

#### Looking at birds to make sense of climate change and of other changes too...?

Anne Sourdril, Emilie Andrieu, Marc Deconchat, Cécile Barnaud, Cécile Gazo

#### ▶ To cite this version:

Anne Sourdril, Emilie Andrieu, Marc Deconchat, Cécile Barnaud, Cécile Gazo. Looking at birds to make sense of climate change and of other changes too...?. 77. Annual SFAA Meeting, Mar 2017, Santa Fé, Mexico. 17 p. hal-01605509

HAL Id: hal-01605509

https://hal.science/hal-01605509

Submitted on 5 Jun 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



# Documenting the perceptions of environmental changes through local indicators

- Context: Rural and periurban areas are affected by global environmental changes that are not always easy to perceive for local communities.
- Background: Researchs have been done on local indicators through ethnosciences to document indigenous knowledge on changes and adaptation attempts (Berlin, 1992; Veteto & Carlson, 2014; Crate & Nuttall, 2009).
- Indicators are linked to knowledge, empiric experience and historical expertises of the land and depend on cultural and individual characteristics (Crate & Nuttall, 2016; Orlove et al., 2003).
- Questions in the litterature: Indicators, but for who and of what (global) changes (Dounias, 2007)? How local indicators vary among time, people, sites (Orlove et al., 2010)?








Trees, plants, birds: what is a local « indicator »?

### Objectives of the research (within the ANR PIAF) Looking at birds to make sense of changes?


(Migratory) Birds known as good indicators of socio-economic, environmental changes, climate change and seasonal variations for naturalists what about local residents?





- 1. Are / What are / How are the diagnostics of environmental and socio-economic changes built at a local scale through birds observations? What relevant changes will be shown through those observations for local people (climate change?)?
- 2. Do the local diagnostics and relevant birds indicators vary depending on the connexion of local societies to the environment and the changes experienced? What does that tell us about ethno-ornithological knowledge at a local scale?
- > Work in progress: we are sharing first results here.

# Birds as indicators in South-Western France? From protected to urban areas



- South-western France: LTSER site known (by ecologists and social scientists) since 1980's,
- Urban / Rural / Protected areas: house-centered system, mixed-farming AND sociological changes (rural exodus, peri-urbanisation & arrival of new comers),
- **Ethnographic investigations**: semi-directed interviews, freelists, observations...

150 interviews: old timers & new comers (arrived in the



## Freelisting & ethnography: Between qualitative and quantitative analysis

- Informants in the 3 sites were asked to list all the birds species they knew, then to comment on the changes affecting the birds within (or outside) the list (See Borgatti, 1999, Winkler-Rhoades, 2011),
- The lists are currently analyzed for their underlying dimensionality and for the typicality of the cited birds names for statistical matter and within the FLAME software (Wencelius et al., in press),
- Interviews linked to the list are analyzed and compared to understand the local knowledge and perceptions of changes of individuals and of the local society.

A. F.	Laurianne G.L.		
Pie	Flamant_Rose	Pigeon	
Pinson	Mouette	Colombe	
Aigle	Pigeon	Perruche	
Chouette	Moineau Perroquet		
Buse	Perroquet Martin_Pêcheu		
Mouette	Poule	Goéland	
Colibri	Coq	Rouge_Gorge	
Perroquet	Rossignol	Pivert	
Perruche	Rouge_Gorge	je Mésange	
Mésange	Héron Tourterelle		
Corbeau	Pélican Faucon		
Pigeon	Corbeau	Pie	
Palombe	Pie Hibou		
Coucou	Tourterelle Colvert		
Hirondelle	Pivert Héron		
Grue	Poussin	ussin Buse	
Cigogne	Aigle Colibri		
	Buse	Chouette	
	Perruche	Aigle	

Example of freelists done in the urban fieldsite (Gazo, 2016)

#### Main hypothesis to be tested

- Hypothesis 1: Main local indicators should be migratory birds in all the sites and will show how local residents diagnose climatic and seasonal variations making them more familiar to global environmental issues such as climate change,
- Hypothesis 2: Local knowledge about other birds and associated diagnostics will vary among the 3 sites. Residents from protected and rural area will have a more accurate knowledge on birds species and will be more concerned about biodiversity erosion than urban people that will cite less species.







From specific to more generalist cited species and knowledge?




### H1: Local residents focused their discourses: Not on migratory birds but on « undesired » species



Starling

Eurasian magpie

### H1: They also talked about: Endangered local, « patrimonial » & « game » species



### H1: What about migratory birds? Signs of CC or rural exodus and seasonal variations?

Mentions of migratory birds as indicators of seasonal and atmospheric variations that are not directly linked to climate changes. Changes in migratory birds behaviour are often linked to other environmental as well as sociological changes (changes in agricultural practices for example),





Changes in migratory patterns linked to seasonal variations and transformation of crop farming.

#### Birds indicating the main perceived changes: Rural exodus & change in agricultural practices

Fieldsite	Con	sequences of rural exodus	Main Birds Indicators	
Peri-Urban		Urbanisation	Decrease of passerines, increase of undesired bird	
Rural		Opening of landscape	Decrease of game species changes in migratory bird patterns	
		Closing of landscape	Decrease of patrimonial birds and/or game specie	

#### H2: Comparison among the 3 sites Talking about birds to talk about sociological changes?







More patrimonial species cited

More undesired species cited

PROTECTED Gyps fulvus Vautour fauve Parus ; Aegith: Mésanges Aquila chrysae Aigles Gypaetus bart Gypaète Turdus merula Merle Passer domes Moineau Corvus Tetrao urogallu Grand Tetra Pica pica Pie Columba palu Palombes

Hirundo ; Ripa Hirondelles

RURAL Buteo buteo Buse Columba palu Palombe Passer domes Moineaux Columba livia Pigeon Corbeaux/com Hirundo ; Ripa Hirondelles Carduelis card Chardonnet Erithacus rube Rouge-Gorge Perdrix perdrix Perdrix Pica pica Pie

URBAN Columba livia Pigeon Aquila chrysacAigles Hirundo; Ripa Hirondelles Chroicocephal Mouettes Pica pica Pie Parus : Aegith Mésanges Passer domes Moineaux Streptopelia d Tourterelle Buteo buteo Buse Erithacus rubeRouge-Gorge

10 most local species cited per sites:

More emblematic species cited in the protected area, no local game species cited in urban area.

### H2: Comparison among the 3 sites Talking about birds reveals uses and knowledge (1/2)?








More local species cited

More exotic species cited



Unexpected: each informant cited in mean more species in the urban area and they cited more exotic and domestic species.

This figure unvalidates the second part of our hypothesis: people in the cities do NOT know less local wild species than the others.

Average number of species cited per informant per site

### H2: Comparison among the 3 sites Talking about birds reveals uses and knowledge (2/2)?








More diverse freelists / more specific species

More homogeneous freelists / more generalist species




However in urban area, informants cite fewer species and they cite more generalist species: they all cite the same common species, whereas in rural and protected area each FL contains more specificities and diversities: more uses and detailed knowledge on birds species in the protected and rural areas due to agricultural way of life and connexion to the land?

#### Conclusions and perspectives: Refining and comparing the categories

#### Conclusions and main results:

- Birds: good signs of seasonal and atmospheric variations but mostly of sociological, land cover and land-uses changes: environmental and sociological changes can not be dissociated,
- Residents in **protected and rural area** do not know more species than the urban residents but have a **more detailed knowledge** of the species features due to agricultural connexions to the land and its biodiversity.
- Work in progess: more analysis to come to compare the sites within a gradient of changes, uses and knowledge and more analysis to come within each fieldsite, between types of informants (native/non-native etc.), or birds features (small/big birds; day/night birds etc.).
- Perspectives: Research done within a larger ANR research program: (how) are birds perceived as local indicators in other local communities from countries from the South and from the North? What about other indicators of changes? And what is an « indicator »?

### Perspectives: local vs scientific diagnostics? Indicators for who and of what changes (bis)?





Contrasted diagnostics between local inhabitants who see more birds and naturalists who count less birds in South-Western France.

What does that tell us about diagnostics of changes, variability of knowledge and the possibility to compare, associate or combine different types of diagnostics within conservation attempts for example?

