

URGE - FIELDWORK MANUAL

(2nd version, March 2024)

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	2
“In situ” research - Global and local contexts of research.....	3
How to delimit the local context?.....	3
A specific district delimited from the fieldwork intervention on a specific district or city:...	3
A specific district delimits from social characteristics:.....	4
Without specific district:.....	5
How to ask research questions?.....	7
Specific issues of research in the URGE context participatory research and ethics.....	8
Participatory research.....	8
Ethical considerations.....	10
Research tools.....	12
How to collect data.....	13
Classical tools.....	13
Spatial and creative tools.....	15
Resources.....	20

Introduction

This fieldwork manual is produced within the framework of the URGE Strategic partnership project. The manual is a part of work package 2 “Giving voice: a collection of qualitative data material concerned with urban sustainability and ethics”. It aims at supporting collaborative transnational research activities. This document can be used in future projects and by students. It has been written in a collaborative way by all WP2 partners.

This methodological guideline will be used in two ways:

- For the research team during the project to build a common understanding of research
- For students after the project. As the needs of researchers and students are different, we will conduct a specific test with a student group from AUAS (ref. Roxane Koons) to adapt the document to the specific needs of students.

While preparing this fieldwork manual, we identified one issue related to the transnational context of research, in which the research team needs to find a balance between:

- Giving common directions and tools in order to ensure the quality and transferability of research results.
- Keeping enough flexibility to allow local specificities and diversities in the project.

Therefore, in this introduction we want to caution about how this manual should be used: it is a collection of advices and examples that must be focused and adapted in relation to the users' research contexts.

This guideline will be developed through an iterative process. A first version (2024/01/18) will be completed before March 2024. The final version will include learning of training experiences between all partners.

The first part of this manual is dedicated to the global and local contexts of research. For us, it is necessary to start with an overview of the way the local research teams absorb and make theirs the research involved in URGE (December 2023 - January 2024). This first inventory also addresses some ethical issues that need to be discussed further before the data collection can start.

The second part addresses specific issues we would like to be aware of: participation and ethics.

The third part gives advice in using research tools (general and more specific to “in-situ” research).

“IN SITU” RESEARCH - GLOBAL AND LOCAL CONTEXTS OF RESEARCH

The research conducted in the URGE project has the specificity to be In situ, or site specific. This term is used to “*characterize research or creation process [that] is carried out in a specific territory, which is also integral to its content. In situ processes continuously adapt to the contexts that they invest in; some are nomadic, whereas others are attached to a specific location. These performances or research projects might then be referred to as ‘site-specific.’*” (performascope 2021)

Some contextual elements are necessary to understand the following methodological perspectives. In the URGE project, the research “*will focus on understanding the experiences of vulnerable people with regards to sustainability and identifying conflicts and values within urban communities*”¹.

3 groups are targeted to realize this research, these are:

- work field and associated partners
- service users
- public servants and decision makers (primarily from the projects’ work field and associated partners)

As sustainability is a central concept in the project, one specific research objective is also to document the target groups’ notions of sustainability (socially, economically, and environmentally).

How to delimit the local context?

The URGE research project takes place in five different European cities, involving diverse work field partners. The spatial delimitation of research is part of the methodological background and was done in 3 different ways:

A specific district delimited from the fieldwork intervention on a specific district or city:

DesignArbeid in Amsterdam (Amsterdam New West => De Punt Neighborhood). DesignArbeid focuses on social issues and how these issues can be addressed in public spaces through art. Our objective is to reflect on how we (as members of society) can maintain and improve our living conditions in the city. What concrete steps can people take to influence their surroundings, and what kind of contribution can media, technology, and art make in this respect? DesignArbeid sees that many social problems are

¹ URGE Project Application

approached as a problem of the individual, while they are in fact systemic problems. Politicizing is an important goal in DesignArbeid's strategy.

DesignArbeid works based on themes. The artworks tie in with various local social themes: Who owns the public space? What does saying goodbye mean? What is value? What is work?

DesignArbeid develops democratic design processes for the layout of public spaces. Residents in a neighborhood actively contribute to shaping the public space. Throughout these multi-day processes, we foster an open, inclusive, and democratic approach, providing all residents with the opportunity and space to contribute ideas, participate in the design, and vote on the final decisions.

OVE in Lyon Metropole

OVE is a national foundation supporting vulnerable people (children, youth, adults, and elderly people). Among the 120 structures representing the foundation, one will take part in the current project: the DIME Aline Renard is located in Rilleux-La Pape, in the Lyon Metropole. This establishment provides a range of services for young people with disabilities: day care, accommodation, family support, etc. It is also involved in several partnerships at the city level.

The team is sensitive to urbanization issues, as they impact on the support provided to children and young people: outdoor care possibilities, mobility constraints, etc.

The establishment is in a unique situation during the research period: its usual buildings are being renovated, so it is occupying a temporary building in a former bank. This situation is very interesting in terms of the URGE project: due to the lack of space, the team has to find resources outside the establishment to support the young people.

As part of the URGE project, research will focus on the town of Rilleux la Pape (around 30 000 inhabitants in 2015), where DIME is based.

A specific district delimits from social characteristics:

Kings of the Street location: Novo Polje) in Ljubljana

Association Kings of the Street is a non-governmental humanitarian organisation working in the field of homelessness. In addition to intensive work with the homeless population in the two largest cities in Slovenia (Ljubljana and Maribor), the association is also active in the field of community development (organisation of social, cultural and educational workshops, training of social and other skills through music, theatre, video, language, sewing and computer workshops, etc.) in order to achieve a more socially just development of local communities. They are very active in the local communities where they are in contact with all major stakeholders (from municipalities to related organisations and local citizens).

In recent years, Kings of the Street field workers have noticed a strong trend towards gentrification in the Slovenian capital Ljubljana. In recent decades, Ljubljana's urban development has focused on the intensive influence of private investment in the construction of infrastructure and housing, making the city less community-oriented and more suited to individualised lifestyles. In parallel, the city has a public investment fund (Stanovanjski sklad = housing funds) that invests in the construction of new housing, mostly in response to the lack of affordable housing for young families. However, there is a major imbalance in the housing sector. Expensive and private housing is built close to the city centre or in the city centre, while the “social” or non-profit housing is built in the suburbs with less or no social infrastructure (lack of parking spaces, not enough playgrounds, no green spaces, unsafe pedestrian areas, etc.). At the same time, all these new building investment are significantly restricting public space, and what's more, the public space that would be accessible to all residents is disappearing.

The Kings of the Streets association, a partner of the URGE project, is already present with its activities (field workers and outreach work, youth centre) in one of the newly built neighbourhoods Novo Polje in Ljubljana. The aim of the research is to find out what characteristics the public space in this new neighbourhood has (the quality of the space in terms of sustainable goals), what interests (individuals and groups) compete for the public space and what values guide those who are interested in using the public space in new neighbourhoods (new and old inhabitants, representatives of businesses and public organisations in the neighbourhood, visitors and other users of the “public space”, etc.).

Without specific district:

The Homeless Unit in Copenhagen

research is not carried out in one specific place, but rather with an entity, The Street Contact, who is a key agent in bringing together actors involved in urban development and design. The Street Contact is an entity under the Municipality's Social Administration established in 2013. It was established on the backdrop of employees in various housing companies experiencing an increase in residents occupying certain public common areas in and around the housing companies lots. Here, they stayed for a long time while consuming alcohol and sometimes soft drugs. It created nuisance and insecurity for the neighbours.

The Street Contact contributes to create a sense of safety in residential areas, parks and public spaces and squares. The target group of the Street Contact are the so-called drinking communities in the city's spaces (I.e, adults in an already vulnerable position who consume alcohol and other substances while meeting in the same specific place). Moreover, neighbours and residents in these places are considered the target group of the Street Contact. The employees sometimes mediate between stakeholders residing in the same place. The Street Contact is considered to hold a security-creating role by,

for example, being present in public spaces, as well as responding to inquiries from drinking communities, neighbours, and the surrounding communities. They work in a solution-oriented and inclusive manner and aim at facilitating solutions with and between relevant actors in the immediate surroundings, such as the police, neighbours, local councils, the Engineering and Environmental management, and whomever is relevant to the specific context. In some cases, it has been possible to quell a conflict through dialogue, in other cases infrastructure and design has been changed to accommodate situations. Employees at the Street Contact can also facilitate bridge building to more specialized offers in the Social Administration.

The Homeless unit, who are a partner in URGE, are a part of the network the Street Contact rely on when working with different public spaces and the vulnerable people using them. Doing fieldwork following the work of the Street Contact will allow us to focus on a specific (hopefully) place and the value conflicts between the different agents involved and understand the different positions and experiences with being vulnerable in the urban context. Moreover, we will gain insight into how processes of involving different agents and their positions in the urban development are being conducted. We expect to meet, and talk to, a wide range of actors in urban development who are not usually brought together in dialogue and collaboration. Thus, by following the employees and their activities, we anticipate being able to identify conflicting values and spaces of dialogue within the urban community as well as the experiences of the vulnerable population.

Helsinki

The research will be mostly carried out among two groups of people. The first consists of students and staff of Metropolia University of Applied Sciences, with a special focus on Social Work degree programs. This will provide a broad view into the realities of people with diverse backgrounds, especially from the pedagogical viewpoint. The researchers will study closely the concepts, encounters and interactions with the participants in a dialogic manner and prepare ground for the protreptic elaboration of the topics they consider significant.

The second group of people consists of people associated with Familia ry, a Helsinki-based NGO that supports the wellbeing on intercultural families through peer support and volunteer activities. Here, the research follows similar process but provides varied responses and different thematic emphases, reflecting the diverse positionalities of the participants. The study of these two groups with porous boundaries equips the researchers to understand the most critical concerns from a comparative perspective for further study.

→ How to do?

Begin the cases with a thick description of the places in which the research takes place and/or provide a thick description of the context in which the work of the entities/people that have been objects of research take place

Always keeping track of the localization of data collection (name of the district, precise address)

Having spatial description as part of the observation: paying attention on streets, buildings, etc...

Using “walking methods” or “mapping methods”

How to ask research questions?

As methodology is always connected to research questions, we also wanted to share the way we address research questions in our specific local context. The following table comes from a preliminary work before our first meeting in the research team. It shows the diversity of appropriation of the global objectives of research among the local partners.

It is also a basis for discussing together the minimum we need to have in common at this step.

How local contexts translate / appropriate the research objectives?

Amsterdam	Objective: To understand conflicting values and experiences of people in vulnerable positions living in Amsterdam New-West, regarding creating and maintaining a sustainable (socio-economic, spatial and cultural) urban life. What socio-economic, spatial, and cultural challenges are experienced by communities Design Arbeid is engaged with? • What dimensions of urban issues and conflicts are experienced by people in vulnerable position in Amsterdam New-West? • What values, ideas and emotions about these urban issues and conflicts are identified by DesignArbeid’s associated partners, public servants and decision makers? • How can we better incorporate voices of people in vulnerable positions in addressing the identified urban issues and conflicts through a co-design approach?
Lyon	How are vulnerable people and the professionals working with them involved in urban planning? What is the specific urban knowledge of vulnerable people? For example, what knowledge do they have of resource locations, means of getting around...? What are the conflicting values that emerges in a co-construction urban planning project?

Helsinki	To understand how people (students, professionals jne.) with diverse backgrounds (ie. Intercultural, immigration, students, professionals, decisionmakers) experience urban daily life and spatial power structures as inclusive/exclusive, To understand how people with diverse backgrounds participate in urban design and identify conflicts within urban communities, To understand the values behind these conflicts.
Ljubljana	What are their [all key stake holders in the particular neighbourhood] personal values and what are their perceptions of the community values? How do they imagine the future of the new neighbourhood? What do they recognize as common goods in the new neighbourhood? What are they interested to protect in the new neighbourhood as common goods?
Copenhagen	Objectives: To understand how vulnerable people experience urban daily life and spatial power structures, To understand how vulnerable people participate in urban design and identify conflicts within urban communities, including their notions on sustainability (socially and economically primarily, but also environmental if possible) To understand the values behind these conflicts.

SPECIFIC ISSUES OF RESEARCH IN THE URGE CONTEXT PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH AND ETHICS

Two specific issues are important to mention here: participatory research and ethics. These two dimensions are deeply connected and have already been studied together (ProEthics, 2023). In this part, we underline the specific points we must be aware of during the research.

Participatory research

Common values, civic engagement and participation are main priorities of the URGE project, and our aim is to strengthen social workers' ability to advocate on behalf of, and with, vulnerable urban populations in planning and development of sustainable urban communities. Moreover, we have also committed to a common approach based on Protreptic wherein equality in participation and value-based dialogue is central (URGE, 2023 – KA220-HED-EBB-14BD9). Participatory research seems obvious to the URGE project, where lived experience from vulnerable positions, dialogue about values, and

knowledge from different stakeholders and communities are central objectives. Participatory research focuses on co-constructing research through cooperation between researchers and stakeholders, community members, and others with insider knowledge and lived experience (Vaughn, L. M., & Jacquez, F. 2020). Participatory research engages communities and stakeholders, who are not necessarily trained in research but belong to or represent the people who are the focus of the research. The benefits to the URGE project are that not only will the research be informed by and relevant to the current and empirical urban community development, which is pivotal to the social work education; the results of the research process as well as the end results can more easily be translated into community settings (Vaughn, L. M., & Jacquez, F. 2020)². The URGE project corresponds to the “citizen science” definition as *“an ‘umbrella’ term that describes a variety of ways in which the public participate in science. The main characteristics are that: (1) citizens are actively involved in research, in partnership or collaboration with scientists or professionals; and (2) there is a genuine outcome, such as new scientific knowledge, conservation, action or policy change.”* European Citizen Science Association (ECSA). We do not as a project commit to a specific Participatory research framework or approach that must be utilized in all five contexts, rather we share the common “a value in doing research with those who are typically the subjects of research, rather than on them” (Reason, P., & Torbert, W. (2001)³. Fieldwork partners are included in all steps of URGE project, including research (WP2). We realized that a common framework regarding this dimension is necessary in all steps of research.

Before data collection: Firstly, to understand and accommodate the needs of participants in the research groups, both locally and as joint project group within participatory research, specific attention should be given to vocabulary. Because of the different positions we have (researchers and professionals), we are not used to the same vocabulary. We agree that we should pay specific attention to using clear words and explaining technical vocabulary. This attention to vocabulary is also important as English is not the native language of participants of the project. Secondly, to make sure that discussions on research design and methodology locally are based on knowledge from both educational and work field partners according to relevance to both the URGE objectives as well as the local setting, including considerations on how to involve different stakeholders, communities, individuals etc.

During data collection: To be open to changes and accommodations in the research that need to be made because of feedback from stakeholders regarding relevance, ethics etc., and to accommodate to the perceived relevance of the focus to the stakeholders.

² Vaughn, L. M., & Jacquez, F. (2020). Participatory Research Methods – Choice Points in the Research Process. *Journal of Participatory Research Methods*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.35844/001c.13244>

³ Reason, P., & Torbert, W. (2001). The action turn: Toward a transformational social science. *Concepts and Transformation International Journal of Action Research and Organizational Renewal*, 6(1), 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cat.6.1.02rea>

After data collection: To involve all participants in analysis and communication of research results, bearing in mind that the research should be not only focused on and informed by the field of focus, but also relevant to their understanding of challenges and needs. To be aware of the way research results can be used and consider them as a means of change in a critical approach.

Ethical considerations:

Common values, civic engagement, and participation are main priorities of the URGE project (URGE, 2023 – KA220-HED-EBB-14BD9). We have a special interest in how social workers can use their knowledge about – and give voice to – people in vulnerable positions by creating spaces for value-based dialogues about sustainability and urban planning. To achieve this, we have committed to a joint approach inspired by protreptic, and thus, to turn towards the essential values of life. Ethical considerations are in this way at the heart of the project. Social workers, as well as social work educations are ethically bound by the Global Social Work Statement of Ethical Principles. The statement “*makes an explicit commitment to value the people with whom social workers engage. Implicit in our acceptance of this Statement as social work educators, students, researchers, and practitioners is our commitment to uphold the core values and principles of the social work profession as set out in this Statement.*” (IASSW, 2018).

Ethics, thus, constitute a very central dimension related to all actions in the URGE project and our protreptic-inspired approach is aligned with the viewpoints of the global social work statement: “*We recognize a need for a fundamental conceptual shift from situating human dignity primarily within the context of autonomy to recognizing the inter-subjectivity and interrelatedness of human dignity and human rights. Far from being autonomous and independent beings as constructed by liberal theory, as human beings we are all embedded in societies and dependent on their socio-political, economic, and cultural structures and conventions*” (IASSW, 2018).

As mentioned, participatory research and ethics are deeply interconnected. At the heart of the URGE project is a strong belief in the transformative potential of participatory research. We are inspired by Paolo Freire and thus motivated by the possibilities of addressing asymmetries of power, privilege, and knowledge production (1970). In this way “*participatory ethics might be understood as an ethical stance against neutrality, and ‘an “existential” commitment to an ethical ideal rather than to historical inevitability*” (Cahill, Sultana and Pain, 2007A) Our ethical stance is as mentioned founded in the Global Social Work Statement of Ethical Principles: <https://www.iassw-aiets.org//wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Global-Social-Work-Statement-of-Ethical-Principles-IASSW-27-April-2018-01-English.pdf>

We oblige ourselves to be attentive to ethical dimensions of our research through all phases of the research process, including joint reflections prior to research, during research and in the processing of data. This includes but is not limited to the ethical considerations below. Furthermore, the recording, storing and managing of the collected data will be handled according to the local national regulations that are present in the various partner countries.

Representation of vulnerable groups

Participatory research is about inclusion, and specifically in the URGE project it is both about the inclusion of the voices from the margins that are not often heard in urban planning, and about 'what could be' - imaginations of participatory dimensions of sustainable city planning: in other words we are interested in lived experiences and how people perceive their positions and possibilities, as well as in engaging in transformative advocacy that strives to address unequal relations of power and opens up new spaces. The ethical imperative is then firstly to understand that people have deep knowledge about their lives and experiences and should help shape the questions and frame the interpretation (Cahill, Sultana and Pain, 2007). Secondly, it is to be critical of our own positionality, reflexivity, and the power relations involved. This also underlines that notions of ethics are multiple and contextual, and best understood in place. This calls for ethical reflections and dialogue in the five different local contexts, which can revolve around questions such as:

- How are ethics negotiated with participants?
- What power relations and hierarchies become considerations in doing research?
- How can our process reflect our collective negotiated ethical agreements?
- Do respondents have different ethical viewpoints to those researchers have in terms of 'good practice' (and what issues does this raise)?
- In which way can we operationalize participatory ethics in our research practice?

Collecting personal data with vulnerable groups: informed consent?

When we were discussing ethics with WP2, the importance of consent forms was emphasized and although consent is very important, our experience is that in the neighborhoods that we have been working in, there is often a mistrust of government and official agencies. Also, literacy or language can be obstacles. Our experience is that the insistence on the reading and signing of documents by participants can prevent people from participating. That means that people who might have very valuable contributions will not be heard because of our insistence on the signing of consent forms. Therefore, we stress the importance of all teams adhering to informed consent, which can be written or oral depending on the context as per the ethical standards in anthropological research.

Accessibility and understanding of research objectives:

It is important that we have awareness about who participates in our research, by what means, and to what ends. We must be aware about not romanticizing the process of participation in ways that neglect reflections on exercises of privilege, also in the communities. If we fail to do this, power or exploitation

may be reproduced by the very participants who claim to speak for others in their own community. As Michelle Fine puts it:

“stories of lives and relations are not sitting there like low hanging fruit, ready for the picking. You have to work with the community to determine what is sacred, what will not be documented, reported, defiled” (Fine et al., in press, cited in Cahill, Sultana and Pain, 2007)."

The practical and ethical implications of this viewpoint include creating opportunities for people involved to review and challenge interpretations and engage in dialogue. This also raises questions of using an accessible language (even nonverbal), which will require dialogue about practical and ethical considerations. It requires ethical reflections that consider experiences of vulnerable people and the use of methods that adhere to our ethical stance, e.g. situations and methods that are non-violent, non-intrusive, anti-oppressive etc. This section also refers to the section 'Representation of vulnerable groups', since many of the ethical reflections regarding accessibility and making ourselves, and our motive as researchers, understood are also connected to questions and considerations about representation.

As we are striving for inclusivity, please keep in mind that the groups we encounter in vulnerable positions are extremely diverse and we all tend to view them through our own lenses of bias, prejudice and stereotypes. These can be addressed and elaborated on more specifically in the locally produced research methods and articles. We highlight the freedom to locally adapt this consideration regarding to local contexts.

RESEARCH TOOLS

This part develops research tools that can be used during the URGE project. We offer a range of tools to help researchers meet the research objectives defined in the project:

- Understanding and documenting how vulnerable people experience urban daily life, especially with regards to their ideas about sustainability (socially, economically, and environmentally).
- Identify conflicts within urban communities and understand the values behind these conflicts."

In order to save the coherence of the project, the 5 research teams will use 2 or 3 of the same methods, namely: observation, interviews + 1 of the creative methods. Using these tools is part of a more general design research that is presented here as an introduction to the tools.

The research design is a creative act of organising research tasks in the complexity of real-life settings according to the research standards. Research design is a plan that guides the whole process of work.

How to collect data

In general, there are two ways to frame research data collection: inductive and deductive. In the context of URGE research, we generally use an inductive research approach in which theoretical background helps us understand field findings. However, because of the in-situ research URGE also encompasses, there is never one clear all-encompassing approach that fits all local context best. For this reason, we provide a short overview of the two approaches and the choices and mindset that comes along with it. In this overview it is important to keep a protreptic mindset at all times. This means the researchers are letting be and letting go and being open to change. Secondly, it is about being attentive to many different dimensions. The researcher goes with an open mind for change. The researcher is a participant in the participatory research rather than in the role of the observer researcher. Depending on the local research questions a balance between an inductive and deductive approach can be chosen:

Local Research Questions	
Inductive	Deductive
Exploratory and flexible nature You keep the questions open	- Collect theory - Define values - Define conflicts - test your theoretical findings
Whom do you want to conduct research with? Social worker, people in vulnerable positions, etc.	

Based on the above decisions and answers, the researcher decides what kind of research tools are most suitable. When a more inductive approach is chosen, we recommend using at least one spatial or creative method as described in the following part.

Classical tools

The objective of the URGE research is to focus on understanding the experiences of vulnerable people regarding sustainability and identifying conflicts and values within urban communities. The main results are a collection of qualitative, ethnographic data materials from the partner cities. Therefore, the methods described in this section will focus on the latter-named methodological perspective. This requires not only a flexible approach to collecting data but also different forms of media such as writing, drawing, and images to record different kinds of observations. Here, the main focus is on the meaning of ethnographic data, which we understand as “the processes through which people create their world” (Dellwing and Prus 2012 in Müller 2021). In the context of this project, it should be clear that this is also a so-called multi-sited ethnography as it will follow ensembles of people, things,

metaphors, and scripts across a globalized European context. Therefore, the fieldwork will take place in different cities and at different times from March to September 2024.

(Participant) Observations

Before conducting the observations, two important steps should be taken. The first is to locate informants and the fieldwork site. The second is an introductory small talk or friendly conversation in which, as Spradley suggests, “the researcher slowly introduces new elements to assist informants to respond as informants” (Spradley, 1979, p. 58). After this, the project draws from Spradley’s suggestion to make use of so-called Grand Tours and Small Tours. In practice, this means that the researcher will first visit the research site in a more informal setting in which they create a first impression of the site. Grand Tour observations can be informed by, but not limited to, location, specific events going on, activities at play, and objects that stand out (Spradley 1979). This form of observation could also be translated to the idea of ‘hanging around’. Here, it is important to get a good first impression that also helps to define and delimit specificities of experiences within the context of the site. In the Grand Tour, the informants should be encouraged to ‘ramble on and on’ about the significant features of the cultural scene. The second step would be the so-called Small Tour in which a focus on experiences is central. Observations in this stage would describe interactions, personal experiences, and potential conflicts. This part searches for more personal experiences and patterns at the same time. In other words, central to these observations would be the knowing in practice as Sarah Pink (2010) would describe it. It is a practice of seeking to understand experiences from the perspective of the one experiencing it.

For this project, it is important that the concept of sustainability stays central in the observations. Sustainability in the scope of this research refers to social sustainability, as well as economic and environmental sustainability. Additionally, because of the multi-sited ethnographic methods and perspective we use, the observations should be conducted in a semi-structured manner that allows for site-specific cultural elements, without forgetting the broader global processes that shape the different sites. Besides the importance of centering sustainability in the data collection, URGE research also focusses on people connection to space and place, and how a sense of place (making) is negotiated, produced and reproduced (e.g., Cresswell 2004).

Interviews

Interviews are another method that helps us gain an understanding of the experiences and knowledge in practice. First, it is important to delineate the different actors at play who could be interviewed. In deciding whom to interview, we distinguish two categories:

Who should be interviewed?

- Social roles: politicians, social workers, managers, citizens, service users.
- Positions in conflicts: individuals experiencing vulnerabilities in the urban context, various positions surrounding conflicts; this varies from context to context.

The interviews can take place as informal conversations that will be collected via field notes and possibly other forms of media. Furthermore, interviews can take place in a semi-structured manner that, with the participants' consent, will be recorded and transcribed. More information about the ethical considerations in this research can be found in section 2.2 of this guideline.

The semi-structured interviews ideally take place after the participant observations as it helps to decide on factors such as power position and relevance to the main objective, which is to understand the experiences of vulnerable people regarding sustainability and identify conflicts and values within urban communities. Regarding the kind of themes and questions that could be central to the interviews, we focus on the following:

- Explorations of daily life experiences, both individual and communal.
- Identification of (organizational) values.
- Identification of dilemmas in relation to the above-mentioned values.
- Mapping conflicting values.
- Identification of democratic dialogue techniques.

Focus-groups

Focusgroups be used as a method of data collection in this research as well. Typically, focus groups are used to explore a theme in depth in which practitioners are interested in the ways individuals discuss a certain issue as members of a group. The unstructured setting will help give insight into structures of spatial power dimensions and individual experiences of these structures. Second, focus groups can be used to get insight in lived experiences of vulnerable people in relation to urban design and/or conflicts with spatial power structures in urban life and communities.

Spatial and creative tools

Because of the “in-situ” dimension of this research, we suggest that using spatial and/or creative methods can be interesting to collect data. Nevertheless, as research in the context of the URGE project is focused on participatory elements, the use of creative and spatial methods can be of significant help in understanding different kinds of lived experiences and senses of belonging. In this research we suggest making use of various forms of creative and spatial methods, but recommend to at least make use of: 1) sensitive mapping or 2) walking methods.

Both sensitive mapping and walking methods are methods that help understand participants engagement with spatial dimensions and interaction

with communities and surroundings. In the URGE project we focus on sustainable positions in relation to urban contexts and conflicting values in creating these positions. Both methods can help us better understand different positionalities and lived experiences of potential conflicting values in urban contexts.

Walking methods

General introduction to walking methods

Many interview methods fall short in capturing the complexities of the relationship humans have with space. In contrast to traditional interview techniques, walking interviews promote spatial thinking and observation (Evans and Jones, 2011). Walking methods are fruitful for studying the interaction between humans and space as they draw attention to the surroundings while the research participant's entire body and all senses are involved in observing and interpreting the environment. Although not always recognised as such, walking has played an integral role in ethnographic practice (Vergunst & Ingold, 2016). By introducing the perspective of physical movement in space to mere interviewing or participant observation, walking methods provide an excellent platform for initiating discussions about spatial issues and experiences in a relaxed atmosphere.

Walking interviews have been employed for long in urban studies (see, for example, Lynch and Rivkin, 1959) and are increasingly favored in urban planning research (Evans and Jones, 2011). By removing research participants from static and fixed environments and engaging in tangible fieldwork through movement, walking interviews also serve to disrupt traditional power dynamics between interviewer and interviewee. This shift not only facilitates participants in better reflecting on their relationship with space (Jones et al., 2008) but also cultivates a more egalitarian exchange of ideas and perspectives.

Walking studies are emerging as a research area that bridges social sciences, geography, and critical arts practice (Lorimer, 2011). Walking interviews, being a research method that inherently embraces diverse interpretations and variations depending on the research problem at hand, provide numerous approaches for implementation. Hence, the selection of a specific approach should align with the type of data that best serves the objectives of the project (Jones et al., 2008). In this context, we present a selection of engaging walking methods.

Teacher method

In the teacher method, the expert-layperson roles are exchanged: the research participant is seen as an expert who acts as a guide, showing the researcher important places that hold significance to their life. The participant is the teacher, and the researcher is the student. There are three main parts to this method. First, there's a casual chat to plan the visit and get comfortable with each other. Then, they go on a walk together in the significant place, possibly taking photos and talking about what they see. Finally, they wrap up with another chat, using the photos to spark more conversation.

Go-along method (see Kusenbach, 2016, 2003) With the go-along method, the participant is accompanied by the researcher in their natural setting, allowing the researcher to observe and engage with the participant as they go about their regular activities. The interview process resembles that of a conventional sit-down interview, although ad hoc questions may arise during the interaction. Open-ended inquiries are employed, and the researcher is equipped with a list of topics they wish to explore.

Participatory method

The participants have full control over the walking interview process, determining what they wish to showcase to the researcher, the duration of the interview, and the route to be taken. The interviewees lead the conversation, assuming the role of tour guides and being acknowledged as authorities in their respective domains.

Bimbling

Bimbling, a variation of walking interviews, has been employed to investigate topics such as activism, necessitating the removal of participants from highly politicised environments. This "talking while walking" interview follows a similar format to conventional walking interviews, with the distinction that neither the participant nor the researcher necessarily knows the route beforehand. It is through the act of walking that participants can recall and articulate their experiences.

Sensitive map

Sensitive map is used "as a tool for mediating our different relations to space and situated power relationships".

It enables non-specialists to draw a territory in the form of a map with two main aspects:

- It frees itself in part from the conventional rules of cartography to allow the expression of a lived space: "undisciplined" cartography (Palsky, 2013)
- It adopts certain principles, notably the use of symbolic language (the legend) to support the discourse

Sensitive mapping is used in a variety of contexts

- In the context of research and the production of knowledge on spatial representations, particularly in the field of human geography. It favors an "embodied approach, situated within the perceiving body" (Performascope, 2021). It is a methodology in which the process of data collection is as important as the result: "the cartographic gesture is here as significant and important as the maps created" (Mekdjian, Olmédo, 2016).
- In the operational context of urban design, to collect representations and practices of the city, and to plan space accordingly. It is also used by associations working with vulnerable populations, for example with people in migration situations, to better understand their travel and experience:

The particular interest of this cartographic production lies in the fact that it is not conceived of as a representation of previously *acquired knowledge*, but rather as an occasion for learning and observation that reveals our concrete sensibilities – emotions, feelings, fears, desires that emerge in the course of our daily or exceptional crossings of space.

To make a sensitive map is to take interest in the cartographic gesture that, in drawing, reveals that which makes up our relation to a space. And if the result of the map is not readily accessible to everyone, it is because every relationship to space is situated, demanding to be contextualized, elaborated, and shared. The creation of a sensorial map thus also becomes an occasion for encounters and of decentering in order to *comprehend the logic of the Other and participate in the production of knowledge.*” (Performascope, 2021).

Sensitive map can also be mixed with other mapping method, as participatory mapping, for individual or collective use.

Individual use

Individual map concentrates on individual perception of space. It is used in order to understand how individuals feel and understand places where they live now or where they have been. It is for example often used to understand migrants experience of travelling.

Collective use

Collective cartography is seen as a collection tool for producing collective maps that will be analyzed in research perspective, but also as a tool for mediation and dialogue between actors:

- Identify important places and links for each participant
- Encourage participants to argue over the choice of places to be represented, and to compare differing representations.
- Create a shared representation of the territory

Both individual and collective use of sensitive map are useful in research with vulnerable people and situations of asymmetry:

In the case of individual mapping, using cartography rather than traditional interviews reduces the asymmetry between interviewer and interviewee, by offering a new interview situation, different from other forms of interviewing (social workers, teachers, etc.).

In the case of collective mapping, even if all participants do not have the same mapping skills, the various stages proposed enable a dialogue to be established in which everyone has their place.

:

How to analyse data ?

The way in which data is analyzed depends on whether the research is carried out inductively or deductively. Research teams in the local contexts are free to choose and adapt different ways of data analysis⁴. This section therefore sets out the expectations for the analysis process in the URGE project.

Data analysis should result in the production of set of data about values and sustainability in each local urban context.

For each country, data analysis identify :

- which actors work with the target group in question
- which values they work from
- how they experience that their values conflict with urban development in the area in question
- Best practice examples of inclusive practices in sustainable urban

The results are presented in 5 case-studies. As in the case of the previous URBAN-SOS project, "to describe and analyze the different cases/examples in their context, we draw on theoretical perspectives from social geography, in particular critical perspectives that consider the social dimension of place and place-making, including the significance and importance of our sense of place in a globalized world, i.e. our sense of belonging and identity (e.g. Lefebvre 1991, Massey 2004).

From these perspectives, places and examples of practice are more than just 'context' or location. Rather, they are a way for people - policy makers, planners, social workers and beneficiaries - to understand, know and be in the world. So we cannot take place and context, and the way they are planned and organized, for granted. Instead, we need to examine (through our fieldwork) how place relates to politics, policy and planning through discussions about defining the meaning and appropriate use of place. " (URBAN SOS Project).

⁴ In qualitative research, data will usually be very dense with information and ideas. We will need to comb through the data in detail, interpret its meanings, identify patterns, and extract the parts that are most relevant for our research question. Two of the most common approaches to qualitative data analysis are: Thematic analysis: This analysis focuses on the content of the data and involves coding and organizing the data to identify key themes; Discourse analysis: This analysis focuses on putting the data in context and involves analyzing different levels of communication (language, structure, tone, etc)

RESSOURCES

Méthodes de recherche dans le champ de la déficience intellectuelle.
Nouvelles postures et nouvelles modalités (pp. 1-16). Berne: Peter Lang.

Ackerman Rebecca, Design thinking was supposed to fix the world. Where did it go wrong? An approach that promised to democratize design may have done the opposite. Sébastien Caquard, « Cartography I. Mapping narrative cartography », *Progress in Human Geography*, 37, 1, 2013, pp.135-144

Cahill. C, Sultana, F., & Pain, R. (2007) *Participatory Ethics: Politics, Practices, Institutions*. journal compilation © ACME Editorial Collective

Evans, J., Jones, P. (2011). The walking interview: Methodology, mobility and place. *Appl. Geogr.* 31, 849–858. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2010.09.005>

Jones, P., Griff, B., Evans, J., Hannah, G., & Ricketts Hein, J. (2008). Exploring Space and Place With Walking Interviews. *Journal of Research Practice*, 4(2).

Kusenbach, M. (2016). The Go-Along Method, in: Schwanhäußer, A. (Ed.), *Sensing the City: A Companion to Urban Anthropology*. Birkhäuser, pp. 154–158.

Kusenbach, M. (2003). Street Phenomenology: The Go-Along as Ethnographic Research Tool. *Ethnography* 4, 455–485.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/146613810343007>

Lorimer, H. (2011). Walking: New Forms and Spaces for studies of pedestrianism. In T. Cresswell & P. Merriman (Eds.), *Geographies of mobilities: Practices, spaces, subjects* (pp. 19–33). Ashgate.

Lynch, K., Rivkin, M. (1959). A walk around the block. *Landsc. Mag. Hum. Geogr.* 8:3, 24– 34.

Mekdjian, S., Moreau, M. « Redessiner l'expérience: art, sciences et conditions migratoires », *antiAtlas Journal*, 1, 2016, [en ligne]: <http://www.antiatlas-journal.net/01/re-dessiner-l'experience-art-science-et-conditions-migratoires> (06/05/21)

Olmedo, E., « Cartographie sensible. Tracer une géographie du vécu par la recherche-crédation », [Thèse de doctorat], Paris 1, 2015

Performascope: Interdisciplinary Lexicon of Performance and Research-Creation, Grenoble: Université Grenoble Alpes, 2021, [online]: <http://performascope.univ-grenoble-alpes.fr/en/detail/177837>

Reason, P., & Torbert, W. (2001). *The action turn: Toward a transformational social science. Concepts and Transformation*. International Journal of Action Research and Organizational Renewal, 6(1), 1–37.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/cat.6.1.02rea>

Vaughn, L. M., & Jacquez, F. (2020). *Participatory Research Methods – Choice Points in the Research Process*. Journal of Participatory Research Methods, 1(1).
<https://doi.org/10.35844/001c.13244>

Vergunst, J. L., & Ingold, T. (Eds.). (2016). *Ways of Walking* (1st ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315234250> (Original work published 2008)