

Studying Motivation for Community Engagement: Climate Resilience

Upper Valley Adaptation Workgroup (UVAW)

Lillian Eisner, Sam Runkle, Tyler Vandenberg, Snow Kang
Soc 11: Research Methods
Dartmouth College, 2018

INTRODUCTION

The Upper Valley Adaptation Workgroup (UVAW) is a bi-state (Vermont and New Hampshire), multi-stakeholder working group. The UVAW defines its mission as “building climate resilient communities in the Upper Valley through research, information sharing and education.” This mission makes the UVAW incredibly unique: unlike many environmental groups that focus on advocacy for environmental conservation and against climate change, the UVAW focuses on the effects of climate change on individuals and communities. Its mission is not to admonish the Upper Valley community’s residents for causing climate change, but to equip them with the knowledge and skills necessary to adequately respond to its effects. In this way, the UVAW has the ability to reach an audience beyond environmental activists and to anyone interested in maintaining their community’s health, safety, food and resource availability, financial strength, etc—that is, even people who do not believe in climate change as a human-induced phenomena could have reason to join and work with the UVAW.

Currently, however, the UVAW’s main concern is that their audience has reached a point of stagnancy. The UVAW hosts free, three-hour public educational forums focusing on preparedness but find themselves repeatedly “talking in circles” with the same individuals. The ultimate goal of this study, and of the UVAW, as articulated in their 2017 Strategic Plan, is to better understand the motivators necessary to spark currently disengaged Upper Valley community members into climate-resilient actions. The UVAW is looking to expand their reach to break through to climate skeptics and inactive bystanders. Through better understanding motivational tactics—such as championing, argument framing, and brokering—as well as the identities that shape climate resilient opinion—such as prior opinion on climate change,

geographic location, and economic and social identity—this study will seek to aid the UVAW in reaching a larger slice of the Upper Valley community. In doing so, this research aims to aid the UVAW in improving the environmental health and resilience of all communities in the Upper Valley.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Current State Public Opinion and Engagement Regarding Climate Change

Public opinion on climate resilience varies throughout the United States and the Upper Valley, as do the factors that drive these opinions. Unlike other similarly divisive political issues—in which opposing sides agree on the issue’s existence and the basic facts, if not the proposed intervention (e.g. gun violence, poverty, etc.)—there is disagreement about the fundamental facts regarding climate change (Egan and Mullin 2017). In general Americans believe that climate change is a large concern at surprisingly low rates, particularly in comparison to other industrialized nations (Nagel 2011). Whereas 93.3 percent of respondents in industrial nations viewed the “global warming or the greenhouse effect” as a very serious problem in a 2005 to 2008 World Values Survey (WVS), only 32 percent of Americans saw climate change as a “serious potential threat to their lives” in a 2010 Gallup survey (Nagel 2011). Although these are slightly different questions regarding the seriousness of global warming and climate change, these extremely different responses reveal the relatively low concern for climate change in the United States.

Importantly, the public opinion regarding climate change varies greatly across states, localities, and communities (Howe et al. 2015). Nationally, surveys consistently find that around

63 percent of Americans believe in the existence of global climate change and around 47 percent believe that climate change is human-caused (Howe et al. 2015). However, county-level estimates of belief in climate change existence vary massively, ranging from 43 to 80 percent. This extreme variation in public opinion is likely a function of geographic differences in demographics—particularly sociodemographics—cultures, ideologies, political affiliations, personal experiences as well as vulnerability (both financially and environmentally) to the effects of climate change (Howe et al. 2015; Egan and Mullin 2017). Additionally, the literature collected concludes that climate change skepticism stems from low education, low trust in society, conservative values, among other factors. In fact, a large part of skepticism has also been found to stem from religious values (Zhou 2014).

Climate change is moreover an important issue for the Upper Valley. Both heavy rainfall events and flash floods have become more common—and more likely—over the past 20 years (Winter, Huang, and Osterberg, Hongoltz-Hetling 2017). This and other changes in weather patterns have very real consequences for Upper Valley residents and businesses. Although there is little understanding of the public opinion regarding climate change amongst Upper Valley residents, it stands to reason that the same geographic and demographic trends seen throughout the country would hold for this area, specifically differences in opinion based on political ideologies, racial and ethnic composition, rural vs. urban divides, and proximity to a higher education institutions (Howe et al. 2015). The Upper Valley, as a fairly politically, economically, and educationally diverse area of Vermont and New Hampshire likely shows a wide range of political affiliations and opinions on the issue of climate change.

Opinion and Motivation Formation

Individual and public opinions, such as those that relate to climate change, are formed through primary groups (Baur 1960) – groups that are held together by intimate, face-to-face relationships such as a family. As issues increase in public polarization, individuals feel increased pressure to seek clarification and thus turn to their primary group for opinion formation (Baur 1960). Considering the diverse political spectrum of Upper Valley residents and the tendency to form political and public opinions based on primary groups such as families, rather than through fact based persuasion, understanding how opinions form and reform will be important in changing positions and communicating with oppositionists (Baur 1960; Zhou 2016; Anfinson 2018).

The academic literature suggests that climate change skepticism is particularly difficult to change, and in fact may become more entrenched, with the introduction of scientific facts (Zhou 2016; Anfinson 2018). To sidestep some of the shortcomings of factual arguments, researchers have proposed frame dissonance as a potential motivational framework for social engagement and incentivization to act (Shuster and Campos-Castillo 2017). Frame dissonance is a motivational framework in which an organization or cause frames a particular social reality or movement as out of line with an individual's or community's value system and thus motivates them to act against that reality or movement. This is in direct opposition to frame resonance, in which an organization or cause frames a particular social reality or movement as in line with an individual's or community's values thus motivating them to act in support of that reality or movement. Shuster and Campos-Castillo (2017) studied archival data from the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) debate and concluded that frame dissonance, as deployed by the anti-ERA

groups, worked to better incentivize and motivate people than did frame resonance, as deployed by the pro-ERA groups. Furthermore, the motivational power of frame dissonance can be seen in more recent movements such as Black Lives Matter, suggesting that frame dissonance may work to motivate across social issues (Shuster and Campos-Castillo 2017). Argument framing is particularly important in thinking through climate change communication because it is such a politically polarized issue.

Another tactic in intentional opinion formation and motivation is the use of “champions” to persuade targeted groups of people (Anderson and Bateman 2000). Championing is the concept of having one advocate, or “champion,” in a given community, who will then spread a certain message throughout that community. Successful environmental championing has been linked to high interpersonal skills, as well as effective framing and understanding (Anderson and Bateman 2000). Championing may be particularly applicable to climate change communication due to the specific reasons people ignore climate change risks even while knowing the scientific facts that support these risks: lack of trust (Lidskog 1996). Because trust is built on a daily basis people are skeptical to change daily behaviors in the face of environmental risks (Lidskog 1996). Thus using community champions—those who have already built trust within their community—to spread environmental messages may make community members more likely to accept the message.

Influential Factors in Motivation

As discussed previously, there are many factors which influence individuals’ and communities’ opinions and motivation regarding climate change and, more specifically, climate

resilience engagement. Three factors arose consistently in the literature that affected an individual's motivation to participate in climate resilient actions: prior environmental views and values, culture and vulnerability of place, and identity, including socioeconomic status among other metrics (sociodemographic identity).

Prior environmental values and motivation

Entrenched views and values relating to environmental issues is the first and most prevalent factor in determining motivation to engage with climate resilience/change efforts. Scholars debate the relevance of framing in light of the hyperpolarization in the climate change discourse. Nisbet (2010) argues that the gap between the reality of climate change and perception is largely due to problems with framing; many frameworks do not call for swift action against climate change. By contrast, Hoffman (2011) and Zhou (2016) argue that climate change is too polarizing of an issue, and an effort to reframe the discussion will not enhance the argument. One line of argument is that climate change skeptics and advocates are locked in a “logic schism” and “brokers,” which are essentially untouched middle-ground concepts such as technology, are needed to bring the two sides back together (Hoffman 2011). The other, and perhaps more relevant, line of argument is that framing may not have any effect on opinion formation due to the strength of the national climate change discussion, and that political conservatives may be too strong in their position to be swayed (Zhou 2016). Climate change is such a politicized issue that reframing will not sufficiently influence the public. Moreover, pressing governmental or personal action against climate change can have a “boomerang” effect on skeptics, strengthening them in their stance and reducing their open-mindedness (Zhou 2016). This debate highlights the

importance of carefully chosen language and argument framing in the light of the political polarization of environmental views and values.

Culture and vulnerability of place and motivation

An individual's and a community's location, both in the culture of that place and in physical vulnerability to climate change of that land, influence that individual's or community's view on climate change (Howe et al. 2015). For example, the specific social status and history of the Alaskan Native village of Kivalina in the broader context of the United States leaves the people of Kivalina especially vulnerable to the effects of climate change (Shearer 2012). Accordingly, both the environmental vulnerability of a physical location as well as the social vulnerability of its community impact the magnitude of the climate change felt by a given location (Shearer 2012). Moreover, different cultures have different attitudes towards climate change. For instance, Australian citizens exhibit a hesitance to contribute income toward stopping climate change which is often attributed to the country's culture of individuals valuing present over future goods (Everuss, Carvalho, and Casanova 2017). However, this behavior is ill-explained with solely a common assumption and must be researched further (Everuss et al. 2017). Thus, the relationship between culture and environmental views is complex and must be carefully parsed on a case-by-case basis.

Sociodemographic identity and motivation

Sociodemographic identity, which defines an individual's identity as a combination of social, demographic, and financial factors, can affect an individual's views on climate change

and the importance he or she assigns to those views. In light of the 2008 financial crisis, the Great Recession, researchers have sought to understand the relationship between public trust in climate change science and economic anxiety (Scruggs and Benegal 2012; Nagel 2011). Because short-term economic concerns seem to directly compete with long-term environmental concerns, when economic anxiety is heightened, distrust in climate science also tends to heighten (Scruggs and Benegal 2012). This directly ties socioeconomic status and economic anxiety to belief in climate change. This negative relationship between economic strain and climate change complicates the relationship between identity and climate change belief and motivation.

Social background also plays a significant part in determining individuals' environmental attitudes (Tranter 2012). Many environmentally related views appear to have gendered and age-related trends including men tend to be less worried about climate disasters than women, women tend to be less likely to support fuel alternatives than men, and older people tend to be more likely to change behaviors than younger people (Tranter 2012). These trends again complicate the relationship between identity and climate change belief. This is important in understanding the complex formation of climate change views in the Upper Valley, especially because of the variation in socioeconomic status and other demographic measures in this region.

Gap in Current Literature

With many different polarizing views on climate change and climate resilience engagement, it is important to recognize the spectrum of attitudes that appear throughout the United States and within the Upper Valley. While there are climate change deniers, there are also

many people who fall into the categories of “concerned,” “cautious,” and “disengaged” who may be more easily motivated to engage with UVAW (Leiserowitz 2009:3).

The literature overall gives a well-defined picture of the current state of the climate change debate and current climate change movements. There is also much literature on general opinion formation and motivation. However, the vast majority of the literature regarding climate change focuses on opinion formation and argument framing—particularly in relation to climate change skeptics and deniers—as opposed to on motivation to take part and engage in climate resilience actions. What remains to be determined in the literature are ways in which “concerned,” “cautious,” and “disengaged” community members, as opposed to climate change skeptics and deniers, can be motivated to engage in climate resilience efforts. Furthermore, this kind of environmental study has also not been conducted on a local level as opposed to a national or state level.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Using the framework established in “Global Warming’s Six Americas: 2009,” this research will focus on understanding the motivation of three of the six distinct groups of American adults. This study focuses on the Upper Valley residents that fall in the categories of “concerned,” “cautious,” and “disengaged” on issues of climate change which make up 33%, 19% and 12% of the adult US population, respectively and make up 64% of the adult US population combined (Leiserowitz 2009:3). All three of these groups, although not “deniers” of climate change, by definition do not engage with climate change issues. This study will focus on non-deniers because as discussed, pressing personal action against climate change can have a

“boomerang” effect on skeptics, however, pressing those who are not necessarily skeptics may yield more positive results (Zhou 2016).

This study seeks to answer the question: How can the UVAW get the Upper Valley residents who fall into the three categories of “concerned,” “cautious,” or “disengaged” involved and engaged in climate resilience? This specific question is then further broken down into two questions: What motivates Upper Valley residents to social action and engagement? and how might Upper Valley residents be motivated to engage in climate resilience work?

Particular attention will be paid to how prior climate change opinions, specific Upper Valley community, and perceived economic strain affects the kind of motivation necessary to inspire engagement in climate resiliency. Thus, Upper Valley residents engaged in community movements and in government service who are also not currently involved in the work of UVAW will be recruited for in-depth interviews. These interviews will seek to understand the motivations that led to their current involvement in community issues; their prior views on environmental issues and climate change; the economic anxiety and strain they have felt in the past year; and the Upper Valley community in which they live and with which they identify. The relationships we expect to see between these independent variables, and their relationship to our ultimate goal of engagement in climate resilience movements, are demonstrated in the conceptual model included in appendix F. This qualitative information will be used to better understand the participants’ motivations (or lack thereof) to get involved with climate resilience work with the UVAW.

METHODS

Research Design

We believe that a qualitative study involving semi-structured in-depth interviews with carefully selected participants will provide the most useful answers to UVAW's questions. In order to avoid some of the pitfalls of survey methodology in public opinion analysis as articulated by Perrin and McFarland (2011), in-depth interviews will be used. These pitfalls associated with survey methodology include question-wording effects, which may conflict with the comprehension of a question, proxy responses, or obscure responses that participants may select, and priming and framing effects, which may steer individuals in a certain direction when recording their answers, and because the issue of climate change and climate resilience is such a divisive issue in the United States (Howe et al. 2015), these issues may be of particular concern. Semi-structured in-depth interviews are also contextually better than surveys in that they allow participants to set evaluative criteria and define analytic categories for the researcher (Lamont 1992), and essentially let the interviewees respondents guide how we analyze the data. As opposed to using another form of qualitative research such as ethnographic research, in-depth interviews will be used because, according to Lamont, “[semi-structured interviews are] less time-consuming than participant observation” (1992:19). Thus, the most appropriate method for the research inquiry at hand would be the semi-structured in-depth interview.

This study will seek to understand the relationship between several independent variables and active engagement in community movement—ideally climate resilience engagement. The first independent variable is an individual's *prior views about environmental issues* and climate change. This is important because the motivation an individual requires may be dependent on their level of skepticism, for example, framing may be a necessary adjustment to make to

motivate a neutral individual (Nisbet 2010). To get at this question participants will be asked about their relationship with the outdoors and with nature as well as their reaction (in general) to current political policies regarding the environment. These are two separate operationalizations of views on climate change that may reveal differences between political agenda and emotions toward the environment. The second independent variable will be the Upper Valley *community in which the participant lives*, which is important because an individual's community informs their opinion, as argued by Howe et al. (2015). This information, along with survey data about regions of the Upper Valley, may provide important information about the individual's social, political and economic environment. This is related to the third independent variable, which is the participant's *perceived economic anxiety and strain*, which is relevant, because economic anxiety and distrust in climate science are correlated (Scruggs and Benegal 2012; Nagel 2011). The researcher will ask the participant about their experience in the last year with economic worries and strain to operationalize this independent variable. Finally, and most importantly, the research will aim to understand the kind of *motivation* that will directly affect the dependent variable of involvement with social and community work. To get at these variables, the participants will be asked to talk about their personal values, their perceived community values, and to describe their work and their motivation for that work. At the end of the interview, the participants will be asked more directly how they would be motivated to participate in climate change and climate resilience work. A more detailed proposed interview questionnaire is included in the Appendix.

This study takes an inductive, exploratory, applied research approach in which it attempts to understand what kinds of motivation for the people in the Upper Valley community work to

get those community members involved in action. This study will attempt to create a theory that surrounds that effort, so that the theory can be applied to better understand the motivation that will suit this specific Upper Valley environment.

Participants and Sampling

The participants in this study will be Upper Valley residents engaged in community movements and in government service, such as city and town halls that are not currently involved in the work of UVAW. This will be a non-probability, purposive sample, meaning that the sample gathered is not random, and will be picked at the researchers' own judgement, as the participants will be hand selected. This is appropriate because it will allow us to have in-depth interviews only with people that will have meaningful answers to questions about motivations to work in public service or in social and community projects. Also, because people who work at city and town halls will be specifically targeted as participants, it will be important to have representations from across the Upper Valley area, such as from town and city hall governments.

In order to contact selected participants, the researchers at UVAW will send emails to government officials and bureaucrats as well as to other community participants involved in projects at Vital Communities. These involved community members will be accessible to UVAW as it is housed at Vital Communities and is thus situated in this network. Participants will be given information via email about the nature and purpose of the study and asked to voluntarily participate. We suggest that the UVAW use a private email account that is solely dedicated to communicating with potential interviewees to maintain and ensure privacy and

security. Because interviews will be carried out face-to-face, interviews will be secured by setting a time and place to meet the interviewer.

This will be a cross-sectional study with in-depth interviews carried out over one, ideally short, time period, and analyzed as such. Because this is not a random sample of individuals in the Upper Valley and of these specific Upper Valley communities, it is important to note that the information gathered will not necessarily be generalizable to the entire local population. While in-depth interviews may provide good data for theoretical generalizations and the development of inductive reasoning, they do not provide good data for generalizability to a specific population (Dixon 2016:283). However, because this is an inductive research project, a potential theory may be developed by the information collected and this theory may be tested in a more generalizable way in future research (such as with a follow up survey in about a year or so). The reliability and validity of the independent and dependent measures are both mitigated by the fact that an in-depth interview allows for the participants to create the standards of evaluation and “let interviewees themselves describe their standards of evaluation and lead the researcher toward the most appropriate analytical categories” (Lamont: 18). Much of the burden of ensuring reliability and validity--in this, as with all qualitative research methods--will fall on the researcher and her ability to separate her personal biases from the analysis and interpretation of the data (Dixon: 284).

This method is an in-depth interview with a semi-structured format. These interviews will be confidential, and should take about one hour. The interviewer will have a list of questions and prompts, and will be recording the interviews with a tape recorder or with an application on their smartphone. This will allow the researcher to jot down initial thoughts about the given prompts

and also to go back into deeper analysis of the participants responses. These interviews will be held at the time and place of the participant's choosing. Lamont describes carrying out interviews "at work, in the garden, at the cafe," etc. which will be modeled in this in-depth interview methodology (18). Ideally, all of the interviews would be carried out by the same interviewer. More realistically, these interviews would be carried out with a standardized script, questions, prompts, and procedures. That being said, the interview script is meant to be a guide and there is intentional flexibility in the sequencing of questions, as well as the additions of questions and/or follow ups during the interview process. It is critically important to allow the participant to carry the conversation in a way that is comfortable for them, and for the interviewer to be aware of their presentation to the participant. Lamont describes attempting to present "a blurred professional identity" to make the participants less wary of authority and in order to "minimize distortion effects" (19). In the context of the Upper Valley, the interviewer must be careful to present a neutral and unassuming demeanor, particularly on the polarizing topic of climate change and climate resilience. We have included a guide for in-depth interview conduct as well as to a proposed, standardized procedural method in the Appendix. This will attempt to mitigate the influence of the interviewer's personality and their relationship to the material. Moreover, the interviewer is encouraged to practice the interview process a few times before conducting an interview to collect data for analysis. That way the interviewer can become comfortable with the interview guide and the format of semi-structured in-depth interviews.

Data Analysis

Directly following each interview any notes taken during the interview, often called field jottings, will be expanded into detailed field notes, methodological notes, personal notes, and theoretical notes (FN, MN, PN, TN). These notes will then be turned into a theoretical memo that summarizes the important points and patterns of the particular interview conducted, that will be used later as a reference for that interview. A more detailed guide to the creation of field notes and theoretical memos is attached to the appendix.

The collected interview recordings will then be transcribed into a written form of the interview, including all verbal and auditory phenomena such as pauses and rephrasings. An example transcription, from an interview using this interview guide, is included in the appendix as a reference. Transcription technology such as Express Scribe can be used to ease the time-intensive transcription process. After three to five interviews conducted, the theoretical memos, field notes, and interview transcriptions will be consulted to create a coding scheme to better identify the patterns and/or themes in the qualitative data. These codes will be conceptual themes (as opposed to numbers as in survey data) (Dixon 2016:280). Importantly, these codes will not be predetermined and will rather be determined as part of the inductive analysis of the interview data, because the codes must be re-evaluated and adjusted as new interviews are conducted and new themes emerge. The coding scheme will be evaluated and potentially adjusted or expanded after every three to five additional interviews. Based on the literature review, potential codes may include motivation inspired by primary group experiences and motivation for financial security. Once coding schemes have been established, illustrative quotes and narratives will be selected from the interview transcriptions as data, themes and patterns will emerge to construct theoretical answers to the research question.

It is difficult to predict the results of this inductive research because of the lack of grass-roots environmental campaigns and social movements (Nisbet 2010). This study will be attempting to fill in the gap in research of how to understand the relationship between motivation and climate resilience campaigns, such as the project of UVAW.

Strengths and Weaknesses of this Methodology

The major strength of this research method is that it would allow for a natural inductive research inquiry as well as for a in-depth understanding of personal experiences and motivations. Another major strength of this selected methodology is that it avoids the pitfalls of similar methodologies, such as a survey method, that may perpetuate biases about climate change based on political leaning, etc.

The major limitations of this methodology are: the time and man power required to thoughtfully carry out semi-structured in-depth interviews; the difficulty in analyzing the volume of data obtained; the limited generalizability of the findings, once analyzed. Because UVAW only has one paid employee and that employee does not work full hours, it will be difficult to balance all of the work that needs to be done to successfully run this kind of study. Also, because of these limitations in funding and personnel, it may be difficult to create a consistent and uniform interview structure and practice due to the reality of having multiple interviewers, etc. This, as a result, may call into question the validity and reliability of the data obtained and subsequently analyzed. However, if done with care and consistency, this methodology will provide great data for the inductive research question presented.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This proposal adheres to the guidelines set forth by the Belmont Report to ensure the protection of research participants; its three ethical principles are respect for persons, beneficence, and justice, which call for researchers to consider informed consent, risk/benefit assessment, and the selection of subjects of research. Many recommendations set forth below apply to multiple principles even if they are only explicitly addressed in relation to one principle.

The first principle of the Belmont Report is respect for persons: treating individuals as autonomous agents and protecting those with diminished autonomies. It is essential that the researchers guarantee the participants understand and consent to giving and receiving all relevant information. Particularly because some topics addressed in this study—political opinions, economic standing, and family—may be too personal for some people and stressful to interview about, the researchers will take special precautions to make sure participants understand the nature of the questions we will be asking and are cognizant of their ability to opt out of any (or all) of the questions as they choose. There is no aspect of the research that needs to be withheld until the research is concluded, so full disclosure should be given at the onset. To ensure consent and understanding, a consent form is included in the Appendix that allows potential research subjects to choose whether or not to participate after being informed of the study's nature and extent in an organized and comprehensive manner. The form includes the structure of the study, the purpose, the contents, the risks and anticipated benefits, the ways the study will protect subjects' privacies, as well as a point of contact should the participants still have questions/concerns. In addition to the consent form, the interviewer should remind participants of the study's voluntary nature as included in the Interview Guide, also in the appendix.

The second principle of the Belmont Report is beneficence: abiding by the maxim “do no harm” and maximizing benefits while minimizing risks. For instance, because of the huge impact Tropical Storm Irene had on the Upper Valley region in 2011 there is a possibility that some of our research participants (Upper Valley community members) were directly affected by the storm and could be harmed by talking about it. For this, and other sensitive topics, the interviewer should practice navigating the topic carefully and give warnings preemptively.

The third principle of the Belmont Report is justice: fairly distributing costs and benefits. Although the UVAW advocates for climate resiliency and may be inclined to favor those who share their beliefs, researchers must treat everyone equally and fairly regardless of their views. Researchers involved in this study need to be respectful of the discrepancies between political opinion and varying education levels across the Upper Valley and make sure not only that they do not offend anyone in this process, but also that they sympathize with roots of various viewpoints. In order to protect the participant, it will be important to have interviewers who are equipped to listen and communicate sensitively with the participants. Choosing interviewers carefully and/or training interviewers on sensitivity will ensure justice is met.

Because we have proposed in-depth interviews with community leaders, elected officials, and government workers, it may be difficult to ensure privacy for our participants; there are relatively few of these figureheads in the Upper Valley, so participants would be fairly easy to identify. The answers to personal questions will be especially easy to trace back to the participant. To maximize privacy, participants will be given pseudonyms and interview data will be kept on a secure thumb drive in a locked file cabinet, to which only the researchers have the key. Furthermore, confidentiality may be ensured by not sharing information with anyone

outside of the UVAW without the participants' permission. Because the research for our community partner would be internal research as opposed to research for an academic paper, it would be possible to ensure confidentiality by not publishing or sharing the collected data with anyone outside of the community partner organization at all.

FEASIBILITY AND SIGNIFICANCE

Through background research and communications with volunteers of the UVAW, the issue of bringing in Upper Valley community members who have yet to get involved with climate resiliency emerged as the most pressing challenge facing the organization today. This proposal aims to identify ways to motivate currently disengaged community members in climate-resilient actions by interviewing potential "messengers."

The proposed design is specifically tailored to feasibly address this goal of the UVAW given their resources. For example, the proposed participants of the study are Upper Valley government officials and bureaucrats, as well as individuals involved in other projects at Vital Communities. These proposed participants contact information should be accessible to the UVAW because this organization has recently joined Vital Communities' network. Moreover, the method itself, semi-structured in-depth interviews, fits the UVAW's need for a detailed understanding of personal and unique experiences and motivations for climate resiliency. This method is also well suited to the topic due to climate change's polarizing nature, which other more impersonal research methods, such as surveys, may not handle as well. Semi-structured in-depth interviews are also relatively less time-consuming and less costly than other qualitative research methods, such as ethnographic research. Of course there are limitations of this

methodology, like time and manpower required to carry out interviews and interpret qualitative data. Furthermore, this method requires thoughtful and extensive practice for the interviewers; much of the data's quality, validity, and reliability rely on the quality of the interviewer. However, semi-structured in-depth interviews remain the most viable method of research in part because the information gathered from just one of these interviews is perhaps more substantial than multiple surveys. Thus fewer responses need to be collected and fewer participants recruited. The UVAW boasts several highly dedicated volunteers, including those who met with the researchers of this proposal on their own time and those who regularly attend three-hour forums. With these volunteers, the necessary time and manpower needed for in-depth interview research can be feasibly met.

Learning how to engage currently disengaged community members in climate-resilient actions can lead to improving the environmental health of communities within the Upper Valley as well as strengthening inter-communal relations, financial security, and overall safety. With the UVAW as a model, these results can subsequently extend beyond the Upper Valley. Further, climate resiliency works protect our most vulnerable populations, such as native populations, communities of color, and low-income communities from the effects of climate change (Shearer 2012). Thus, by successfully enabling communities to prepare for and respond to climate impacts, the UVAW can mitigate the marginalizing nature of mainstream environmental justice that often ignores those who ultimately suffer the most. From a sociological perspective, this study can aid in better understanding how to spark community action toward climate resilience among disengaged individuals at the local level, thus adding to the academic discourse of climate change opinion formation and social movement engagement. More broadly, this study will

illuminate ways to spark community action and engagement on any social, community-based issue.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Lynne M., and Bateman, Thomas S. 2000. "Individual Environmental Initiative: Championing Natural Environmental Issues in U.S. Business Organizations." *Academy of Management Journal* 23(4):548-70.
- Anfinson, Kellan. 2018. "How to Tell the Truth about Climate Change." *Environmental Politics* 27(2):209-227.
- Baur, Jackson E. 1960. "Public Opinion and the Primary Group." *American Sociological Review* 25(2):208-219.
- Dixon, Jeffrey C., et al. 2016. *The Process of Social Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Edin, Kathryn, and Kefalas, Maria. 2007. *Promises I Can Keep: Why Poor Women Put Motherhood before Marriage*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Egan, Patrick and Mullin, Megan. 2017. "Climate Change: US Public Opinion." *Annual Review of Political Science* 20(1):209-227.
- Hoffman, Andrew J. 2011. "Talking Past Each Other? Cultural Framing of Skeptical and Convinced Logics in the Climate Change Debate." *Organization & Environment* 24(1):3-33.
- Hongoltz-Hetling, Matt. 2017. "Dartmouth Study Finds Heavier Rainfall may be Regions 'New Normal.'" *Valley News*, June 21.
- Howe, Peter D., Mildemberger, Matto, Marlon, Jennifer R., and Leiserowitz, Anthony. 2015. "Geographic variation in opinions on climate change at state and local scales in the USA." *Nature Climate Change* 5:596-602.
- Lamont, Michele. 1992. *Money, Morals and Manners*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press Books.
- Leiserowitz, Anthony, Maibach, Edward, and Roser-Renouf, Connie. 2009. "Global Warming's Six Americas." *Yale Program on Climate Change Communication*.

- Lidskog, Rolf. 1996. "In Science We Trust? On the Relation Between Scientific Knowledge, Risk Consciousness and Public Trust." *Acta Sociologica* 39(1):31-56.
- Nagel, Joane. 2011. "Climate Change, Public Opinion, And The Military Security Complex." *The Sociological Quarterly* 45(2):203-210.
- Nisbet, Matthew C. 2010. "Communicating Climate Change: Why Frames Matter for Public Engagement." *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development* 51(2):12-23.
- Perrin, Andrew J., and McFarland, Katherine. 2011. "Social Theory and Public Opinion." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37:87-90.
- Scruggs, Lyle, and Benegal, Salil. 2012. "Declining Public Concern about Climate Change: Can we Blame the Great Recession?" *Journal of Global Environmental Change* 22(2):505-515.
- Shearer, Christine. 2012. "The Social Construction of Alaska Native Vulnerability to Climate Change." *Race, Gender & Class* 19(1/2):61-79.
- Shuster, Stef M., and Campos-Castillo, Celeste. 2017. "Measuring Resonance and Dissonance in Social Movement Frames With Affect Control Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 80(1):20-40.
- Tranter, Bruce. 2012. "Social and Political Influences on Environmentalism in Australia." *Journal of Sociology* 50(3):331-348.
- Zhou, Jack. 2016. "Boomerangs versus Javelins: How Polarization Constraints Communication on Climate Change." *Environmental Politics* 25(5):788-811.
- Zhou, Min. 2014. "Public Environmental Skepticism: A Cross-National and Multilevel Analysis." *International Sociology* 30(1):61-85

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Introduction and Consent:

I am a part of the Upper Valley Adaptation Workgroup team and we are seeking to understand how to get Upper Valley community members involved in our climate resilience mission. Before we get started I just want to make sure that you have previous involvement in community-based work. If you don't mind, I am going to tape this conversation using a recording application on my phone. This is so I can listen to you, but I will also take a few notes, if that's ok. First, let's make up a name for you, so that your privacy will be protected. You are the expert here. I am the learner. I'll ask a few general questions, but you can talk about anything you feel is important, even if I don't ask about it. And, if you don't like my questions, you don't have to answer them. One more thing-if you want to answer off the record, we can turn the recorder off, and then turn it on again later. In fact, why don't you hold my phone? That way you can turn the recording on and off yourself Are you ready to get started? (Based on Interview Guide from Edin and Kefalas)

Interview Questions:

We're going to start with talking a little bit about you and the issues that are important to you...

1. Let's start with you telling me about yourself and what you do (either in local government or as a part of Vital Communities).
 - a. What is your job/position title and what are your responsibilities
 - b. How did you get interested in what you do / why did you decide to do it?

c. Can you tell me about an experience you had that made you feel this was something you wanted to get more involved with?

2. We're working with an organization that is interested in supporting community well-beings and would like to know how to get people engaged with actions in things activities that would benefit their community...what are some things you do in your community that are important to you?

a. Are there any particular social issues are you passionate about?

b. Tell me a story about what helped you find this passion?

c. Is there a moment that sticks out in your mind when you felt especially motivated to do something about this issue? Can you tell me more about that?.

3. Has anyone that you know been personally affected by the kind of issues you've talked about?

a. Probe for the people and their relationship to you that have been personally affected.

Now we're going to talk a little bit more about your community and where you live...

4. Tell me a little bit about your neighborhood. (Probe for closeness of neighborhood, how well they know each other, how similar neighbors are to one another.)

a. What do you see as important you and your neighbor's well being?

b. Thinking more broadly about the Upper Valley...what do you see as most important to the well being people in the Upper Valley right now?

5. We are interested in thinking about environmental impacts on the community...can you tell me about your relationship with the nature and the outdoors?

- a. Are there any particular activities you enjoy doing in the outdoors?
- b. Has this changed at all in the past few years due to weather? If so, how?

6. Where do you live in the Upper Valley?

- a. Are there any other communities in the Upper Valley that you feel a part of?
- b. Where do you spend most of your time?

We're going to switch gears a little bit here and talk about some more sensitive issues. I just want to remind you that we can turn off the recording at any time and that if you don't like the question you don't have to answer.

7. I know there have been some recent policy changes at the federal and state level...has this changed your work with or concerns about your own well-being or the well-being of the community?

- a. In your opinion, what have been the biggest political issues over the last few years?
- b. Were you or anyone you know affected personally by any of these issues?
- c. Probe for political party or clear political stances if possible.

8. Specifically in relation to the environment, have you noticed and how do you feel about any recent policy changes?

9. Tell me about any economic anxieties you are feeling or have felt in the last year.

a. Have you felt concerned about money in the past year?

b. Do you see this happening to other people you care about outside of your family?

We're almost done with our interview so I wanted to ask you some questions to kind of sum up what we've talked about...

10. So putting together a bit about what we've talked about today, what would you say would make you get up out of your seat and work on environmental resilience in your community?

a. Do you think the same things would work for others you know? What do you think would be motivating to your friends/family? To your neighbors/local community? To members of the Upper Valley as a whole?

APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM

CONSENT TO TAKE PART IN RESEARCH

Studying Motivation for Community Engagement: Climate Resilience

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Taking part in research is voluntary.

Your decision whether or not to take part will have no effect on the quality of your life. Please ask questions if there is anything about this study that you do not understand.

What is the purpose of this study?

The purpose of the study is to better understand attitudes toward community involvement and motivation as well as towards climate resilience in the Upper Valley. This study seeks to identify strategies to engage currently disengaged members of the Upper Valley community in social movements and specifically in climate resiliency work for the UVAW.

Will you benefit from taking part in this study?

You will not personally benefit from being in this research study, however long term engagement with the UVAW could benefit your community.

What does this study involve?

Your participation in this study may last up to 1 hour. You will be asked questions regarding your feelings toward climate resilience, and the environment in general.

What are the options if you do not want to take part in this study?

The alternative is to not take part in the study.

If you take part in this study, what activities will be done only for research purposes?

If you take part in this study, the following activities will be done only for research purposes:

In-depth Interview of about 1-hour in length.

What are the risks involved with being enrolled in this study?

There are very few psychological, physical, social, or other risks associated with your participation in this study. This interview involves the discussion of potentially psychologically distressing topics such as climate change, environmental events, and socioeconomic status. The risk of this distress will be mitigated by warnings throughout the interview and ability to opt out of answering any and all questions.

Other important items you should know:

- **Leaving the study:** You may choose to stop taking part in this study at any time. If you decide to stop taking part, it will have no effect on the quality of your life.
- **Number of people in this study:** We expect about 20 people to participate in this study.
- **Funding:** There is no outside funding for this research project.

How will your privacy be protected?

The information collected as data for this study includes:

Feelings toward climate resilience.

Economic strain and socioeconomic status.

Political views.

We are careful to protect the identities of the people in this study. We also keep the information collected for this study secure and confidential.

In order to protect your privacy, we will anonymize all identities attached to answers.

No publication or public presentation about the research described above will reveal your identity without another authorization from you.

Identifiable data collected for this study will be used for research purposes which are determined to be reasonable and in line with expectations by a review committee.

It is possible for a court or government official to order the release of study data including information about you.

Will you be paid to take part in this study?

No.

Whom should you call with questions about this study?

If you have questions about this study or concerns about a research related problem or injury, you can email the research director for this study: INSERT PRIMARY RESEARCHER AND CONTACT INFORMATION HERE

If you have questions, concerns, complaints, or suggestions about human research at Dartmouth, you may call the Office of the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects at Dartmouth College (603) 646-6482 during normal business hours.

CONSENT

I have read the above information about Studying Motivation for Community Engagement: Climate Resilience and have been given time to ask questions. I agree to take part in this study and I will be given a copy of this signed consent form.

Participant's Signature and Date

PRINTED NAME

Researcher or Designee Signature and Date

PRINTED NAME

APPENDIX C: EXAMPLE INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT

Lily: Um...Can you tell me a little bit more about why you decided to get involved in Palaeop?

Rumpelstiltskin: Yeah..for Palaeop I..um..for a couple reasons...(Pause) (Sigh)...One (Sigh)...Um (Lipsmack)...is that (Pause) there...so throughout my, like, past 3 and a half years at Dartmouth...um...it's become pretty clear to me that students tend to have (Pause) very different expectations for the direction of the college than the administration does and it seems like the lines of communication (pause) umm... (lipsmack) that...that have been in place for the past couple years have been ineffective (Sigh) and so one of the reasons that I wanted to join Palaeop was to try to facilitate a stronger line of communication between the students and the administration (pause) Um... and Palaeop meets at least once a week with a Dean or President Hanlon. And... Um...we have kind of like a very direct line to people high up on the administrative chain so...um...that was attractive to me because I felt like I would at least try to help bring...um...concerns from the students...um...to the relevant people. Um...The second reason I wanted to join Palaeop was...(sigh) um...that (Pause) (lipsmack)...it has the..the resources necessary to start (pause) um... start...um...changing the systems in place that I thought were harmful or ineffective to the study body.

Lily: Mm..so what, what systems would those be?

Rumpelstiltskin: Sure...so I think one of the big ones for me was mental health resources on campus...um...just for an example...um... (pause) (lipsmack)...for, for students who are on the Dartmouth College insurance plan (Oh- Lily) and want to see a Dick's House (Sigh) Psychologist or Therapist for any variety of issues that are related to mental health...um... (Pause) (Lipsmack)...the insurance plan only covers 10...um...kinda like complimentary...um (Pause)...therapy visits (Ok- Lily) and then after...um...after 10, after your 10th visit you're essentially cut off (mhm -Lily) from Dick's house resources and are either forced to start paying very, very high premiums for..um...(Lipsmack) for seeing Dick's House Therapy or find a, find

like a third party therapist in the Upper Valley...um...which tend to be even more expensive...um (sigh)...and so we started a campaign a couple years ago called "end the 10" (pause)...um...in order to try to fix, kinda, this issue and...so that's kind of like one (sigh)...um...one thing that I wanted to change and then (sigh) kind of a variety of other things in- in- including kinda resources for sexual assault...um...trying to expand interdisciplinary options for students on campus..uh...stuff like that.

Lily: So, can you think of...um (Lipsmack)...a specific experience that you had that made this something you wanted to get involved with?

Rumpelstiltskin: (Lipsmack) For Palaeop?

Lily: For either Paleop or ski patrol whatever...(pause)...just an experience that you had...

Rumpelstiltskin: that drew me towards applying? (mhm - Lily) Um (Sigh (Pause)...I think so, yeah, so for Palaeop I had a couple classes with seniors my freshman year that were part of Palaeop and I really looked up to them because they seemed to be (Pause)...um...smart and (Pause) responsible and (Pause)...um... and they cared a lot about the direction that Dartmouth was going in...um...and not only that...um (Pause)...it kind of become clear to me that (Pause) a lot of these seniors were (Pause)...um...like, weren't wearing rose-colored glasses...and, like, were very, like, realistic and willing to face a lot of the problems about Dartmouth. And so...um....yeah. So that was, like, a very attractive quality that I wanted to, like, have as well.

Lily: So having...having people as role models is important for you.

Rumpelstiltskin: Yeah, role models def...people I looked up to that was, like, a huge draw for both Paleop and for Ski Patrol....um...(Pause). Yeah.

Lily: Mhm, great. Thank you for sharing that. Um (Lipsmack) So, we're working for an organization that's interested in supporting community...um...wellbeing and, like, to get to know how people get engaged with actions and activities that would benefit their community. So, um, what are some things that you do in your community that are important to you?

Rumpelstiltskin: (Lipsmack) Important to me...um...I think, so for Ski Patrol, I'm going to talk about Ski Patrol, I think...(Pause) um...being able to, like, (Pause), directly see the change that I am...um...responsible for (mhm -Lily) is, like, a huge draw. So, for example, when I, like, help splint someone's broken arm, I can literally see the change that, that the patient undergoes as a result of my, like, training. Right? And, like, being able to, like, like, actually, reach out and touch, like, like, the difference (Pause) is, like, super appealing to me and, like, having the change be tangible and visible and (Pause) like very visceral almost...um...makes me feel like I am doing my community a service...um...whereas...like, as opposed to, like, maybe another type of club where the change you...um (lipsmack)...like effect is less visible, I don't think that would draw me to, to that club as much.

APPENDIX D: IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWER TIPS:

Types of Interview Questions

- **Introductory questions:** Opening questions should produce spontaneous, rich descriptions by allowing the respondent to discuss the study topic broadly through the lens of their own experience. The rest of the interview will follow up on the dimensions introduced in the story or stories told in response to these opening questions. For example: Can you tell me about...? Do you remember an occasion when...? Could you describe in as much detail as possible a situation in which...? What happened in the situation you mentioned?
- **Follow-up questions:** The respondent's answers to introductory questions can be extended through the curiosity, persistence, and critical attention of the interviewer. This can be done through direct questioning, a nod, pause, or repetition of significant words or ideas. You can also train yourself to notice "red lights" in the answers – unusual terms, strong intonations, or body language can signal a wealth of underlying topics relevant to the research question. The goal is to both listen to what is important to the respondent and keep in mind the main goals or questions of the research.
- **Probing questions:** The interviewer pursues answers by probing their content, without stating what dimensions are to be taken into account. For example: Can you give a more detailed description of what happened? Can you tell me more about that? Have you had other experiences like this? Could you give another example?
- **Specifying questions:** If the respondent makes broad or impersonal statements, you can pose questions that direct them toward a more personal account. For example: What did you think/feel in that situation? What did you actually do when you felt that way? How did your body react? Have you also experienced this yourself?
- **Direct questions:** Here the researcher directly introduces new topics or dimensions into the discussion, that have not emerged naturally through the interview. Such direct questions are best saved for the end of the interview, after respondents have already given their own spontaneous descriptions and, in so doing, indicated which aspects of the topic are most important to them.
- **Indirect questions:** Here you may attempt to get at a question by asking the respondent to talk about how "others" or "people in general" think about an issue, taking their answer as a possible indirect statement of their own thoughts or feelings on the matter. You will need to follow up with some careful questions to interpret their response.
- **Structuring questions:** Interviewers are responsible for directing the flow and content of the interview. In some cases, you may need to directly and politely break off long answers that are irrelevant to the topic of investigation. For example: Let's switch gears a bit. I'd like to introduce another topic.
- **Interpreting questions:** You can also use questions to verify that you correctly understood a respondent's meaning, to clarify details you are unsure about, or to speculate on possible thoughts or feelings a respondent may have that they haven't yet discussed. For example: So do you mean that...? Is it correct to say that...? Do you see any connections between...?
- **Silence:** Interviews should be run at a pace that is comfortable for the respondent and encourages them to share and elaborate. With this goal in mind, you can use brief pauses and moments of silence to your advantage. By allowing pauses in the conversation, you are giving your respondent enough time to reflect and draw associations, then break the silence themselves with new and important information.

Types of Interview Probes

- **Nondirective interview probes:** I see. Uh-huh. Yes, I understand. Nodding.
- **Brief expectant pauses:** Pauses of around 2-3 seconds encourage respondents to elaborate. Pauses in excess of 10-15 seconds have a negative effect on rapport.
- **Neutral requests for more information:** How so? I'd like to know more of your thoughts on that. What do you have in mind? Can you tell me more about that? Is there anything else?
- **Near repetition of the respondent's words:** Conveys close attention to and sympathy with the respondent, provides encouragement to continue.
- **Summarizing your interpretation of the respondent's thoughts/feelings:** e.g., So it seems as though you feel that...
- **Requests for specific kinds of additional information:** *What* do you think that is so? *How* did that become clear to you? *When* was that? *Why* was that experience important to you?
- **Requests for clarification:** I'm not clear on that. Could you explain what you meant?
- **Repetition of a primary question** (if respondent doesn't answer it fully the first time)

Adapted from Steinar Kvale, *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*

10 Tips for Strong In-Depth Interviews
(Healy-Etten and Sharp 2010)

1. **Probe, Probe, Probe (in a Non-Alien Way):** Probing questions make the respondent think more about their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors, and allow you to learn just what is behind them. It is helpful to write down probing questions underneath your main questions to remind you to probe further. Probes are the single most important tool in your toolkit. Learn to use them effectively.
2. **Avoid \$100 Words:** Phrase your questions in a way that your respondent will understand. For instance, instead of asking “What is your gender ideology?” ask “What do you think the proper role for a woman [man] is?” or “Who do you think should be responsible for housework?” The answers to these questions will let you *know* a person’s gender ideology.
3. **Turn a Clark Kent Question into a Superman Question:** Many closed-ended questions can be turned into an open-ended question by beginning the question with a “why” or “how” instead of “what,” or by following up the answer to a close-ended question with “Why?,” “Why not?,” “Why do you feel that way?,” “How does that make you feel?,” and other pithy phrases. Try to use “how” more than “why,” since “why” questions sometimes make interviewees feel that you are judging them.
4. **Pull a Homer Simpson:** Sometimes you will ask questions that seem very commonsensical to your interviewees. One tactic for handling this problem is just to “play dumb.” Tell them you really don’t know what they are talking about. This will make your interviewees further explain things, which will provide you with much better data. Playing dumb is also a good way for you to seem non-judgmental when asking a “why” question – you want to know “why” because you sincerely don’t understand and not because you think they’re wrong for feeling, thinking, or behaving in a certain way.
5. **Battle the “You Know What I Mean?” Demon:** You may find that your interviewees will end a statement with the phrase “You know what I mean?” or some other variant. Kill this demon every time you see it. Do not nod your head and say “Yep.” Say no, you don’t know what they mean, or ask the interviewees to clarify what they mean for your sake. This will arise especially with questions about thoughts and feelings.
6. **Order Attention Pay to:** The questions you ask should flow logically from one to the next, or you should have transitions between sets of questions to let the interviewee know that you are now going in a different direction. Asking questions that do not logically follow one another makes the interview process seem disjointed and artificial; this can have a huge impact on the interview dynamic. Questions that seem orderly put the interviewee at ease and make the interview seem more *like a conversation*, helping the interviewee open up to you. It will also make you seem as if you’ve got your act together, giving you legitimacy as an interviewer.
7. **Be a Good Ant and Don’t Lead, Follow:** Try to avoid leading questions that may make interviewees feel obligated to answer in a particular way. “How did the division of housework make you upset?” is a leading question because it assumes that the person was upset about the issue. The question “How did the division of the housework make you feel?” gets at the same thing, but it does not lead the interviewee in a specific emotional direction.
8. **Enjoy the Silence:** There will often be “dead air” during the interview. Avoid the temptation to fill it. Give your interviewees time to think about the answers they want to give. Don’t worry. Interviewees are usually quick to tell you if they don’t understand a question or don’t have anything else to say about a topic.

9. **Don't Be a Judge Judy:** You may not agree with some (or a lot) of what your interviewees say, but it is really not your job as an interviewer and researcher to morally judge your interviewees. Rather, your goal is to document, understand, and try to explain why they think and feel in certain ways. Therefore, try not to take a judgmental tone or stance toward what the interviewee says during the interview. Also remember that you can convey judgment in nonverbal ways, such as how you look at a person when they give an answer or the critical tone you use when asking follow-up questions. Try to keep these nonverbal cues in check during the interview.
10. **Shut up:** Do not put words into people's mouths. Let them say things in their own words, especially with questions that deal with thoughts, opinions, and feelings. Remember, if you say it, it's not data. It is only data when the interviewee says it. If you go back over an interview tape and you notice that you talk as much or more than the interviewee did, then it was probably not a good interview.

Characteristics of a Skilled Interviewer

- **Knowledgeable:** Has extensive knowledge of the interview theme, and which topics are important to pursue; can conduct an informed conversation about the topic.
- **Structuring:** Introduces a purpose for the interview, outlines the procedure briefly, and closes the interview by, for example, briefly summarizing what was learned and asking whether the interviewee has any questions.
- **Clear:** Poses clear, simple, and short questions; speaks calmly and understandably, without using complex language or academic jargon.
- **Gentle:** Allows respondents to finish what they are saying; lets them proceed at their own rate of thinking and speaking; is easygoing, tolerates pauses, and shows that it is acceptable to discuss unconventional or provocative opinions or deeply emotional issues.
- **Sensitive:** Listens carefully to the content of what is said, noticing the nuances of meaning in an answer; encourages the respondent to discuss those nuances more fully; empathetic, noticing not only what is said, but *how* it is said, and what is *not* said; can sense when a topic is too emotional to pursue further.
- **Open:** Hears which aspects of the interview topic are most important to the respondent; listens with attention to all content; open to new topics introduced by the interviewee, and follows up on these topics.
- **Steering:** Knows what s/he wants to find out, controls the course of the interview, and is not afraid to redirect or interrupt irrelevant digressions.
- **Critical:** Does not take everything said at face value, but questions the reliability and validity of the interviewee's statements; compares these statements against relevant observational evidence; attentive to logical inconsistencies in information learned during the interview.
- **Remembering:** Retains what a respondent has said during the interview; can recall earlier statements and ask to have them elaborated; can link what has been said during different parts of the interview.
- **Interpreting:** Manages throughout the interview to clarify and extend the meanings of the interviewee's statements; provides interpretations of what is said, which may be confirmed or disconfirmed by the interviewee.

Adapted from Steinar Kvale, *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*

Procedures for Conducting In-Depth Interviews

1. Introduce yourself and your study. Get informed consent, including consent to record the interview.
2. Put the respondent at ease for the conversation to follow. Start with a general question to get them talking, and be an active listener.
3. Be aware of your appearance and how it might influence the respondents' perceptions of your goals and what they feel comfortable telling you.
4. Keep the interview situation as private as possible.
5. Try out your recording device to make sure it can clearly detect conversations in the type of setting where you'll be conducting the interview (especially if it's in a public place). Be familiar with how the recorder works. If in doubt, use a second one as a backup.
6. Be thoroughly familiar with the interview guide.
7. Start interview questions with an open-ended question on a non-threatening topic to get people comfortable talking to you. Save direct questions for the latter part of the interview.
8. End the interview by asking if there is anything else that you should know about our topic that you haven't yet asked.
9. Ask questions as written and in the order written as much as possible (more important for structured or semi-structured than unstructured interviews).
10. Don't assume the answer to any question – ask!
11. Speak slowly and clearly, and ask questions in a basic way (no jargon or complex words).
12. Use appropriate neutral probes when needed.
13. Record notes during the interview, when appropriate.
14. Expand on these notes as soon as possible after the interview.

APPENDIX E: FIELD NOTE AND THEORETICAL MEMO CREATION

Kinds of Ethnographic Notes:

- 1) Field Notes (FN)
 - a) Objective notes on what the researcher sees, hears, and observes
 - b) Information about the interview scene itself (who else is there, lighting, etc.)
 - c) As detailed as possible
- 2) Methodological Notes (MN)
 - a) Documenting the methods used (where the interview took place, how the interviewer divided their attention, etc.)
 - b) Used to adjust methods for future interviews
- 3) Personal Notes (PN)
 - a) The researcher's personal reactions and behaviors
 - b) Potential impacts of personal reactions and behaviors
 - c) Potential impacts of the interviewers presentation and characteristics
- 4) Theoretical Notes (TN)
 - a) Patterns in the FN
 - b) Negative cases that do not fit the pattern and refine theories
 - c) Written after the interview and as a jumping off point for the Theoretical memo

Recommended Note Taking Practices:

1) During the interview

- a) Interviewer should try to blend in with the participant and location
- b) Interviewer should be careful of invading privacy
- c) Interviewer should try to write down as much as possible without losing focus of the interview and the research question at hand
- d) Interviewer should write in words and phrases instead of full sentences and use abbreviations and code when possible
- e) Interviewer should write down objective observations while trying to capture actions, emotions, and feelings

2) After the interview

- a) Interviewer should expand the field notes (FN) immediately after the interview into full sentences
- b) Attempt to capture exact words and details
- c) Add in MN, PN, and TN

Theoretical Memo Creation:

After reading through field notes (FN) and expanded MN, PN, and TN write up a kind of extended abstract for the interview that includes important themes, quotes, methods, and personal notes. This theoretical memo will serve as the summary of the interview to easily

compare interviews with one another and create themes and coding schemes. These theoretical memos will also be used to adjust interviewing practices and methods.

APPENDIX F: CONCEPTUAL MODEL

