

Supplementary Materials

Design

<p>Co-designed project framing</p>	<p>The co-designed project framing consisted of detailed discussion with fourteen residents across the two locations. Clark et al. (2022:1) suggest that “engagement with communities at the focus of research can promote thoughtful, sensitive designs”. Specifically, we followed a co-design approach to ensure that our framing and language stood the best chance of resonating “on the ground” with individuals, businesses, and community groups; to engender trust, legitimacy, and rapport; and to attempt to align the project with local needs (as far as possible within the remit of the funding).</p> <p>In both locations, the people we engaged with suggested that we should emphasise the co-benefits that “climate action” can secure, in other words, how taking climate action can support aspirations to “live well”; this resulted in the project title “Have your say Aberfeldy/Tulloch: Local ideas for climate action and living well”. In addition, four categories were suggested to organise ideas, namely “Getting around”, “Home”, “Local business” and “Living well”.</p>
------------------------------------	--

Table 1: describes the approach taken to project design

Project promotion, participant recruitment, and exit strategy

<p>Leveraging the mailing lists and social media of community groups and the local authority;</p>	<p>Where possible and when consent could be granted, we leveraged the mailing lists of community groups to promote the project and to extend the (open) invitation to participate to local people and businesses. We also made use of the local authorities’ social media channels and mailing lists.</p>
<p>Posters and bus stop signage</p>	<p>Posters promoting the project and informing people how they could get involved were displayed in shops and public spaces throughout both project locations. Digital bus stop signage along popular public transport routes was also leveraged to promote the project.</p>
<p>Paid Facebook promotion campaign</p>	<p>We promoted the project and associated activities through a paid Facebook advertising campaign, targeted at people in both project locations.</p>
<p>Incentivisation framework</p>	<p>Recognising that we did not have the time or resource to develop trusting relationships with local people for whom participating in a project like this was new, we sought to adopt a position of monetary incentivisation (£100+). We recognised that monetary incentivisation is a short-term solution to a much bigger set of problems restricting greater citizen involvement in decision-making. However, considering that research suggests it can improve recruitment (especially for vulnerable and marginalised groups -</p>

	<p>Bentley and Thacker, 2004), we reasoned that, in this instance, the potential benefits outweighed the cons. However, it quickly transpired that there were tensions between our aspirations (i.e., the UoE team), and what constitutes feasible practice to a local council. Our partners at the council pointed out that, for them, this was not a “one-off” project; engaging with communities around issues including but not limited to climate action is part of their day job. They reasoned that if they were to offer significant monetary incentivisation for this project, then people would expect them to do it for all projects going forward – which their operational budget would not allow. This resulted in an incentivisation framework whereby everyone who submitted an idea to the website would be entered into a draw for a £50 voucher, and focus group participants could receive a £25 voucher.</p>
Door knocking and offline materials	<p>This consisted of door knocking in each core project location, delivering materials to approximately 250 households and discussing the project where possible. The materials package included a letter explaining the project, how to get involved, and a questionnaire / survey that could be returned to a local convenience store.</p> <p>The purpose here was threefold: firstly, to increase inclusivity by reaching out to people who may not use the internet; secondly, to promote the project and recruit participants; and thirdly, to see and be seen in the two communities.</p>
Social media	<p>Dedicated Facebook, Twitter and What’s App accounts for each core project location. Primarily used to promote the various activities/events, but people were also encouraged to submit ideas directly via these platforms. In the UK, different generational cohorts tend towards certain social media applications (Statista, 2022); by incorporating several platforms into the project design, we hoped to increase participation across multiple cohorts.</p>
Exit strategy / next steps	<p>The exit strategy from the project was for the project partners (led by the local authority) to take the climate action proposals generated and prioritised by communities and integrate them into a funding application to raise funds for implementation.</p> <p>The local authority also reverted to first point of contact for the communities who participated in the project.</p>

Table 2: describes the project promotion, participant recruitment and exit strategies

Activities

Bespoke websites for idea submission	<p>A website for each location where individuals, community groups and local businesses were encouraged to identify barriers restricting climate action and living well, as well as to propose place-based solutions that could be leveraged to drive positive change.</p>
--------------------------------------	--

	<p>In Aberfeldy, we followed a co-design approach, where people and businesses uploaded content prior to the website going live (video and written text) that provided an example of a locally grounded climate action idea across each of the four categories. In Tulloch, the website was not co-designed due to a lack of time constraint.</p>
Focus groups	<p>We facilitated focus groups in each project location to enable greater qualitative depth and exploration of barriers and place-based solutions identified through websites and offline submissions; and, to gather broader feedback regarding the approach to the project, and associated methods. Focus groups took place online as this was the preference of those who signed-up. According to Bormann (2022:5): “in focus groups, the contributions of other participants, confrontations with other views, and group dynamics can stimulate reflection, and deep-seated perceptions and evaluations become salient”.</p>
School workshops	<p>In-person workshops with students from both project locations. Interactive sessions involved evaluation of place (goods and bads), as well as activities designed to draw out potential (sustainable) futures at behavioural, household and community level (e.g., community mapping; ideal home of the future). Important as this enabled a greater diversity of intergenerational perspectives; indeed, according to Ursin et al (2021:14): “children and youth hold a vital position in climate politics and are perhaps the most important stakeholders”.</p>
Idea refinement and prioritisation event	<p>The final in-person events constituted the culmination of the project. The events served as a platform to refine and prioritise the proposals derived from the ideas of individuals, community groups and local businesses. The research team collated the ideas submitted by people and businesses throughout the project, curating coherent “panel proposals” that combined several thematically linked individual submissions.</p> <p>Participants, stakeholders, and interested parties were invited to engage with the co-produced panel proposals in an interactive way: to understand their potential impact, provide valuable feedback, and indicate their priorities. We aimed to foster dialogue, collaboration, and further refinement, ensuring that the community's voice was heard (thus the refinement and prioritisation events also acted as a formal review stage for translation of ideas into proposals).</p> <p>According to Satorras et al (2020:2): “although it may resemble other concepts such as collaborative governance or participatory planning, co-production puts the emphasis on citizens' involvement in the production of both knowledge and planning decisions”.</p>
Online voting/prioritisation	<p>We created an online form for anyone who could not attend the in-person idea refinement and prioritisation event but still wanted to participate. This</p>

	was done on a Google form which duplicated the information on display at the in-person counterpart.
--	---

Table 3: describes the methodological toolbox of approaches leveraged to facilitate public participation

References

- Bentley, J.P. and Thacker, P.G. (2004). The influence of risk and monetary payment on the research participation decision making process. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, [online] 30(3), pp.293–298. doi.org/10.1136/jme.2002.001594.
- Bormann, M. (2022). Perceptions and Evaluations of Incivility in Public Online Discussions—Insights From Focus Groups With Different Online Actors. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 4. doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2022.812145.
- Clark, A.T., Ahmed, I., Metzger, S., Walker, E. and Wylie, R. (2022). Moving From Co-Design to Co-Research: Engaging Youth Participation in Guided Qualitative Inquiry. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 21, p.160940692210847. doi.org/10.1177/16094069221084793.
- Satorras, M., Ruiz-Mallén, I., Monerde, A. and March, H. (2020). Co-production of urban climate planning: Insights from the Barcelona Climate Plan. *Cities*, 106, p.102887. doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2020.102887.
- Statista. (2022). Social networking site preference by age UK. [online] Statista. Available at: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/308712/main-social-networking-site-preference-in-the-uk-by-age/>.
- Ursin, M., Lorgen, L.C., Alvarado, I.A.O., Smalsundmo, A.-L., Nordgård, R.C., Bern, M.R. and Bjørnevik, K. (2021). Promoting Intergenerational Justice Through Participatory Practices: Climate Workshops as an Arena for Young People’s Political Participation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.727227.