University of Wollongong

Research Online

Faculty of Social Sciences - Papers (Archive)

Faculty of Arts, Social Sciences & Humanities

2016

A meta-ethnography to synthesise household cultural research for climate change response

Lesley M. Head

University of Wollongong, lhead@uow.edu.au

Christopher R. Gibson

University of Wollongong, cgibson@uow.edu.au

Nicholas J. Gill

University of Wollongong, ngill@uow.edu.au

Chontel A. Carr

University of Wollongong, ccarr@uow.edu.au

Gordon R. Waitt

University of Wollongong, gwaitt@uow.edu.au

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/sspapers>

Part of the [Education Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au

A meta-ethnography to synthesise household cultural research for climate change response

Abstract

Cultural change is critical to climate change responses, but the in-depth qualitative research that investigates culture is necessarily conducted at scales difficult to integrate with policy. A focus of climate change mitigation and adaptation is affluent developed world households. Adapting methods used elsewhere in social science, we report and assess a meta-ethnography of household sustainability research, scaling up findings from 12 studies encompassing 276 Australian households. Seven themes are dominant: family concerns are central to household practice; adaptiveness is contingent but more pervasive than often assumed; households make sense of climate change not through abstract arguments, but through physical resources and materials; boundaries of the home space are dynamic and subjective; daily time is an important currency; paradoxes abound among everyday practice; and privacy and a sense of autonomy are prioritised. Insights from the method include new light on familiar themes when seen through an environmental lens, thickening and triangulation of existing research, and a stronger basis for international comparisons. Some findings have straightforward application to policy, others identify potential areas of risk and resistance, others still are more conceptual. We conclude the method has considerable potential and is worth developing further, providing a critical perspective is maintained.

Keywords

ethnography, change, synthesise, meta, household, response, cultural, research, climate

Disciplines

Education | Social and Behavioral Sciences

Publication Details

Head, L., Gibson, C., Gill, N., Carr, C. & Waitt, G. (2016). A meta-ethnography to synthesise household cultural research for climate change response. *Local Environment: the international journal of justice and sustainability*, 21 (12), 1467-1481.

A meta-ethnography to synthesise household cultural research for climate change response

Abstract

Cultural change is critical to effective responses to climate change, but the in-depth qualitative research that most effectively investigates culture is necessarily conducted at small scales that can be difficult to integrate with policy. A key policy focus of climate change mitigation and adaptation is affluent households of the developed world. Adapting methods used elsewhere in the social sciences, we report and assess a meta-ethnography of household sustainability research, scaling up findings from 12 studies encompassing 276 Australian households. Seven themes are dominant: family concerns are central to household ethical practice; adaptiveness to interruption and unforeseen events is contingent, but more pervasive than often assumed; households make sense of the world (and climate change) not through abstract arguments, but through physical resources, objects and materials; boundaries of the home space are dynamic and subjective; daily time is an important currency; paradoxes abound among everyday practice; and privacy and a sense of autonomy are prioritised. We assess the method against two criteria, whether it generates new insights and is relevant for climate change response. Insights include new light on familiar themes when seen through an environmental lens, thickening and triangulation of existing research, and a stronger basis for international comparisons. On relevance, findings are uneven. Some have straightforward application to policy, others identify potential areas of risk and resistance, others still are more conceptual. We conclude the method has considerable potential and is worth developing further, providing a critical perspective is maintained.

Keywords: adaptive capacity, time, ethnography, family, sustainability, mitigation

1. Introduction

Cultural change is critical to effective responses to climate change (Crate et al. 2011, Adger et al. 2013, Castree et al. 2014). Cultural elements can provide both barriers and enablers to climate change mitigation and adaptation (Adger et al. 2013: 112, Hackmann et al. 2014), and adaptive capacity examined at national scales can mask barriers, constraints, vulnerabilities and opportunities at smaller scales (O'Brien et al. 2006, Hitchings et al. 2015, McNamara and Prasad 2014). However the in-depth qualitative research that most effectively investigates culture is necessarily conducted at small scales. Cultural research uses qualitative methods including ethnography to provide rich, contextual understandings of everyday life. Resulting data can be difficult to integrate with the quantitative approaches used in most climate change research, and has not been well integrated into climate change policy (Adger et al. 2013: 112). An ongoing issue is how to develop rigorous comparison of case study research (Liverman 2008), without compromising the depth and detail which are its key strengths. In this paper we apply and assess a potential method, meta-ethnography, using it to analyse household sustainability research.

An important focus for climate change policy is households of the developed world, which contribute to climate change (Reid et al. 2010) through greenhouse gas emissions both from direct energy use and as conduits for the flow of goods and services (Druckman and Jackson 2009). Households make sense both to the people who live in them, and to government policy-makers, as foundational social units, and as sites through which it is logical to understand the consumption of energy, water and materials that have implications for sustainability issues and climate change mitigation. They are also an important potential scale of climate change adaptation (Lo 2013, Prior and Eriksen 2013), although climate change adaptation research in relation to the developed world is only just beginning to systematically

engage with the household scale (Keogh et al. 2011, Sherreib et al 2010, Eriksen 2013, Toole et al. 2014).

The household has long been an important scale of ethnographic analysis in the developing world (e.g. 1993, Eakin 2006, Head et al. 2011). Netting argued the household is a particularly resilient and appropriate unit of social analysis in smallholder agricultural contexts, yet it 'is a social group so ubiquitous in human society that it is easy to take it for granted' (Netting 1993: 58). Crate (2003) extended the analysis to high latitude contemporary agropastoralists, using Netting's framing of the household as a repository of detailed local ecological knowledge, a joint enterprise with implicit labour contracts (some based on gender) adjustable to daily and seasonal temporalities, and an innate social security system through the life cycle, particularly in providing for children and elders. It is possible, as Netting (1993: 334) argued, that the smallholder system 'may be more vital and necessary to our future than we realize'. It is also likely, as Crate (2003) argued, that similar analyses can be extended to a much broader range of household types in which home-based subsistence and market-based labour activity are combined. However for the moment the specific social ecologies of agricultural and urban households can most fruitfully be examined separately.

In affluent urban societies households are an increasing focus of government policy in relation to sustainability issues, and an expanding research literature considers the household as a crucial scale of social organisation for pro-environmental behaviour (Reid et al. 2010, Gibson et al. 2011, 2013, Lane and Gorman-Murray 2011, Tudor et al. 2011). Everyday life in such households is at once insignificantly tiny and the engine of the global economy that drives climate change. This will be even more the case with growing levels of affluence in countries such as China (Peters et al. 2007, Zheng et al. 2010) and India (Kadian et al. 2007).

The household is an essential site to analyse the dilemmas and potential of ‘scaling up’ climate solutions from cultural analysis of the complexities of everyday life (Abbott and Wilson 2014).

In this paper we apply meta-ethnography (Noblit and Hare 1988) to a climate change context. We report a meta-ethnography of cultural environmental research about the household. Meta-ethnography synthesises qualitative studies to arrive at interpretations greater than the sum of the parts. Widely used in social studies of medicine and education research (see references in Methods), in which policy applications of research findings are sought, it has not been used in relation to environmental or climate change issues. While somewhat analogous to the role of meta-analysis in quantitative studies, meta-ethnography is not intended to be deductive, aggregative and averaging. Rather it is faithful to the interpretivist paradigm and the grounded, comparative methods of the original research (Noblit and Hare 1988: 12, 23).

The national scale is an appropriate one at which to undertake this initial analysis. It allows us to synthesise findings about cultural mores understood as broadly shared within a particular national community, and in this case, within a nation that also has among the highest per capita emissions in the world (Garnaut 2010). To have scaled up further would prematurely gloss over national differences and risk losing the specific and distinctive underlying themes. Our work provides a basis for comparison with potential studies in other countries, particularly those such as the UK, USA and Canada, which are recognised as having a lot in common with Australia (Dietz et al. 2009).

The structure of the paper proceeds as follows. We first outline a conceptualisation of the household as a complex site of socio-ecological interactions and impacts. We briefly review

research showing why simplistic behavioural and policy solutions do not work, in order to build our case that a recognition of in-depth cultural research is important. We then outline the meta-ethnographic method, present our results and discuss the policy and methodological implications.

2. Conceptualising the household in climate change mitigation and adaptation

Tracking the contribution of Western households to their nations' greenhouse gas emissions is widely recognised as important. It is also difficult, and results vary according to the scale and what is measured (Munksgaard et al. 2000, Spangenberg and Lorek 2002, Kenny and Gray 2009, Wilkinson et al. 2009, Wilson and Grant 2009, Duarte et al. 2010, Zheng et al. 2010). In Australia, calculations vary depending on the assumptions made about where responsibility is to be attributed: 13 per cent if only direct energy use within the household is considered, and 56 per cent if the emissions embedded in externally produced goods and services consumed in the household context are included (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2003). Direct energy use by US households constituted 38% of US CO₂ emissions (and 8% of global) in 2005 (Dietz et al. 2009). The way responsibility is attributed in these analyses, for example between household consumers and industrial producers, affects policy priorities for action. (Bin and Dowlatabadi 2005). These methodological challenges stem from a broader conceptual one: how should we think about configurations of people and material things whose social and ecological relations are diverse, shifting and complex? Treating households as black boxes will not do, but many environmental policies targeted at the household scale tend to take the inherent complexity of the domestic sphere for granted.

We have argued that a more sophisticated conceptualisation of the household is needed to

maximise the effectiveness of such policies and suggest alternative ones (Gibson et al. 2013). Using the theme of ‘connected households’ (Head et al. 2013), we recognise that households are part of, and a product of, a network of connections. The black box contains its own complex politics and practices; households are material and social assemblages with variable gender, age, class, ethnic and familial structures (Figure 1). The family with children, the student shared household, the extended family or the retired couple will all experience and respond to climate change and sustainability concerns differently, as will home-owners, private and public renters, and unit and house dwellers. Households are homes in which social relations are the core human concern; in which families bond, people invest emotions and undertake all kinds of identity work beyond the putatively ‘environmental’ (Blunt & Dowling 2006). The black box is also porous. Home spaces and the people who live in them are inextricably linked into the social, technological and regulatory networks that make up suburbs, cities, regions and nations. Daily life – itself a contested and jostling process within households – is connected to wider systems of provision and socioeconomic networks.

<Figure 1 about here>

There is considerable potential for reducing emissions in behavioural changes (Dietz et al. 2009) such as installing low-flow showerheads, changing driving behaviours and line-drying of laundry (Dietz et al. 2009), but there is also considerable research showing why behavioural change is not straightforward (Lorenzoni et al. 2007, Ockwell et al. 2009; Shove 2010). People hold climate change at arms length from everyday life using norms of conversation and emotion (Norgaard 2011). Smart meters do not challenge practices that householders consider non-negotiable (Strengers 2011). Most incentive and education programs pay little attention to the ways household energy, water and other resource

consumption practices are part of the rituals, rhythms, habits and routines of everyday life (Shove 2003; Gregson et al. 2007). Sustainability campaigns normally fail to appeal to, or appreciate, the emotional meanings attached to material possessions (Hobson 2008) or home spaces (Blunt & Dowling 2006). Even when householders want to make behavioural changes there are a range of ways they can be locked in.

That attitudes and practice often do not match provides both avenues and barriers to reducing emissions, but not necessarily in predictable ways. Some of the most avid water savers express vehemently anti-green attitudes (Sofoulis 2005: 447), drawing instead on a rhetoric and identity of frugality; and a lot of sustainability work is being done by low-income households who do not necessarily identify as ‘green’ but who nonetheless consume less (Waite et al. 2012). Pro-sustainability behaviours such as recycling, and reducing electricity or fossil fuel consumption, are often motivated by financial rather than environmental concerns (Gregson et al. 2007). Identifying and mobilising underlying cultural resources, while still acknowledging the complexities of everyday life, is thus essential to more effective policy framings and wider cultural change. This is why we sought a means to scale up household cultural research.

3. Methods

We followed the seven broad stages of meta-ethnography identified by Noblit and Hare (1988). As is commonly recommended, we adapted each step to suit the specifics of our study (Britten and Pope 2012).

3.1 Identify research interest

We identified the research interest as the dimensions of everyday life that have implications for climate change mitigation and adaptation at the household scale in Australia. The justification for choosing a national level of analysis was outlined above, but we note that cultural environmental research into the household is still an emerging field in the Global North (there is a large literature on households in the Global South). Based on a critical mass of comparable ethnographic studies, there are still only a few countries for which a meta-ethnography could be done.

3.2 Decide relevant literature

Many studies undertake a broad literature search and then zoom in to decide what literature is relevant. In this field the total number of studies is small and we have a comprehensive knowledge of relevant work. We selected studies against four criteria; (i) they discussed one or more environmental themes relevant to climate change mitigation and adaptation (without necessarily explicitly discussing them in that context), (ii) they are each of a separate household sample, (iii) both the qualitative methods and data were reported in the peer-reviewed literature, and (iv) both the methods and data were reported in sufficient detail for analysis. The twelve studies are listed by author, date and sample characteristics in Table 1, and listed in full in the bibliography. About the same number of papers again were excluded because they did not meet all four criteria, most commonly because they were of overlapping household samples, or the methods or data were not reported in sufficient detail. (Sample sizes in meta-ethnographies vary between 2 and 44, but are typically less than 10 (Campbell et al. 2003, Atkins et al. 2008).) Methods used in the selected studies included in-depth/semi-structured interviews, diaries (text, photo and/or video) and household tours. As with other studies used in meta-ethnography, not all are strictly based on long-term immersion ethnography.

It seems to be relatively unusual for meta-ethnographers to synthesise work that includes their own (at least one of us is involved as author or supervisor on 8 of the 12 studies). The strengths of our approach are consistent methodological sensibilities in the original research studies, and deep familiarity with both the subject matter of the papers and much of the original data. As ‘the synthesis enterprise itself is essentially an interpretive endeavour’ (Noblit and Hare 1988: 16), deep familiarity with the subject matter enhances this task.

3.3 Repeated reading to extract key concepts

Three authors independently undertook repeated reading of studies to extract key concepts that are the data for synthesis. At this stage we distinguished where possible between 1st order or emic constructs that reflect participant understandings (Atkins et al. 2008) (usually found in the results section of articles) and 2nd order or etic constructs that are interpretations made by authors (usually found in discussion and conclusions sections). In practice, the distinction between the two constructs is less than implied, as the researcher has already selected (usually the richest) data in deciding what to report on and how to frame the paper, but in some instances it threw up interesting additional information.

3.4 Determine relationships between studies

In discussion between the three initial coders, the concepts identified in Step 3 were merged down to nine themes. Some approaches to meta-ethnography would keep groups of papers thematically separate, for example first analysing all the water-related papers together. We did not do this because we were explicitly interested in concepts that transcended particular topics.

3.5 Translate studies into one another

This process is analogous to constant comparison. Each of the studies was then independently analysed by a fourth author to search for all nine Step 4 themes. These may not necessarily have been identified in the original empirical studies. In some studies this stage proceeds by comparing two studies, then translating that comparison into a third, and so on. In our view this approach gives undue interpretive influence to whichever two papers are compared first. Instead we treated this stage as an independent ‘back-coding’ operation to test the persistence of the themes.

3.6 Synthesise translations

Translations are synthesized by identifying concepts that can encompass those found on other studies. This was initially undertaken by LH and refined in discussion between all five authors. At this point the two least persistent themes were merged or absorbed into others.

3.7 Express synthesis

The synthesis is expressed in the seven persistent themes of the results section. The order of presentation in the text and Table 2 is structured to aid the narrative rather than implying order of importance. Throughout Steps 3-6 we also sought to identify and discuss emergent themes not necessarily identified in any individual paper. These are discussed in the implications section.

4. Results

Seven persistent and inter-connected themes were identified in the meta-ethnography of empirical work on households (see Table 2 for examples under each theme).

4.1 Family is central.

Family and social relationships are key drivers of household decision-making, even in environmentally conscious households. This means that family roles, obligations and practices of care – mothering, fathering, care for elderly parents, generational differences – strongly influence environmental outcomes, with implications for climate change response. Environmental practices, like other family issues, are negotiated, argued about and resolved in pragmatic ways. For example, cohabiting extended family households share laundries and kitchens but not TVs and cars. Within this theme, recurring issues deserving of further research include gender roles and the influence of childhood. The presence of children shapes parental decision-making through both aspirations to good parenting, however that is understood, and in the hurly-burly of everyday life. Childhood experience is an important influence on everyday practices later in life.

4.2 Adaptiveness is contingent, but pervasive.

Everyday life requires and enhances many types of adaptiveness, flexibility and coping. Households have differential capacities and potential for adaptiveness, their starting point being to work with what they have or the hand they have been dealt. Innovation often emerges through restriction, which is tolerated where it makes sense and is shared, as in the example of water restrictions during drought. Many resource-use minimising practices are driven (often unintentionally) by values such as frugality and thrift rather than environmental values. Experiences of 'other' conditions emerge as a cultural resource. For example rural childhoods can shape lifelong frugal water practices, and migrant experience of interrupted or scarce energy supplies can help deal with impediments arising from scarcity or interruption.

Households may begrudge interruptions to supply and prosperity, but they possess social and cultural means to cope.

4.3 A sense of autonomy needs to be maintained.

Power is constantly negotiated at a range of scales (individual, family, household) as people make decisions and process a variety of information. They may or may not respond to information provided at a meta-level outside the household. Freedom, choice and control are articulated as important issues – in ways that variously conform with and confound wider governmental objectives. Hence when environmental expectations collide with practices or standards considered non-negotiable (for example, some levels of thermal comfort, seamless scheduling provided by the car, seasonal abundance at Christmas) they may be ignored, resisted or worked around. Meanwhile in the case of adaptive practices such as informal water harvesting, households responded to the collective and governmental imperative to reduce water with an ethic of self-sufficiency and autonomy from big governmental and/or infrastructural systems.

4.4 Households make sense of the world through materials.

Everyday interaction with and use of material things, including the materials of the home itself, are at the forefront of people's awareness. In interviews they constantly bring abstract concepts, including climate change, back to the stuff around them. Households engage actively and skilfully with home design and layout in ways that can reduce consumption and use energy more effectively (managing airflow, shade, water use), but can also ratchet up potential greenhouse gas emissions via materials and objects that are obtained, excessively accumulated and cleaned for reasons of aesthetics, status and a sense of self. Changes are

easier to make or rationalise when they are visible, as evidenced by more widespread engagement with reducing water rather than energy consumption.

4.5 Boundaries are dynamic and subjective.

The family and home provide privacy, freedom and retreat from the world, but are variably permeable to friends, visitors and networks of sharing. The home is a site of integrity, integration, preservation and recognition. Inside and outside spaces can be both boundaries and corridors of connection, with varying degrees of resistance to communality. Within the household both spatial and personal boundaries (related to social class, gender, age and ethnicity) are maintained and breached. Crucial here are individual patterns of movement and living, and associated levels of convenience. These are prioritised and maintained to the cost of everything else.

4.6 Time is an important currency.

Everyday life involves constant attempts to ‘smooth’ and ‘save’ time to make routines seamless and minimise interruptions. In practice these rhythms and movements are subject to disruption and friction, especially where children are involved. Maintenance of any sense of routine and rhythm in busy schedules is heavily dependent on female labour, usually unpaid. Things that enhance flexible timings and save ‘wasting’ time are relatively non-negotiable, cars being the prime example. Given the importance of valuing time saved in a number of studies, its absence in others – each focusing on water – was notable. This indicates that uninterrupted supply of water contributes to seamless household routines that play a significant part in the shaping and functioning of society, and alerts us to possible arenas of both friction and opportunity if supply becomes less reliable.

4.7 Paradoxes abound.

All the themes are cross-cut by paradoxes that hold practices, values and perceptions in tension. Consistent with other research, these findings demonstrate that identities and behaviours do not line up (Blake 1999, Shove 2010). Shifts can be unpredictable and policies may have unintended consequences. Thus people risk becoming dependent on an increasingly narrow band of thermal comfort, despite demonstrated capacities to enjoy and adapt to a much wider band. Water tanks that theoretically save water are used to maintain ideas and practices of uninterrupted supply. Business-as-usual continues and dealing with the condition of scarcity is avoided. Though when scarcity does arise there are capacities to cope that stem from willingness to accept seasonal and thermal variability, a shared ethic of minimising waste, and rural, childhood and migrant memories of hardship, and how things were once done.

5. Discussion

In assessing the meta-ethnographic method for its potential to scale up household ethnographic research for climate change response, two main questions are relevant. Does it generate new insights not available in the individual studies? Are the insights generated relevant to climate change response?

Does it generate new insights?

None of the insights generated are blindingly new. It is possible to find each of these themes somewhere in an individual paper or in discursive overviews drawing on the same work. But the findings are useful in several ways. First, take for example the finding that the concept of family is central at a household scale of social life. Surely a no-brainer? But there is more than meets the eye to the idea that even in strongly green identifying households, the social

bonds trump the environmental ones. ‘Family’ provides a promising non-environmental lever that could be mobilized in climate change response. For example, shared valuing of the family – whatever its diverse forms – provides a potential bridge across the current left-right divide on climate change policy in Australia, the USA and elsewhere.

Second, while the persistence of themes across disparate studies can be seen as aggregative rather than newly interpretive, that in itself provides value, for example thickening the way time is considered in different contexts. To a strong extent the findings triangulate the individual pieces of work against one another. While it is a truism that fine-grained qualitative research always throws up complexity, there are clear consistencies here in that complexity.

The findings thus, third, strengthen the basis on which comparisons between households can start to be made at an international scale, particularly from parts of the world acknowledged to be facing similar challenges to Australia, such as the USA (Dietz et al. 2009), and/or where there is a strong tradition of household-scale sustainability research, such as the UK (Tudor et al. 2011). The paradoxes and contradictions have been widely reported in other literature, for example, confirming that a focus on encouraging green identities is a likely barrier and may be counterproductive, while the above-mentioned family values – albeit in diverse expressions – may provide a non-environmental lever that can gain wide traction. In contrast, the focus on autonomy and privacy may be a more uniquely Australian concern.

Are the insights potentially relevant to climate change response?

The seven themes are uneven in the extent to which they are relevant to climate change response. They have variable relevance to policy or, more accurately, they are uneven in the extent to which they would be easily translatable into policy applications. Some are quite

conceptual and their relevance and/or application will be indirect. To explore this question further, we inferred the mitigation and adaptation capacities in households and the potential for these to increase or decrease, as shown in the right hand columns of Table 2. Note that it is not the aim of this paper to provide policy recommendations, rather we aim to assess the extent to which the meta-ethnography might be useful in different contexts.

The most positive implication is the strength of adaptiveness in this analysis. It is clear that households have all kinds of capacities to respond, cope and adapt – many of which may not be readily apparent when assessing resilience at either the individual or the population scales (Downes et al. 2013). They may be readier to make sacrifices to deal with climate change than governments and policy-makers have given them credit for. Income, education, social class, and geographical location (latitudinal position, coastal exposure, remoteness) have become common proxies for vulnerability (Beer et al. 2012), but neither vulnerability nor capacity should be assumed from macro-scale demographic or socioeconomic data (McNamara and Prasad 2014). Developed world populations determined as vulnerable using quantitative demographic data are being shown through subsequent qualitative methods to have strong social bonds, from prior experiences of rallying together in response to extreme external forces such as droughts, wildfires, and floods (Beer et al. 2012). As Anderson (2008) argued, seemingly vulnerable low-income, rural households apprehend climate change through shared discourses of endurance, uncertainty, advocacy, and local resolve. It is relatively straightforward to imagine some policy implications of this finding. For example, informal strategies and networks, once identified, acknowledged and supported, could provide safety nets for those without.

The consistently complex themes such as family and autonomy, which on Table 2 show as

much potential to decrease mitigation or adaptation actions, are not easily translatable into policy actions. However they provide an important contribution in identifying areas of risk for government intervention. For example the themes encompassing autonomy, privacy and control alert governments to areas where they might expect resistance, and against which policy suggestions should be tested. The issue needs to be considered in light of the evidence for left-right political polarisation in levels of acceptance of climate change science (McCright and Dunlap 2011), but we interpret this as a deeper issue than that of political leanings towards greater or lesser government regulation. It is consistent with other cultural environmental research showing the importance of privacy and freedom in the context of domestic life (Blunt and Dowling 2006, Head and Muir 2007).

Further, our analysis shows how everyday temporalities can provide sites of both resistance and creativity in responding to the challenges of climate change, particularly for families. Certainly the increasing expectations of seamless time and mobility provide points of friction at the moment, and mitigate against a range of sustainability activities, e.g. walking instead of driving. The friction is particularly experienced by women whose role as household managers involves negotiating and integrating the temporalities of individual family members. In many of the studies in our analysis, a slower pace of household life would be welcomed; it is often the expectations of and connections with the wider world that force the speed. But these connections may change by force as the temporalities of modernity unravel. The importance of social temporalities in relation to climate change has been identified by a number of authors (Hulme et al. 2009, Norgaard 2011, Pahl et al. 2014). Fincher et al. (2014: 203) argue that ‘the everyday is the temporal site at which events and meanings at different temporal scales coalesce for people making sense of their situations’. In a study of responses to sea level rise, they showed that the everyday time of elderly residents can sometimes be more

realistic in its climate change response than official temporalities focusing on distant futures, even in the name of preparedness. The shifting socialities of time under climate change are important and need further research.

The themes that are the most difficult to translate into policy include the more conceptual ones around boundaries and materiality. But even here there are possibilities. For example, the centrality of engagements with physical things, resources and materials shows that encouraging reduced consumption as a climate change response should not be presented as an attempt to de-materialise everyday life. In fact these kinds of efforts might lead to more active resistance. Rather, new kinds of relationships with things will need to be fostered, in a new phase that extends well beyond municipal recycling schemes (Lane and Watson 2012).

Among the implications of this are fostering cultures of respect for physical things, their embodied energy and input materials (purchasing items, often second-hand, that are ‘well-made’ or ‘built to last’); improved supply-chains for home renovation that facilitate access to reclaimed and low-footprint materials; industrial design of products that pre-empt easy repair or disassembly for recycling; and catalysing change around norms of cleanliness and newness, including encouraging aesthetics that celebrate re-use. Via everyday objects and materials households thus need to be plugged into the bigger picture of industrial ecology and the circulation of materials.

6. Conclusions

Meta-ethnography has been widely used in other areas of qualitative research but not in relation to environmental or climate change issues. In applying it here to studies of households in the affluent West, we argue that the method holds considerable promise but will also need critique and development. In areas where it is well established, there is ongoing

discussion of its merits and complex epistemological questions (Doyle 2003, Atkins et al. 2008), as well as how to foster innovation in the techniques (Dixon-Woods et al. 2006). Notwithstanding any difficulties, its key contribution is that it ‘does not conceptually dismiss single case studies as locally bound’, but rather ‘compels us to acknowledge the importance of not only the uniqueness of individual cases, but also the uniqueness of collectives’ (Doyle 2003: 340).

We conclude that meta-ethnography has considerable potential and is worth persisting with in this area of research. One area for future work to test is whether a narrower thematic focus in the meta-ethnography, for example household water practices rather than the broader remit of household sustainability, would throw up the more specific new insights found in studies such as those of diabetic medication treatments (Campbell et al. 2003). Other potential developments would be meta-ethnographies in other national contexts that could then be compared with this one, or meta-ethnographies of studies in environmental institutions and businesses. In the latter case the experiences of professional environmental managers (e.g. Sofoulis 2015) could be compared with those of householders. Although the field of cultural environmental research into households is itself relatively new, and the body of work is not huge, we argue it is urgent to consider how to best scale up its findings to inform climate change response, including mitigation and adaptation policies.

References

- Abbott, D. and Wilson, G. 2014 Climate change: lived experience, policy and public action, *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management* 6: 5 – 18.
- Adger, W.N., Barnett, J., Brown, K., Marshall, N. and O’Brien, K. 2013 Cultural dimensions

- of climate change impacts and adaptation. *Nature Climate Change* 3, 112-117.
- Allon, F. and Sofoulis, Z. 2006. Everyday Water: cultures in transition. *Australian Geographer* 37, 45-56.
- Anderson, D. 2008. Drought, endurance and “the way things were”: The lived experience of climate and climate change in the Mallee. *Australian Humanities Review* 45.
<http://www.australianhumanitiesreview.org/660archive/Issue-November-2008/anderson.html> (last accessed 27 November 2013).
- Atkins, S., Lewin, S., Smith, H., Engel, M., Fretheim, A. and Vomink, J. 2008. Conducting a meta-ethnography of qualitative literature: lessons learnt. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 8, 21.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics 2003, *Yearbook Australia, 2003*. Cat. No. 1301.0., Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra, <<http://www.abs.gov.au>>.
- Beer, A., Tually, S., Kroehn, M. and Law, J. 2012. *Australia's country towns 2050: What will a climate adapted settlement pattern look like?* Gold Coast, Australia: NCCARF.
- Bin, S. and Dowlatabadi, H. 2005. Consumer lifestyle approach to US energy use and the related CO₂ emissions. *Energy Policy* 33(2): 197-208.
- Blake, J. 1999. Overcoming the ‘value- action gap’ in environmental policy: Tensions between national policy and local experience. *Local Environment* 4, 257-278.
- Blunt, A. and Dowling, R. 2006, *Home*. Routledge, London.
- Britten, N. and Pope, C. 2012. Medicine taking for asthma: a worked example of meta-ethnography. In K. Hannes and C. Lockwood (eds) *Synthesizing Qualitative Research: Choosing the Right Approach*. Wiley-Blackwell, UK. pp. 41-57.
- Campbell, R., Pound, P., Pope, C., Britten, N., Pill, R., Morgan, M. and Donovan, J. 2003. Evaluating meta-ethnography: a synthesis of qualitative research on lay experiences of diabetes and care. *Social Science and Medicine* 56, 671-684.

- Castree, N., Adams, W.M., Barry, J., Brockington, D., Büscher, B., Corbera, Esteve, Demeritt, D., Duffy, R., Felt, U., Neves, K., Newell, P., Pellizzoni, L., Rigby, K., Robbins, P., Robin, L., Rose, D.B., Ross, A., Schlosberg, D., Sörlin, S., West, P., Whitehead, M. and Wynne, B. 2014. Changing the Intellectual Climate. *Nature Climate Change* 4: 763-768.
- Crate, S.A. 2003 Viliui Sakha Post-Soviet Adaptation: A Subarctic Test of Netting's Smallholder–Householder Theory. *Human Ecology* 31 (4): 499-528
- Crate, S.A. 2011. Climate and culture: anthropology in the era of contemporary climate change. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 40: 175-194.
- De Vet, E. 2013. Exploring weather-related experiences and practices: examining methodological approaches. *Area* 45: 198-206.
- Dietz, T., Gardner, G. T., Gilligan, J., Stern, P. C., & Vandenbergh, M. P. 2009. Household actions can provide a behavioral wedge to rapidly reduce US carbon emissions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(44), 18452-18456.
- Dixon-Woods, M., Bonas, S., Booth, A., Jones, D. R., Miller, T., Sutton, A. J., Shaw, R.L. and Smith, J.A. and Young, B. 2006. How can systematic reviews incorporate qualitative research? A critical perspective. *Qualitative Research* 6: 27-44.
- Downes, B.J., Miller, F., Barnett, J., Glaister, A. and Ellemor, H. 2013. How do we know about resilience? An analysis of empirical research on resilience, and implications for interdisciplinary praxis. *Environmental Research Letters* 8: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/8/1/014041>
- Doyle, L. H. 2003. Synthesis through meta-ethnography: paradoxes, enhancements, and possibilities. *Qualitative Research* 3: 321-344.
- Druckman, A. and Jackson, T. 2009. The Carbon Footprint of UK Households 1990–2004: A Socio-Economically Disaggregated, Quasi-Multi-Regional Input–Output Model.

- Ecological Economics* 68: 2066–77.
- Duarte, R., Mainar, A. and Sánchez-Chóliz, J. 2010. The impact of household consumption patterns on emissions in Spain. *Energy Economics* 32: 176-185.
- Eakin, H. 2006. *Weathering risk in rural Mexico: Climatic, institutional, and economic change*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Eriksen, C. 2013. *Gender and wildfire: Landscapes of uncertainty*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Eriksen, C. and Gill, N. 2010. Bushfire and everyday life: examining the awareness-action ‘gap’ in changing rural landscapes. *Geoforum* 41: 814-825.
- Farbotko, C. and Head, L. 2013. Gifts, sustainable consumption and giving up green anxieties at Christmas. *Geoforum* 50: 88-96S.
- Fincher, R., Barnett, J., Graham, S. and Hurlimann, A. 2014 Time stories: Making sense of futures in anticipation of sea-level rise. *Geoforum* 56: 201-210
- Ford, J. D., B. Smit, J. Wandel, M. Allurut, K. Shappa, H. Ittusarjuat, and K. Qrunnut. 2008. Climate change in the Arctic: Current and future vulnerability in two Inuit communities in Canada. *Geographical Journal* 174:45–62.
- Garnaut R. 2010. *The Garnaut Climate Change Review: Final Report*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibson, C., Farbotko, C., Gill, N., Head, L. and Waite, G. 2013. *Household sustainability: challenges and dilemmas in everyday life*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Gibson, C., Waite, G., Head, L., and Gill, N. 2011. Is it easy being green? On the dilemmas of material cultures of household sustainability, in R Lane and A Gorman-Murray (eds.), *Material geographies of household sustainability*, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 19–34.
- Gregson, N., Metcalfe, A. and Crewe, L. 2007. Moving things along: the conduits and practices of divestment in consumption, *Transactions of the Institute of British*

- Geographers* 32: 187–200.
- Hackmann, H, Moser, S.C. and St. Clair, A.L. 2014. The social heart of global environmental change. *Nature Climate Change* 4: 653-5.
- Head, L., Atchison, J., Gates, A. and Muir, P. 2011. A fine-grained study of the experience of drought, risk and climate change among Australian wheat farming households. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 101: 1089-1108.
- Head, L., Farbotko, C., Gibson, C., Gill, N. and Waitt, G. 2013. Zones of friction, zones of traction: the connected household in climate change and sustainability policy. *Australasian Journal of Environmental Management* 20: 351-362.
- Head, L. and Muir, P. 2007 *Backyard. Nature and culture in suburban Australia*. Wollongong: Wollongong University Press.
- Hitchings, R., Collins, R. and Day, R. 2015 Inadvertent environmentalism and the action–value opportunity: reflections from studies at both ends of the generational spectrum. *Local Environment* 3: 369-385..
- Hobson, K, 2008. Reasons to be cheerful: thinking sustainably in a (climate) changing world, *Geography Compass* 2: 199–214.
- Horne, R., Maller, C. and Lane, R. 2011 Remaking home: the reuse of goods and materials in Australian households. In R. Lane and A. Gorman-Murray (eds) *Material Geographies of Household Sustainability*. Surrey: Ashgate. Pp. 89-112.
- Hulme, M., Dessai, S., Lorenzoni, I., Nelson, D.R. 2009. Unstable climates: exploring the statistical and social constructions of ‘normal’ climate. *Geoforum* 40: 197–206.
- Kadian, R., Dahiya, R.P. and Garg, H.P. 2007. Energy-related emissions and mitigation opportunities from the household sector in Delhi. *Energy Policy* 35: 6195-6211.
- Kenny, T., & Gray, N. F. 2009. A preliminary survey of household and personal carbon dioxide emissions in Ireland. *Environment International* 35: 259-272.

- Keogh, D.U., Apan, A., Mushtaq, S., King, D. and Thomas, M. 2011 Resilience, vulnerability and adaptive capacity of an inland rural town prone to flooding: a climate change adaptation case study of Charleville, Queensland, Australia. *Nat Hazards* 59:699–723
- Klocker, N., Gibson, C. and Borger, E. 2012. Living together but apart: material geographies of everyday sustainability in extended family households. *Environment and Planning A* 44: 2240-2259.
- Lane, R. and Gorman-Murray, A. (eds.) 2011. *Material geographies of household sustainability*, Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Lane R. and Watson M. 2012. Stewardship of things: the radical potential of product stewardship for re-framing responsibilities and relationships to products and materials. *Geoforum* 43: 1254.
- Liverman, D. 2008. Assessing impacts, adaptation and vulnerability: Reflections on the Working Group II Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. *Global Environmental Change* 18: 4-7.
- Lo, A.Y. 2013 The role of social norms in climate adaptation: Mediating risk perception and flood insurance purchase. *Global Environmental Change* 23: 1249-1257
- McCright, A. M., & Dunlap, R. E. 2011. The politicization of climate change and polarization in the American public's views of global warming, 2001–2010. *The Sociological Quarterly* 52: 155-194.
- McNamara, K.E. & Prasad S.S. 2014. Coping with extreme weather: Communities in Fiji and Vanuatu share their experiences and knowledge. *Climatic Change* 123: 121-132.
- Moy, C. 2012. Rainwater tank households: water savers or water users? *Geographical Research* 50: 204-216.

- Munksgaard, J., Pedersen, K. A., & Wien, M. 2000. Impact of household consumption on CO₂ emissions. *Energy Economics* 22: 423-440.
- Netting, R. McC. 1993. *Smallholders, Householders: Farm Families and the Ecology of Intensive, Sustainable Agriculture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Noblit, G.W. and Hare, R.D. 1988 *Meta-ethnography: Synthesizing Qualitative Studies*. Sage Qualitative Research Methods Volume 11, Newbury Park CA.
- Norgaard KM 2011 *Living in Denial. Climate Change, Emotions, and Everyday Life*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- O'Brien, K., Eriksen, S., Sygna, L. and Naess, L.O. 2006 Questioning Complacency: Climate Change Impacts, Vulnerability, and Adaptation in Norway. *Ambio* 35: 50-56.
- Ockwell, D., Whitmarsh, L. and O'Neill, S. 2009. Reorienting climate communication for effective mitigation: forcing people to be green or fostering grass-roots engagement? *Science Communication*, 30: 305-327.
- Organo, V., Head, L. and Waitt, G. 2013. Who does the work in sustainable households? A time and gender analysis in New South Wales, Australia. *Gender Place and Culture* 20: 559-577.
- Pahl S., Sheppard S., Boomsma, C. and Groves, C. 2014. Perceptions of time in relation to climate change. *WIREs Clim Change* 5:375–388.
- Peters, G.P., Weber, C.L., Guan, D. and Hubacek, K. 2007. China's Growing CO₂ Emissions: A Race between Increasing Consumption and Efficiency Gains. *Environmental Sciences and Technology* 41: 5939-5944.
- Prior, T. and Eriksen, C. 2013 Wildfire preparedness, community cohesion and social-ecological systems. *Global Environmental Change* 23: 1575-1586.
- Reid, L., Sutton, P., and Hunter, C. 2010. Theorizing the meso level: the household as a crucible of pro-environmental behaviour. *Progress in Human Geography* 34: 309-327.

- Sherrieb, K., Norris, F.H., Galea, S. 2010. Measuring Capacities for Community Resilience. *Soc Indic Res* 99:227–247
- Shove, E 2003. *Comfort, cleanliness and convenience*, Berg, Oxford.
- Shove, E. 2010. Beyond the ABC: climate change policy and theories of social change. *Environment and Planning A* 42: 1273-1285.
- Sofoulis, Z. 2005. Big water, everyday water: a sociotechnical perspective. *Continuum* 19: 445–463.
- Sofoulis, Z. 2015. The trouble with tanks: unsettling dominant Australian urban water management paradigms. *Local Environment* 20: 529-547.
- Spangenberg, J. H. and Lorek, S. 2002. Environmentally sustainable household consumption: from aggregate environmental pressures to priority fields of action. *Ecological Economics* 43(2): 127-140.
- Strengers, Y. 2011. Negotiating everyday life: the role of energy and water consumption feedback, *Journal of Consumer Culture* 11: 319–338.
- Strengers, Y. and Maller, C. 2011. Integrating health, housing and energy policies: social practices of cooling. *Building Research and Information* 39: 154-168.
- Strengers, Y. and Maller, C. 2012. Materialising energy and water resources in everyday practices: insights for securing supply systems. *Global Environmental Change* 22: 754-763.
- Tudor, T., Robinson, G.M., Riley, M., Guilbert, S. and Barr, S.W. 2011 Challenges facing the sustainable consumption and waste management agendas: perspectives on UK households. *Local Environment* 16: 51–66.
- Waite, G., Caputi, P., Gibson, C., Farbotko, C., Head, L., Gill, N. and Stanes, E. 2012. Sustainable household capability: which households are doing the work of environmental sustainability? *Australian Geographer* 43: 51–74.

- Waitt, G. and Harada, T. 2012. Driving, Cities and Changing Climates. *Urban Studies* 49: 3307-3325.
- Wilkinson, P., Smith, K.R., Davies, M., Adair, H., Armstrong B.G., Barrett, M., Bruce, N., Haines, A., Hamilton, I., Oreszczyn, T., Ridley, I., Tonne, C. and Chalabi, Z. 2009 Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions: household energy. *The Lancet* 374(9705): 1917-1929.
- Wilson, J. and Grant, J.L. 2009. Calculating ecological footprints at the municipal level: what is a reasonable approach for Canada? *Local Environment* 14: 963–979.
- Working Group II Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2008 *Global Environmental Change* 18: 4-7.
- Zheng, S., Wang, R., Glaeser, E. L., & Kahn, M. E. 2010. The greenness of China: household carbon dioxide emissions and urban development. *Journal of Economic Geography*, lbq031.