries system: the outcomes of private ownership of fishing rights and the changes in administrative practices*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. 81 p. Biological Research Reports from the University of Jyväskylä.
- Smith, C. L. 1983. Evaluating human factors. In Nielsen, L. A. and Johnson, D. L. eds., *Fisheries Techniques*, pp. 431-445. Bethesda, Maryland: American Fisheries Society.
- Spash, C.L & Vatn, A. 2006. Transferring environmental value estimates: Issues and alternatives. *Ecological Economics* 60 (2), 279-388.
- Tillner, R. 2007. *Eine vergleichende Analyse der Angelbeteiligung in ausgewählten Industrienationen*. Bachelor-Arbeit. Landwirtschaftlich-Gärtnerische Fakultät. Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. 99 p.
- Toivonen, A.-L., Appelblad, H., Bengtsson, B., Geertz-Hansen, P., Gudbergsson, G., Kristofersson, D., Kyrjebø, H., Navrud, S., Roth, E., Tuunainen, P. & Weissglas, G. 2000. *Economic value of recreational fisheries in the Nordic countries*. TemaNord 604, Copenhagen. Nordic Council of Ministers, 71 p.
- Toivonen, Anna-Liisa., Roth, Eva., Navrud, Ståle., Gudbergsson, Gudni., Appleblad H., & Bengtsson, Bo. 2004. The economic value of recreational fisheries in the Nordic countries, *Fisheries Management and Ecology* 11(1):1-14.
- Ulrich, R., Dimberg, U. & Driver, B.L. 1991. Psychophysiological indicators of leisure benefits. In Driver, B. L., Brown, P. and Peterson, G., eds., *Benefits of Leisure*, pp 73-89 in State College, Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.
- Vaske, J.J. 2008. *Survey Research and Analysis: Applications in Parks, Recreation, and Human Dimensions*. State College, PA. Venture Publishing, Inc. pp. 658.
- Vesterinen J. & Pouta E. 2009. *Water recreation benefits from reduced eutrophication in Finnish surface water*. Paper presented in the 12th Congress of the European Association of Agricultural Economists - EAAE 2009.
- Vesterinen, J. 2009. *Value of water quality in a recreational setting: hedonic pricing analysis for summer house properties*. Working paper. MTT Agrifood Research Finland- VeHy project. Data collected February 2009.
- Weithman, A.S. 1999. Socioeconomic benefits of fisheries. In C.C. Kohler and W.A. Hubert, eds., *Inland Fisheries Management in North America 2nd edition*, pp. 193-213. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland.
- Whitehead, J., Haab, T. C., Huang, J-C. 2000. Measuring recreation benefits of quality improvements with revealed and stated behavior data. *Resource and Energy Economics* 22, 339-354.
- Wightman, R., Sutton, S., Matthews, B.E., Gillis, K., Colman, J. & Samuelson, J.R. 2008. Recruiting new anglers: Driving forces, constraints and examples of success. . In Ø. Aas ed., *Global Challenges in Recreational Fisheries*, pp. 303-323. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell
- Wilde, G.R., Ditton, R.B., Grimes, S.R. & Riechers, R.K. 1996. Status of human dimensions surveys sponsored by state and provincial fisheries management agencies in *North America*. *Fisheries* 21(11), 12-17.

Wilson, M. A. & Hoehn, J (Ed.) 2006. Environmental Benefits Transfer: Methods, Applications and New Directions - Benefits Transfer S.I. *Ecological Economics* 60 (2), 335-482.

List of abbreviations:

BT	=	benefit transfer
CBA	=	cost-benefit analysis
CE	=	choice experiment method
CIOE	=	classic open ended and interval
CM	=	choice modelling
CS	=	consumer surplus
CV	=	compensating variation
CVM	=	contingent valuation method
DC	=	dichotomous choice format
HD	=	human dimensions
HP	=	hedonic pricing method
I-O model	=	input-output model
MB	=	multiple bounded
OE	=	open ended
PC	=	payment card
PS	=	producer surplus
RP	=	revealed preference method
SP	=	stated preference method
TEI	=	total economic impact
TEV	=	total economic value
TC	=	travel cost method
WTA	=	willingness to accept
WTP	=	willingness to pay

Glossary (modified from Bateman et al. 2002):

Altruistic value: Altruism is the desire to secure enhancement of the wellbeing of others. Altruistic economic value is the willingness to pay on the part of individual A to ensure that individual B secures some gain in wellbeing. Altruistic value is an example of non-use value.

Benefit (or bid) function: A regression equation that describes the relationship between WTP and relevant factors such as characteristics of the population, the change in the non-market good or service and so on.

Benefit transfer: An approach which makes use of previous valuations of similar goods at a study site and, with any necessary adjustments, applies them to produce estimates for the same or similar good in a different context, known as the policy site. What is transferred may be a mean WTP, with or without some adjustment for changed conditions (for example, different income levels), or a benefit function (or bid function).

Bequest value: Bequest values measure people's WTP to ensure their heirs and future generations will be able to use the resource in the future. Bequest values are an example of non-use values.

Choice experiment: A form of choice modelling in which respondents are presented with a series of alternatives and asked to choose their most preferred.

Choice modelling (CM): This encompasses a range of SP and RP techniques, including choice experiments, contingent ranking, contingent rating and paired comparisons. CM approaches describe an asset in terms of its attributes, or characteristics, and the levels that these take, and may be used to determine which attributes are significant determinants of value; their implied ranking; the value of changing them; and the total economic value of a resource or good.

Choice set: A set of alternatives presented to respondents, usually in a choice experiment context, where they are asked to choose their most preferred.

Compensating variation: The compensating variation (CV) of a price fall (rise) is the sum of money that, when taken away from (given to) the consumer, leaves him/her just as well off with the price change as if it had not occurred. Thus, utility is held constant.

Construct validity: This examines whether the relationships between measures produced by a CV study and other measures are in accordance with expectations. Examples include predictors from economic theory, and empirical regulations in the form of associations with other variables which seem intuitively correct and which hold across a large number of studies.

Consumer surplus: The difference (or net gain) between the price actually paid when purchasing a good or service and the maximum price the consumer would have been willing to pay for the same good or service. This measure approximates, and is bounded by, the more technically precise measures of economic benefit, compensating variation (CV) and equivalent variation (EV).

Content validity: This assesses whether the SP study asked the right questions in a clear, understandable, sensible and appropriate manner with which to obtain a valid estimate of the construct (say maximum WTP for a specific good) under investigation.

Cost-benefit analysis: A procedure for valuing gains (benefits) and losses (costs) in monetary terms, based on individuals' willingness to pay to secure the benefit or avoid the cost and the resource costs involved.

Direct use value: Where individuals make actual use of a resource for either commercial purposes or recreation.

Economic impact: Economic impact analysis traces the flow of economic transactions through the economy and answers the research question what specific economic sectors win or lose as the result of a policy change. Economic impacts can be expressed in terms of employment, value added (also called the contribution to gross domestic product), total economic output (also called total sales), or income. These effects can be direct, indirect and induced.

Economic rent: Payment made to a factor that is in excess of what is required to elicit the supply of that factor. Economic rent (or resource rent) exists when payments to owners of the resources used in production exceed opportunity costs of maintaining these resources.

Economic value: The monetary measure of the wellbeing associated with the change in the provision of some good. It is not to be confused with monetary value unless the later is explicitly designed to measure the change in wellbeing, nor with financial value which may reflect market value or an accounting convention. The terms economic value and welfare change can be used interchangeably.

Equivalent variation: The equivalent variation of a price fall (rise) is the sum of money that, when given to (taken from) the consumer leaves him/her just as well off without the price change as if it had occurred. Thus, it preserves the post-change utility level.

Existence value: The value that people put on the existence of a resource, even when they have no intention of ever using the resource. Existence values are part of non-use values.

Indirect use value: This arises where individuals benefit from ecosystem functions supported by a resource rather than actually using it (for example, watershed protection or carbon sequestration by forests).

Meta-analysis: A statistical procedure whereby a number of different studies are treated as inputs to a wider study that seeks to explain the variability of outcomes in the individual studies. Meta-studies involve not just outcomes of the original studies (for example, mean WTP) but also the sample size, date and location of the study, the author and so on.

Non-use value: The value placed on a resource by people who are not current users of that resource and who do not intend to use the resource themselves. It is also referred to as passive use value.

Opportunity cost: The value of a resource in its next best alternative use; the net benefit forgone because the resources providing a service can no longer be used in their next most beneficial use.

Option value: The value that people place on having the option to use a resource in the future even if they are not current users.

Payment card: An elicitation format which presents respondents with a visual aid containing a large number of monetary amounts to facilitate the valuation task.

Public goods: Are nonrival and nonexcludable, i.e. these goods can be enjoyed by any number of people without affecting other peoples' enjoyment. For example, an aesthetic view is a pure public

good. No matter how many people enjoy the view, others can also enjoy it. Typically **environmental goods** are purely (both nonrival and nonexcludable) or partly public goods.

Sample frame population: A list of the target population from which the sample will ultimately be drawn, for example, all dwelling units in a city, all visitors to a site, all households with a telephone.

Total economic value: The total economic value of an environmental resource is made up of i) use values and ii) non-use values. Use values are composed of a) direct use value, b) indirect use values and c) option values, whilst non-use values are made up of a) altruistic values, b) existence values and c) bequest values.

Use value: The value placed on a resource by users of that resource.

Utility: This is synonymous with wellbeing.

Willingness to accept compensation: WTA is the amount of money that person require as compensation to forgo the improvement.

Willingness to pay: WTP is the amount of money that a person is willing to give up in order to get a particular good or service (obtaining benefits) based on the specific action or task.

Appendix 1: Examples of used methodology associated to fishery and preservation of fish stocks in the Nordic countries and the Central Europe.

Main reference	Year of publication	Associated good(s)	Used method*	Mean of WTP estimate**
Germany				
Arlinghaus & Mehner	2004	Specialized carp angling	CVM (OE)	881 € per year
Arlinghaus	2004a	Recreational fishing in general in Germany	CVM (OE)	Use value 134 € per year, Non-use value 21 € per year
Arlinghaus	2004b	Recreational fishing in Berlin	TC (multiple sites)	22 € per trip
Finland				
Toivonen et al.	2004	Hypothetical good quality stream in various Nordic countries	CVM (MB and OE)	62-375 € per angler per year depending on country and scenario
Parkkila	2005	salmon angling in the low quality salmon river	CVM (PC)	8-10 € per angler per fishing day 48-57 € per angler per fishing season
Parkkila	2009 forthcoming	New management program for Baltic salmon fisheries	CVM (CIOE), CE	28 € per angler per year forthcoming 2009
Sweden				
Appelblad	2001	Current salmon angling in the Byske river	CVM	12 € per angler per day 44 € per angler per week 101 € per angler per year
		Improvement of river to be as good as Norwegian salmon river		19 € per angler per day 70 € per angler per week 164 € per angler per year
Paulrud	2004	Fishery in the rivers in Bohus area, Sweden and in the lakes in the area	CVM	13-21 € per angler per fishing trip depending on scenario 6-8 € per angler per fishing trip depending on scenario
Paulrud & Laitila	2004	Local sport-anglers, catching an extra fish in the Kaitum river	CE	2-39 € per angler per fish depending on its size
Håkansson	2007	Salmon angling/conservation by building, fish ladder, the Vindel river, Sweden	CVM (CIOE)	4-15 € per person as a lump sum depending on scenario and respondent (angler/non-angler)
UK				
Peirson et al.	2001	Re-introduction of salmon in Thames river, current fishing experience in the Teifi river, Current fishing in the Aire river, England	CVM(PC, OE)	4 € per household per year 14 € per angler per fishing trip 3 € per local angler per day

* = Valuation method, CVM= Contingent valuation (payment format: MB, multiple bounded; PC, payment card; CIOE classical open ended and interval; DC, dichotomous choice format), TC = travel cost method and CE = choice experiment

** = Mean of WTP estimates are given as the currencies have been reported (amount of reported WTP estimates) with some exceptions where reported WTP estimate is adjusted to 2007 Euros (Appelblad, 2001; Håkansson, 2007; Parkkila, 2005; Paulrud, 2004; Paulrud & Laitila, 2004; Peirson et al., 2001; Toivonen et al., 2004). It should be noted that several mean WTP estimates are reported in each paper and due to the differences in scenarios, type of WTP questions and used currencies etc. reported WTP estimates are not commensurate.

Appendix 2: Major steps when conducting a contingent valuation (CV) study

These steps follow Champ et al. (2003):

Step 1: Identify the change(s) in quantity/quality to be valued

Conducting a CVM study starts with identifying the change(s) in the quantity or quality of the amenity to be valued, which is motivated based on the current decision problem, i.e. what is the item to be valued. Initially identification of valued change requires a theoretical definition for the measure of the welfare change to be estimated, based on the property rights structure and on the type of the change from the current (status quo) situation. The proposed change can be either a gain or loss, and for them there are different welfare measures: WTP to secure a gain or WTP to avoid a loss, and WTA to tolerate the loss and WTA to forgo a gain. This step is fundamental: it affects the description of the environmental conditions with and without intended policy, frames the statistical analysis and allows clear interpretation of policy context. Also, as the effect of different policy to individual's utility is to be identified. The status quo (leaving things as they are) in resource condition and services it provides to people, and the state after the proposed change, have to be described in detail using physical and biological measures associated to the good. In this way the difference between the baseline utility with current environmental conditions and the utility with the new environmental conditions can be defined. Economists are dependent on available information on physical changes and their impacts in order to identify their effect on an individual's utility. Vague information associated to policy and its effects accomplish vague results, which is a problem particularly with older studies.

Step 2: Identify whose values are to be valued

The second step involves identification of the population of interest, i.e. those who are affected by intended policy and whose values need to be known. There are two criteria to be used for framing the population, namely those people who will benefit from change or, on the other hand, people who will pay for it. For example, the policy question could be whether to allocate more fish stocks to recreational fishing instead of commercial fishing in a certain water area due to the new regulations. In this case, at least the anglers in the water area in question should be included in the sample frame. However, there are potential anglers and public who might be affected by the policy as well. If updated licence data (e.g. register about purchased fishing licences) are available, they can be utilised for framing the sample. In this case, the unit of welfare measurement is defined as individuals (because fishing licence is personal), and study results are represented as mean WTP per individual instead of WTP per household, which is another option. Policy change might also have wider effects on the community (e.g. through the increased activity in the area) or even the national (or international, e.g. internationally recognized recreation site) level, in which case the whole nation is considered as the relevant population.

There are also factors, which can be used to consider whether to determine user and non-user population in the study, from which, the uniqueness of the good (service) in question, scale of the change in question and context in which the results will be used are most important. Once the sample frame is defined, the next phase is to select the particular sample from the frame, typically using probabilistic sampling (see further information Bateman et al., 2002). The selected sample affects aggregation results since the point estimates of value (WTP), which are stated per individual or per household, are lastly expanded to population values. Therefore, the sample should be representative compared to the whole population.

Step 3: Select data collection mode

The CVM method relies on primary data collection with mail surveys (e.g., Arlinghaus & Mehner 2004), telephone or personal interviews, internet-aided surveys or mixed modes. CVM studies

usually employ mail surveys, often due to reasons related to budget and sample representativeness. The cost of sending (including two mailings and a reminder card) a questionnaire to 1 000 people is about 5 000 to 6 000 Euros with mailing (3-4 Euros per person depending on if they answer in the first stage or not) and printing costs currently in Finland. Another method is a telephone survey, which is relatively affordable when compared to the costs associated to interviews. Personal interviews are recommended by many authors, and they provide different opportunities related to chosen valuation techniques. Use of CAPI-surveys (computer assisted personal interviewing) in face-to-face interviews is currently increasing, and is replacing pen and paper methods. In addition, combined mail-telephone or mail-internet surveys have been popular. Internet and web-based surveys are becoming more common in the future. Expected survey response rate affects the mode selection. In general, response rates tend to increase along with the costs. Higher response rates can be expected also among specific user groups such as recreational anglers than in general population surveys.

Step 4: Choose a sample size

Choosing a sample size is related to acceptable level of precision with a given budget. However, CVM studies typically require rather large sample sizes due to the large variance in the WTP responses, and they are rarely smaller than 1 000 individuals. In addition, previous literature may give insight to develop a reasonable estimate of standard deviation for new application with a particular context. On the other hand, sample size is related to methodological issues (e.g. used response format and bid selection) and expected response rate, which is influenced, for instance, by the policy issue under consideration and percentage of invalid mailing addresses. Other considerations include possible use of sub-samples and eligibility of possible respondents in the survey. Therefore, it is difficult to give any accurate recommendation on optimal sample size, but according to Bateman et al. (2002) it is recommended that sample sizes (usable responses) are about 200-500 for open-ended CV surveys and about 500 – 1000 for closed-ended (dichotomous/referendum) CVM surveys.

Step 5: Design the information component of the survey instrument

The fifth step involves designing the information that is given to the respondent in the questionnaire or an interview concerning the good to be valued, provision of the good and payment method. These issues constitute a significant component in the design of the CVM survey. The main challenge in a CVM study is to design the valuation scenario, including components of the survey instrument and valuation questions, in a way that it is not only understandable for respondents but also scientifically correct.

Firstly, the item to be valued, i.e. the qualitative or quantitative change identified in the first step, is described in written (or verbal) form and with help of illustrative graphs and pictures in order to facilitate the understanding of the respondent. The scenario includes a neutral description of the change to be valued. Information is given in terms of the baseline condition(s) (status quo) and new condition(s) resulting from the policy change, from which one or the other is often missed in older studies, reducing the credibility of value estimates. The standard errors of the welfare estimate decrease when high-powered information is provided to respondents. In a study about brown trout fishing in southern Wisconsin streams, for instance, there was a need to provide information on the affected area with the use of a map, the stocking of the brown trout and composition of catches. In addition, information is needed for substitutes and reminders of budget constraint. If the good is complex and the respondent is unfamiliar with it, more information is needed in order to elicit credible WTP responses.

Secondly, the method of provision is explained in the scenario. This is the mechanism through which the policy is implemented. For instance, when allocation of fish stock will be changed due to the policy, these policies have to be specified. Then, a payment vehicle is selected and described in the scenario. Income taxes (e.g. species protection), admission fee, donations (when reliable one

exists) and increased user fees (recreation) have been widely used. Choosing the payment vehicle means balancing between realism and rejection of the payment vehicle. Then, a decision rule is selected, which means stating the mechanism by which the respondents are informed of the provision of the valuation item in reality. This can be done using individual or summary (e.g. if majority vote positively) statistics on valuation responses. It is closely linked to payment method but is often neglected. In the case of user valuations, such as recreational fishing, it is not applicable because of individual trip costs. Selecting the time-frame for payment tells the respondent the amount of payments and how frequently the payments are required for the policy. Alternatives can be one-time payment, each time when participating, or annual payment for x year e.g. during the next five years. It should be reliable in the sense that connection between the time frame and benefits of the policy change for the respondents is as evident as possible.

Step 6: Design the contingent valuation question

After all the information is given, the respondent can be asked questions to determine how much they would be willing to pay (WTP) for the good (e.g., Arlinghaus & Mehner 2004). There are three primary response formats, open ended (OE), payment card (PC) and dichotomous choice (DC), and they all have strengths and weaknesses (see Champ et al., 2003). The chosen format affects the welfare estimates. OE format asks directly how much the respondent would be willing to pay at most for the specified change, but this is nowadays rather rarely applied, because potential zero bid problem and theoretically reasons (present example of OE format, see e.g., Håkansson, 2007). Instead, the different DC formats are currently used most commonly, such as single bounded dichotomous choice (SBDC), including one bid offer to the respondent, and double-bounded dichotomous choice (DBDC), with two rounds of the bid offers. In addition, DC can be framed as a referendum format. In DC formats bid (price) varies randomly across the sample, and they are relatively inefficient because less information is available from the respondent. Other problems in DC formats are related to “yea” saying and anchoring. The PC format includes several bids, varying from very low bids (starting from zero) to higher ones. In case that each bid in the card is multiple bounded by “response certainty” (definitely or probably yeas; unsure; definitely or probably no), the format is called polychotomous. All the formats, except the open-ended, requires careful selection of bids (e.g. using pretest and the help of previous studies), the number of which is usually 5 - 8. On the other hand, people should be allowed to state also zero responses, in order to identify people who truly hold zero value for the item being valued and whose utility will not increase according to described change. The questionnaire should also include screening questions considering the zero-value. In addition, the follow-up questions are used to identify respondents with real zero WTP for the policy from those who provide zero answer as a protest, and motives for positive WTP. There are several reasons for the protest answers and the questionnaire is designed to include also questions to reveal those and other misleading responses (e.g. outliers with unrealistic high values).

Step 7: Design the auxiliary questions

The questionnaire should be designed to include auxiliary questions, which are used to collect the data to be used in the analyses. Firstly, the questions associated to the respondent’s income and other variables, which provide covariates for statistical analysis, are needed. Secondly, the questions that can be used for assessing the validity of valuation responses are developed. The respondent’s understanding about the good being valued and change the good is providing needs to be evaluated with thorough questions.

Step 8: Pretesting and implementation of the survey

Before implementing the final survey the questionnaire should be pretested through the one-to-one interviews, focus groups and pilot survey. The purpose of the pre-testing is to ensure that the questionnaire is understandable for the respondents in order to elicit the information that it is designed for. Further pretesting is used to find out whether the chosen statements and wording (particularly terms) will cause any problems. Costs of valuation surveys varies a lot depending on budget, sample size, survey mode (mail, telephone, face-to-face interview etc.) and by whom it is

conducted (professional or student), the complexity of questionnaire design and level of analysis anticipated. Typically, 6 000 Euros can be considered as a minimum budget for implementing a valuation survey, which does not include data entry (see further information e.g., Bateman et al. 2002). In addition, total costs and time frame of a valuation study tend to increase along with the complexity of the proposed change and its impacts. Further, in the case of recreation fishing the data is typically collected during the fishing season or immediately after that, and must be considered when determining time frame of the study.

Steps 9 and 10: Data analysis, statistical analyses and reporting study results

After the data collection, the data analysis procedures are developed and statistical analyses are conducted. The mean WTP measure for the good being valued is estimated by using econometric models, and individual valuations are aggregated (i.e. mean WTP per individual is multiplied by the number of population affected by the change) to the whole population. in question. Presuming that the CVM study is designed carefully and following the guidelines, estimation of the preliminary results (e.g. sample averages) should not take much time. However, it should be noted that several assumptions associated to econometric modelling typically have substantial effect on obtained results. Besides estimation of the WTP estimates (preliminary and final sample averages and aggregation values), their reliability and validity need to be addressed. Finally, the study results, particularly estimated values, average and aggregated values, are reported and produced for the needs of the policy analysis. Also study results can be further used in benefit transfer analyses.

Appendix 3: Major steps when conducting a choice experiment (CE) study

In the following text a brief overview is provided for setting up a CE study (Bateman et al., 2002; Bennet & Blamey, 2001; Champ et al., 2003; Hensher et al., 2005).

Before the steps of conducting an experimental design, i.e. manipulation of the attributes and their levels, the importance of precise characterization of the decision problem is highlighted. The decision problem needs to be identified, especially regarding the geographical and temporal scope of the quality changes (environmental problem), but also the types of the values that are affected by the changes (economic problem). It has to be sorted out whether the policy change impact on single site or multiple sites matter and what is the time frame for the change. For instance, changing the fishery regulation in the lake affects the quantity and quality of fish catch at least locally. Policy change might have larger effects on fishing opportunities or existence of some fish species in the future.

Conduction of a choice experiment is above all about understanding the behavioural aspects and statistical characteristics of design, and balancing between them in order that experiment will be credible for respondent, useful for policy making and reliability of estimated results. In addition, although the experimental design process is presented below in a step by step manner, it is more like a sequence of steps and returns to the previous stages are needed.

Step 1: Identify the alternatives, their attributes and attribute levels

At first the components to be used within the experiment are produced. It starts by defining the alternatives and their number, since in choice experiments individuals make choices among several choice situations (choice sets) which include at least two alternatives. Alternatives with different combinations of attribute levels can be unlabeled or labelled. In the first case alternatives are defined with generic titles (e.g. alternative 1, alternative 2. in a management option study), and in later case titles are labelled with the names, which describe the alternative (e.g. bus, car, train in a travel mode study). No-choice or status quo (or so called opt-out option) alternative is typically one of the alternatives in study. The different alternatives are determined by specified attributes and their levels, and thus, the most relevant attributes associated to environmental quality are selected and described. Alternatives include always a price as one of the attributes, which is used as a payment vehicle. In case of recreational fishing, different fish species, size of expected catch, state of fish species (e.g. described by number of smolts from the river), number of anglers (possible congestion problem) and quality of the fishing site environment could be the factors that are relevant for anglers and represent characteristics of an angling site. On the other hand, regulation measures, such as, bag size limit and fishing control might be selected based on their importance for policy decision making. Previous literature, focus groups with representative people and experts, and other pre-tests are typically used to identify the most relevant attributes. However, ambiguity and inter-attribute (associated to cognitive perceptions) correlations must be also considered, because ambiguous attributes are not able to explain variation.

The attribute levels are preferably described quantitatively (e.g. days needed to catch salmon 7, 4, 1), rather than qualitatively (e.g. many, quite many, only few days). This, however, requires existence of adequate data from current and possible future (forecast) levels of attributes. The correctness of attribute definition is essential in order to attach a single meaning, for instance, to the number of salmon under different conditions of respondents. It might be that an attribute needs to be separated into two distinct attributes, in this case one describing fishing success and another state of the salmon stock. There are two concerns for specifying the attribute levels, a range of each attribute level and number of attribute level. A range of attribute levels should encompass whole range (minimum and maximum value) being part of the respondent's preferences. Then for the needs of model estimation, the extreme values experienced by the respondent are needed, but the range still should be feasible and not unrealistic wide. The number of attribute levels is typically

different for each attribute and is dependent on required information about the utility attached to change in each attribute level, such as, whether the utility is linear (2 levels is appropriate) or non-linear (more than 2 levels is needed). Most of the researcher's time is recommended to spend on above mentioned issues in order to produce reliable results.

Further, by changing the levels for the chosen attributes, different goods can be produced. In the next step, the levels are assigned to the choice sets of alternatives to be presented to the respondent.

Step 2: Develop experimental design considerations

The next step is to make decisions concerning the experimental design to be used, i.e. the specification of attributes and their levels for use in an experiment. There are number of methods available. In full factorial design all possible combinations of attribute levels (choice sets) are used construction of the alternatives. In that case, with several attributes and their levels the number of different combination is however high. Through using the fractional factorial designs the number of choice sets can be decreased, since only a fraction of the full factorial is taken. Instead of making a selection of the choice sets of alternatives randomly, scientific methods are needed to produce a subset of all combinations, e.g. orthogonal designs, optimal choice probability design, efficient design etc. Sometimes so called end-point design with only extremes of the attribute levels can be employed, to reduce the size of the design.

For specifying the design the alternatives need to be selected, whether they are generic or labelled (meaning to respondent), which also affect on the size of design. Sometimes only main effects of each attribute might be of interest, but for certain policy changes also the interaction effects of different attribute levels are expected to be significant for the respondent and should be estimated. The design and modelling requirements are also different for the estimation of the linear and non-linear effects of the attributes, and need to be considered. Assuming the worst case, i.e. very complex non-linear relationship among several attributes and their levels might seem to be the best strategy for the researcher. However, that kind of strategy means very large design and sample size and therefore is very costly and might be unfeasible to conduct. Statistical analysis requires certain degrees of freedom, and determines the minimum number of the different combinations of the attributes and their levels in design.

Finally, the blocking strategy is used to divide the final combinations (choice sets) into different segments (blocks), each of them having certain number of the choice sets (e.g. 4-10 depending on size of design), which are given to a different respondent (sub-samples). A small design with 27 combinations, could be blocked to 9 blocks in which case each respondent receive 3 combinations (choice sets), for instance. Typically allocation of choice sets is done randomly.

The next step is about developing the choice context and scenario descriptions. These are again critical steps, and appropriate framing requires time. Development of experimental design includes construction of alternatives that will be presented to the respondent in the survey.

Step 3: Generate experimental design

This step includes conduction of an actual experimental design, which is one of the most controversial tasks related to CE process and therefore is only mentioned in this Occasional Paper. The experiments are generated using systematic and planned design process to combine the attribute levels into choice sets, which are going to be represented to the respondent. Different types of designs can be generated depending on, e.g. preferred statistical properties, which are already defined in the previous step. The specialised computer softwares (e.g. Sawtooth software) and statistical packages (e.g. SPSS and SAS), can be used to generate experimental designs.

Step 4: Generate the choice sets and questionnaire

The questionnaires including the choice sets that are going to be used in survey are finally constructed. In order to avoid biases related to the order of choice sets, their order for each respondent is recommended randomly, so that each respondent views the choice situations in different orders. In addition, the order of the alternatives of choice sets can be randomized. These modifications are more feasible to realise when using electric form of the questionnaire (e.g. in case of internet-aided survey) instead ordinary paper questionnaire, because of very high number of questionnaire versions. In this step the survey instrument, i.e. questionnaire should be finalised in its entirety and data collection is administered.

Step 5: Estimate model and interpret the results for policy analysis and decision support

For the analysis of choice data, which is based on the respondent's choices among alternatives that yield their highest utility, probabilistic models are used. Various statistical softwares (e.g. Nlogit/Limdep) can be used for the welfare estimation. Through the econometric models (e.g. Multinomial logit, Nested logit, and Mixed logit models) the parameters in the utility function are estimated and different values are produced e.g., part-worth utilities (value) for each of the attribute levels and marginal values for different scenarios. Finally, study results can be interpreted and may be used in policy analysis and to support the decision making process.

Appendix 4: Major steps when conducting a travel cost (TC) study

A hand-book example of the steps in conducting a travel cost study is given in Champ et al. (2003), from which a brief overview with comments is given below.

Step 1: Definition of the study area

The first step in any TC study is to define the study site. The study site or sites should be defined as strictly as possible, for example, a particular river or a small group of lakes. The required scale of the study helps to define the size of sites to be analysed. In some cases a regional scale is enough to aggregate recreation benefits, but if the value-effect from change in an environmental attribute is studied, the size of study sites should be kept small enough so that enough variation in the sample is maintained for estimation purposes. If the site is loosely defined, it will cause benefit estimates to be unclear, especially in cases where the evaluated sites are neighbouring each other. For multiple site studies, the general study area should be decided before identifying the sites. For example, it may be decided that sites within a hundred kilometres or two hours from the study population's residences are viable substitutes for each other. The limitation is important, since otherwise the researcher may find himself in a situation where an individual has hundreds of substitute sites, for which the researcher needs to find information.

Step 2: Definition of recreational activities to study

The second step is to define the recreational activities of interest, and the time-scale of the study. When benefits from a recreational activity, like fishing, motivates the study instead of site-specific value, the second step will be the first to take, after which the study area will be defined along with recreation sites inside that area. For these types of studies, a multiple-site approach is better than a single-site study. Clear definition of the recreational activity and season may sound trivial, but in fact it may affect results drastically. For example, in countries with ice cover on inland lakes during winter, the population of ice anglers exhibit different behaviour than summer-anglers. If this is not taken into account, it may severely bias the study results. By clear definition it is not only meant that different fishing methods should be distinguished, but more importantly it should be recognized that people may participate in other types of recreational activities at the same time. If a person primarily fishes but also swims at the site, allocating all the benefits from the visit to fishing would give too high of an estimate of fishing benefits. This is a larger problem with longer trips. If people stay at a site for long stretches of time, it is likely that they will participate in other recreation activities, thus making it problematic to estimate accurate benefits for one specific activity without extensive data. Many studies limit their scope to one-day visits to overcome these problems. Surveys may also be designed to elicit information about other activities during the visit, enabling better estimations through statistical methods.

Step 3: Formation of sampling strategy

The sampling strategy, as the third step, is an important decision affecting the results which can be obtained from the study. There are two options for sampling in general: on-site and off-site sampling. On-site sampling means that the researcher intercepts people at the site of interest and interviews them either orally or using a written survey. The advantages of this approach are that people that actually have visited the site will be caught in the sample and that people may be instructed to fill out the survey correctly. For small, single-site studies this approach may be the best since it could be cheaper than mass mailing of questionnaires. On-site sampling is, however, costly for larger surveys, especially with multiple sites, and requires the site to be such that visitors are easily reached. In practice this means that the study site requires clear points of entry. On-site surveys also tend to obtain information from people who visit the site more often because these people are more likely to be present at the time of interview. This caveat inflates the benefit estimates if not corrected at the model estimation stage. Another important caveat of on-site sampling is that it ignores reasons for non-participation. Off-site sampling with large scale surveys gathering information from both visitors and non-visitors gives light to the reasons why some

people do not visit the site. The important aspect of non-visitors is the group of potential visitors who opt not to visit because of, for instance, too high costs or lacking site quality. Understanding these underlying reasons gives greater comprehension of attainable benefits with changing environmental quality or travel costs. Off-site sampling tends to be costly because it needs a large sample of people. A mail survey with a return envelope has been quoted to cost over 4 Euros per questionnaire in Finland, while the response rate to mailed questionnaires ranges between 40 % and 70 %. On the other hand, a survey of similar size conducted with face-to-face interviews is likely to be much more expensive. In the case that a government agency holds a list of recreational visitors to a site, like purchasers of fishing permits, it is possible to conduct a targeted off-site survey. It is thus important to be aware of existing lists of recreationists and also prior surveys which may give additional insight to the study.

Step 4: Survey design and implementation

After a sampling strategy has been decided it is time to design and conduct a survey. At this time it should be known if also alternative, already existing, databases could be used to supplement the survey. For example, fishing permit holder data may exist, or there may have been useful prior surveys conducted in the area. It must be also noted that substantial survey cost savings can be accrued by combining a TC survey with other surveys to be conducted in the area of interest. Careful survey design is very important; once the data has been collected it is very hard to improve. Survey design benefits from pilot testing of the survey. Depending on the complexity of the study, designing a good survey with a pilot study may take two to four months, and the final survey along with coding the responses to a usable form may take up to half a year. In a TC study the most important questions asked are about the frequency of trips to the site of interest, and possibly to substitute sites, with information on the travel costs. To evaluate fishing benefits, it is imperative that the fish catch and quality per visit are also reported in the survey. Champ et al. (2003) note that it is prudent to ask specific questions only from the last visit to the site, since it is hard for people to remember small details of possibly many fishing trips. Due to the same reason, it is also recommended to conduct surveys just after the season so that the visits are still fresh in the minds of respondents. With continuously collected panel data these problems will not exist as such, but such extensive data collection is rare. Respondent information should include basic socio-economic data, like income, employment, location of residence, family composition, and personal attributes. With a small inclusion to the survey it is also possible to attempt to value changes in site characteristics, like better catch. In this case the respondent will be asked to project the number of future visits to the site, given the current quality and with a better quality. An article by Whitehead et al. (2000) has studied this type of addition.

Step 5: Estimation


After the data collection, demand for fishing will be estimated using econometric methods. With careful preparation in the earlier stages of the study, it is possible to reduce the time spent in the actual estimation. First estimates can be acquired fast thanks to computers, but the validation of the models and deeper insights from the data require time. The first estimates may be far off from the final, publishable, results.

Appendix 5: Table of total economic value (TEV) of recreational fishing in the Nordic countries

In the study, contingent valuation method (CVM) was used to estimate the two TEVs, which measures only net social benefit, consumer surplus, and excludes actual expenditure. In the table below, the figures of columns 3 and 4 are relatively close to one another. The use value of anglers (column 1) added with the non-use value of the non-anglers (column 2) is relatively close to the whole population's WTP for the current state of fish stocks and quality of recreational fishing. This again, column 4, compared to actual expenditure of anglers in each country is in Denmark 415 %, Finland 79 %, Iceland 100 %, Norway 95 % and in Sweden 92 %. These percentages reflect the participation percentages in the respective countries.

	Use value 1	Non-use value 2	TEV 3=1+2	TEV 4
	Fisher's extra WTP for their fishing experience	Non-angler's WTP for current state of fish stocks and current quality of recreational fishing		Fisher's and non- angler's WTP for current state of fish stocks and current quality of recreational fishing
1999 million				
Denmark DKK	248	1650	1898	2150
Finland FIM	501	493	994	967
Iceland ISK	591	1190	1781	1950
Norway NOK	1020	761	1781	1750
Sweden SEK	1030	1400	2430	2500
exchange rate September 2008				
1999 million				
7,46 Denmark euro	33,3	221,2	254,5	288,3
5,95 Finland euro	84,3	82,9	167,2	162,6
131,33 Iceland euro	4,5	9,1	13,6	14,8
8,16 Norway euro	125,1	93,3	218,4	214,6
9,56 Sweden euro	107,7	146,4	254,1	261,4
	354,8	552,9	907,7	941,7
consumer price index September 2008 / December 1999 (Finland) =125,9/105,5				
1,19 2008 million				
Denmark euro	39,7	264,0	303,7	344,0
Finland euro	100,6	98,9	199,5	194,1
Iceland euro	5,4	10,8	16,2	17,7
Norway euro	149,2	111,3	260,6	256,0
Sweden euro	128,5	174,7	303,2	312,0
	423,4	659,8	1 083,2	1 123,8

Appendix 6: The Questionnaire used in the study “Economic value of recreational fishery in the Nordic countries”



Nordiska Ministerrådet
Pohjoismaiden ministerineuvosto
Norræna ráðherranefndin

Questionnaire

“Economic value of recreational fishery in the Nordic countries”

NATURE AND ENVIRONMENT

1. What is your personal relationship to nature and any kind of outdoor recreation? Tick your choice.

	Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know
1.1. I like outdoor recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2. Nature and environment are important issues to me	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3. I prefer to do things other than outdoor recreation during my free time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4. Man can be well off without ever going out to nature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ARE YOU A RECREATIONAL FISHERMAN ?

2. Did you go fishing for recreation at least once during the last 12 months? Tick your choice.

- 2.1. Yes. **Continue with question 3.**
- 2.2. No, but somebody in our household did. **Please, go to question number 12.**
- 2.3. No and nobody in our household fish for recreation. **Please, go to question number 12.**

WHAT KIND OF A FISHERMAN ARE YOU ?

3. How would you describe your hobby? Would you consider yourself to be an / a (only one choice!)

- 3.1. Sports fisherman (use mainly rod and line)
- 3.2. Subsistence fisherman (use mainly gill nets or other standing gear)
- 3.3. Generalist (use all sorts of gear)
- 3.4. Occasional angler (This not for Sweden!!)

FISHING AREA AND ACTIVITY

4. By a fishing day we mean "a day when you carry out fishing activities, regardless of how many hours per day". Approximately how many fishing days did you have during the last 12 months?

_____ days. How many of these days were you ice-fishing? _____ days.

5. How many of these fishing days did you spend in coastal and sea areas, rivers and lakes? Write "0" for the types of fishing you did not perform.

5.1. Coastal and sea area _____ fishing days

5.2. Rivers _____ fishing days

5.3. Lakes _____ fishing days

6. Thinking of the fishing experience you have had in these three areas; how would you rank them (the one you like the most and 3 the one you like the least)?

6.1. Coastal and sea area Rank

6.2. Rivers Rank

6.3. Lakes Rank

FISHING EXPENSES

7. Approximately how much money did you use during the last 12 months on your recreational fishing? Please fill in the form below. If you had no expense on an item, please write "0" Kr. DO NOT count costs of items that last for many years, e.g. gear (rods, nets), fishing clothes and boats.

- 7.1. Automobile transportation to fishing site (fuel, rental cars, road tolls) _____ Kr.
7.2. Boating (fuel, other operating expenses, rental costs etc.) _____ Kr.
7.3. Other transportation to fishing site (ferry, air plane, train etc.) _____ Kr.
7.4. Lodging _____ Kr.
7.5. Licences and annual membership fees _____ Kr.
7.6. Fishing journals, books, videos, CD-roms ... _____ Kr.
7.7. Extraordinary food and drink expenses _____ Kr.
(above what you would have spent anyway)
7.8. Other expenses _____ Kr.
please, specify _____

Please add up your fishing expenses the last 12 months, and write the total below:

TOTAL _____ Kr.

THE NEXT QUESTIONS ARE IMPORTANT TO US - PLEASE, THINK CAREFULLY

The next questions may be difficult to answer and they will certainly require careful consideration. We ask them in order to get some insight into the Nordic people's attitudes towards and valuation of recreational fisheries. In giving your reply, please consider the income of your household. Remember that if you use money on this, you will have less money to use for other things.

8. Think about the experience you had during your recreational fishing the last 12 months, and what it is worth to you to have this experience. Do you think your experience is worth more to you than you paid? What is the **most** you would almost certainly pay **in addition to** what you now spend (see question 7) before you would stop going to the fishing sites you now use? By "almost certain" I mean that the amount you are 95 % certain you would pay

_____ Kr / year **in addition to** what I already pay to have the same recreational fishing experience I had the last 12 months.

9. Imagine that there was a **stream** near your home which for many years had been closed for recreational fishing. It is a clean, scenic and quiet area with a stream with high water quality. The stream has a natural stock of **salmon and sea trout**, which allows for an above average chance of catching these fish species.

Imagine that the stream is opened up for recreational fishing with rod and line. Due to the sensitivity of the area, the number of anglers / sports fishermen will be restricted. To get access you will have to pay a rent which would grant you a 12 month right to fish in this stream. This money is needed to maintain the stream in its current condition.

The rental scheme will be administered through a local fund in your local county council. A board where you are represented by one of the participating anglers/fishermen will take the day to day decisions on the maintenance plan for the stream.

Think of what it is worth to you to be able to fish in this stream. What is the most you would be willing to pay as an annual rent to be granted access to fish in the stream?

The table below lists some amounts. Start at the top of the table by asking yourself: Would I *certainly pay*, *almost certainly pay*, *be unsure*, *almost certainly not pay* or *certainly not pay* 100 Kr., and put a cross in the alternative that best represents your answer. Ask the same question for 300 Kr etc., and continue all the way down the list to the highest amount (20.000 Kr). Only *one* tick for *each* amount is allowed.

	I would certainly pay	I would almost certainly pay	I am unsure	I would almost certainly not pay	I would certainly not pay
100 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
300 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
500 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
700 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What is the most you would *almost certainly* pay as an annual rent before you would decide not to go fishing in this "new" river? _____ Kr./ year

Write "0" Kr. if you are not willing to pay anything. If "0 Kr.", can you explain why?

10. Now, **instead** imagine there was a **lake** near your home which for many years had been closed for recreational fishery. It is a clean, scenic and quiet area with a lake with high water quality. The lake has a natural stock of **pike, perch and pike-perch**, which allows for an above average chance of catching these fish species.

Imagine that the lake is opened up for recreational fishing with rod and line. Due to the sensitivity of the area, the number of anglers / sports fishermen will be restricted. To get access you will have to pay a rent which would grant you a 12 month exclusive right to fish in this lake. This money is needed to maintain the lake in its current condition.

The rental scheme will be administered by a local fund in your local county council. A board where you are represented by one of the participating anglers / fishermen will take the day to day decisions regarding the maintenance plan for the lake.

Think of what it is worth to you to be able to fish in this lake. What is the most you would be willing to pay as an annual rent to be granted access to fish in this lake?

	I would certainly pay	I would almost certainly pay	I am unsure	I would almost certainly not pay	I would certainly not pay
100 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
300 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
500 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
700 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What is the most you would *almost certainly* pay as an annual rent before you would decide not to go fishing in this "new" lake? _____ Kr/ year

Write "0" Kr if you are not willing to pay anything. If "0 Kr" , can you explain why?

11. Now, **instead** imagine there was a **lake** near your home which for many years had been closed for recreational fishery. It is a clean, scenic and quiet area with a lake with high water quality. The lake has a natural stock of **grayling, brown trout and arctic char**, which allows for an above average chance of catching these fish species.

Imagine that the lake is opened up for recreational fishing with rod and line. Due to the sensitivity of the area, the number of anglers / sports fishermen will be restricted. To get access you will have to pay a rent which would grant you a 12 month exclusive right to fish in this lake. This money is needed to maintain the lake in its current condition

The rental scheme will be administered by a local fund in your local county council. A board where you are represented by one of the participating anglers / fishermen will take the day to day decisions regarding the maintenance plan for the lake.

Think of what it is worth to you to be able to fish in this lake. What is the most you would be willing to pay as an annual rent to be granted access to fish in this lake?

Fill in the table below, in the same way you filled in the table in the previous two questions

	I would certainly pay	I would almost certainly pay	I am unsure	I would almost certainly not pay	I would certainly not pay
100 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
300 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
500 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
700 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What is the most you would *almost certainly* pay as an annual rent before you would decide not to go fishing in this "new" lake? _____ Kr. / year

Write "0" Kr. if you are not willing to pay anything. If "0 Kr." , can you explain why?

12. We would like you to answer the next questions **even if you did not fish yourself**. Those that did fish the last 12 months should of course also answer the questions.

Natural fish stocks in the Nordic countries are threatened in several ways. Low water quality, regulation of water level, barriers to fish and other fauna migration (weirs, dams etc.), reduced water flow due to hydro power development, eutrophication due to emissions of nutrients from agriculture, industry and household sewage, acid rain, fish parasites and diseases; all influence the state of fish stocks. If no action is taken, we will loose our natural freshwater fish stocks.

International agreements to reduce transboundary pollution and national programs to combat the threats specific to each country are now designed. This will cost money. Part of the costs will have to be paid by the taxpayers in each country as an additional income tax. Think what it is worth to you to preserve the natural fish stocks we now have.

The costs are uncertain. The table below lists some possible annual costs to you. What is the most you are willing to pay annually as an increase in income taxes to finance the programs that would preserve the current fish stocks and current quality of recreational fishing in the Nordic countries?

The table below lists some amounts. Start at the top of the table by asking yourself: Would I *certainly pay*, *almost certainly pay*, *almost certainly not pay* or *certainly not pay* 100 Kr., and put a cross in the alternative that best represents your answer. Ask the same question for 300 Kr. etc., and continue all the way down the list to the highest amount (20.000 Kr). Only *one* tick for *each* amount is allowed.

	I would certainly pay	I would almost certainly pay	I am unsure	I would almost certainly not pay	I would certainly not pay
100 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
300 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
500 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
700 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20 000 Kr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What is the most you would *almost certainly* pay as an additional annual income tax to preserve the current natural fish stocks in the Nordic countries? _____kr/ year

Write "0" Kr if you are not willing to pay anything. If "0 Kr" , can you explain why?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This background information will only be used for statistical purposes and will be kept strictly confidential. We need this information in order to explain how the Nordic people's attitude and value of their fish stocks and recreational fishing vary between and within the countries.

13. Year of birth? 19

14. Gender? 1. male 2. female

15. How many persons are there in your household including yourself? persons

A household is a group of people living in the same address and using the same refrigerator

16. How many of your household members (including yourself) fish for recreation? persons

17. What is your residential environment like. Would you describe it as

1. urban 2. semi-urban 3. rural

18. How many years of education do you have?

1. 10 years or less 2. 11 - 13 years 3. 14 years or more

19. Approximately how much will you and your household earn in gross income (i.e. before income taxes) in 1999. Please state the expected income to the nearest 10 000 Kr.?

In 1999 my household (including myself) will earn about _____ Kr.

My personal income in 1999 will be about _____ Kr.

In case you do not want to state the amount, please tick the proper interval for

Household income

Personal income

0 - 200 000 Kr.

0 - 100 000 Kr.

200 000 - 400 000 Kr.

100 000 - 200 000 Kr.

400 000 - 700 000 Kr.

200 000 - 300 000 Kr.

700 000 - 1 000 000 Kr.

300 000 - 500 000 Kr.

1 000 000 - Kr.

500 000 - Kr.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS SURVEY.

If you have further comments and/or questions, you can use the space below:

The Methodologies for assessing socio-economic benefits of European inland recreational fisheries were prepared in 2009 by the European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission (EIFAC) Ad Hoc Working Party on Socio-Economic Aspects of Inland Fisheries. EIFAC considered that the implementation of fisheries policy and management would benefit from a more compatible, comparable and scientifically rigorous application of benefit evaluation methods. These Methodologies were officially endorsed by the twenty-sixth session of EIFAC, which was held in Zagreb, Croatia in the period 17-20 May 2010.

