

WORKPACKAGE 2 – SYMBOLICAL AND FACTUAL NUISANCES

DELIVERABLE 8 – SURVEY DISTRIBUTION

CONTEXT

GENERAL CONTEXT

Nuisances are a main aspect of human-animal interactions, especially in cities, seen as the human habitat by default, where animal presence is less tolerated. During our recent research on rats in Paris (Delahaye, 2021), we realised that some of the nuisances were completely overestimated and were in fact more psychological than factual (like in catering), while others were completely unknown to the wide public but really expensive to manage for professionals (automotive mostly). However, nuisances do exist and must be addressed.

INSIDE THE PROJECT

This project partially follows the methodology set for a previous study (Delahaye, 2021) of another urban species (*Rattus norvegicus*) in another urban environment (Paris, France). This study showed that the relationship between humans and liminals can be complex, and that several layers of semiotic links can coexist, sometimes even being contradictory. Consequently, a first step is to create a survey to gather first-hand data about semiotic relationships between humans and liminals in Tartu, particularly about corvids, our case study, and even more especially about the main species of this project, *Corvus cornix*.

RESEARCH QUESTION AND HYPOTHESIS

QUESTION AND SUBQUESTION

This deliverable is part of the Case study 2, aiming to study the gaps and paradoxes between factual nuisances and perception of such nuisances, probably symbolical nuisances. The main question of this Case study is: How can we address the nuisances some liminal species are causing to humans?

The analysis of the survey's distribution aims more specifically to answer the question: How to create good response conditions for relevant exploitation of the survey?

HYPOTHESIS OF THIS STEP

The general hypothesis of this step is that most of the perceived nuisances are in fact symbolic nuisances. Factual nuisances do exist but they are not where we think they are. To improve human/animal cohabitation, a meticulous analysis of both factual and symbolic interactions is needed.

This precise step hypothesises that, based on the previous study in Paris (Delahaye, 2021) and the literature regarding survey quality (Leeuw & Hox, 2008; Lohr, 2008; Manfreda & Vehovar, 2008), the distribution of a survey is an important aspect to ensure its relevance and the solidity of the results. This step is strongly linked with the communication plan regarding the project in general and this survey more specifically (see document COM3).

METHODOLOGY

METHODOLOGICAL CHOICES

The main part of the distribution was done through social media. Even if their audience is not strictly representative of the general population, the necessity to gather enough answers in a limited time and budget (see document COM3) made their use a quite relevant one. It also allowed to distribute it to various public, and consequently in both languages, quite easily.

Another part of the distribution was done through newsletters, blogs and specialized journal.

ISSUES AND PROBLEM-SOLVING

For the Estonian survey, the distribution was difficult due to the lack of social network in the general audience of native speakers. The university was helpful for distribution in Estonian, but it was more difficult to reach the general audience through its medium.

POINTS OF VIGILANCE

Due to the difficulty to gather enough answers, the number of participants is not definitive.

RESULTS

RAW RESULTS

In four months, the survey gathered a total of 173 answers. In details:

- 152 were in English, 21 in Estonian
- 110 were full answers, 63 were partial answers

INTERPRETATION

The number of answers in English is disproportionate in comparison to the number of answers in Estonian, but this important difference was expected due to the large number of English speakers and the rarity of Estonian speakers.

Almost a third of the answers are only partial. This was not expected and will need to be correctly addressed in the analysis of the survey.

In the study made in Paris (Delahaye, 2021) the survey gathered 204 answers. At least the same number of answers should be gathered for this project.

MILESTONE 2 – PROGRESS REPORT

IMPACT OF RESULTS

The distribution of the survey is a major point of Workpackage 2, as it should allow gathering first-hand data in a quantity large enough to ensure good quality and relevance of the analysis.

ISSUES, PROBLEMS OR LACKING

At the current date, not enough answers were gathered in order to ensure the quality of the analysis.

NEXT STEPS

Due to the late interest of different stakeholders in the survey, the initial closure date of the survey is postponed by one month, to gather more answers.

GENERAL PROJECT – CURRENT STATE OF PLAY

IMPACT OF RESULTS

The efficient way to gather data, and the different kinds of obstacles that can occur when trying to do so, should become a part of the more global methodology of cohabitation study the project aims to build.

PROPOSITIONS FOR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT

ACADEMIC ASPECTS

This methodological issue is probably an issue that will appear most of the time when this kind of project will be led or conducted by non-local and/or non-native speaker researchers. This is another clue about the necessity to deeply involved local researchers to ensure the success of the project.

POPULARIZATION ASPECTS

Parts of the current issues can be linked to insufficient or inaccurate communication, and this should be taken into account when reflecting on future communication and/or dissemination plans.

NEXT STEPS

The analysis of the survey answers will be merged with the results of the interviews, in order to propose a more global analysis of the first-hand data of the project.

ANNEXES

REFERENCES

- Delahaye, P. (2021). Rats, Mice and Humans. *Linguistic Frontiers*, 4(1), 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.2478/lf-2021-0004>
- Leeuw, E. D. de, & Hox, J. J. (2008). Self-Administered Questionnaires: Mail Surveys and Other Applications. In *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*. Routledge.
- Lohr, S. L. (2008). Coverage and Sampling. In *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*. Routledge.
- Manfreda, K. L., & Vehovar, V. (2008). Internet Surveys. In *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*. Routledge.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sander Mändoja for the distribution in the newsletter.

Tuuli Pern for the distribution through social media in Estonian language.

The editorial team of Eesti Loodus for their interest and help in the survey distribution.

Andrew Creighton for the distribution through the doctoral students' blog.