

# A flowing conversation? Methodological issues in interviewing farmers about rivers and riparian environments

Emma Thomas<sup>1</sup> | Mark Riley<sup>1</sup>  | Hugh Smith<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Geography and Planning,  
University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

<sup>2</sup>Landcare Research New Zealand,  
Manaaki Whenua, Palmerston North,  
New Zealand

## Correspondence

Mark Riley  
Email: mark.riley@liverpool.ac.uk

## Funding information

Economic and Social Research Council

Geographers are increasingly paying close attention to the importance of the place (and placing) of the research encounter. Research with farmers – who have been seen to hold very distinct people–place relations – is proving a particularly fruitful arena for developing these emplaced methodological discussions. To date, however, such emplaced methodological reflections with farmers have been largely terra-centric, with relatively scant focus on rivers and riparian environments on farms. Within this paper we explore the methodological challenges of interviewing farmers about their lived experiences of, and perspectives on, rivers and riparian environments. We note how positionality is central to gaining access and suggest how performing the role of “geographical ignorance” can help simultaneously play the role of insider and outsider. We consider how engaging farmers in discussion about their riparian environments offers a different methodological challenge to engaging them in discussion of their land-management practices as many struggle to articulate their knowledge of these environments and we reflect on how interview structure and being on and moving around the farm can act as a way of encouraging farmers’ narratives of these spaces.

## KEYWORDS

emplaced research, farmers, interviews, mobile methods, qualitative methods, rivers and riparian

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

Set within the wider reflection on the use of qualitative methods for geographical enquiry, *Area* has recently played host to a vibrant discussion relating to the (re)placing of the research encounter (Anderson, 2004; Holton & Riley, 2014). A fruitful element of these contributions has been around the importance of place to the research interview – or what Anderson and Jones (2009, p. 292) refer to as the “where of the method” – with a consideration of the significance of particular material sites (and siting) of the interview itself (Pitt, 2015), how changing context and being mobile might add to the research encounter (Holton & Riley, 2014) as well as how these issues of place may (re)shape power dynamics, reflexivity and positionality within the interview (Browne, 2016). Central to these contributions is a recognition of socio-spatial construction of knowledge – that is, an awareness that “there is no place without self and no self without place” (Casey, 2001, p. 684) – and the subsequent exploration of how place may be used within research to examine everyday lived experiences and practices (Hitchings, 2012), as well as how particular knowledge(s) may be co-substantive with particular contexts (Anderson, 2004; Holton & Riley, 2014).

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The information, practices and views in this article are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Royal Geographical Society (with IBG).

© 2018 The Authors. *Area* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers).

Research with farmers is a particularly fruitful arena for developing this emplaced methodological discussion for several reasons. First, farming offers very particular people–place relations – an indivisibility of people and place which Gray (1998, p. 345) refers to as “constitutive.” Accordingly, there has been a profusion of work that has focused on the place-specific beliefs and knowledges of farmers in relation to issues such as animal disease (Maye et al., 2014; Naylor et al., 2014), soil management (Ingram, 2008) and wider farmland conservation (Burton et al., 2008; Riley, 2016). Second, very specific sets of patriarchal relations may make research with farmers challenging – particularly as the work of those outside the principal farmer often remains invisible – and more emplaced qualitative methods have proven useful in getting behind this (Chiswell & Wheeler, 2016; Riley, 2010). Third, the often remote and isolated locations of farms create logistical, as well as health and safety, issues in travelling to them and conducting interviews (Chiswell & Wheeler, 2016). Fourth, and cutting across these, the very particular cultural contexts of farming mean that the research interview is one of identity work, with issues of positionality in relation to gender, age and background (and, of course, their intersectionalities) being important (Chiswell & Wheeler, 2016; Pini, 2004). Despite the progress made on the particularities of farm interviews, such research encounters have been largely land-based and reflect the wider criticism in geographical research that we have been too “terra-centric” (Steinberg, 1999). Where more emplaced farm interviews have been developed, these have been overwhelmingly land-focused, with relatively little attention paid to farmers’ perspectives on rivers and riparian environments. Conversely, where research using farmer interviews has touched on riparian environments, farmers’ perspectives have either not been disaggregated from other stakeholders under discussion (e.g., Whatmore & Landström, 2011), or only sparse detail has been provided on the interview process itself (e.g., Winter et al., 2011). The following paper draws on research with farmers in a river catchment in the North-West of England (UK) to examine the methodological issues and potential for undertaking emplaced research interviews with farmers focusing on these riparian environments.

## 2 | PLACING THE RESEARCH ENCOUNTER ON THE FARM

As Dowling et al.’s (2016) recent review suggests, researchers are paying close attention to the place (and placing) of the interview – considering how such sites may be understood through interviewing in situ and how these places (such as the city or the home) may be an active methodological resource. Underpinning this endeavour is a recognition that “place is regarded as constitutive of one’s sense of self” (Casey, 2001, p. 604). As Anderson (2004) notes, drawing on various philosophies considering the people–place dialectic, the human condition is both spatial and *patial*. Such insights recognise that space is not an inert background, but an active medium producing, and being produced by, human action and that “as a consequence of the reciprocal relations between place, human identity and time, individuals engender meanings and significances for particular places” (Anderson, 2004, p. 256). This intimate connection to place is particularly prominent within farming and although Chiswell and Wheeler (2016) note that there has been comparatively little critical reflection on rural research with farmers, two aspects are proving important – how being on, and performing in, the farm space is important to the research encounter, and how *moving around* the farm can be enlightening to these research approaches.

Chiswell and Wheeler (2016) note several practical issues of undertaking qualitative research with farmers, including the remote locations of many farms (and associated challenges of access and health and safety) and the importance of the micro-geographies of the farm space, highlighting how the seemingly indistinct boundaries between home and work create a gendered challenge around what is seen as appropriate researcher behaviour. Riley (2010) examines how these quite particular circumstances make interviewing around the farm particularly valuable as it may uncover less singular, male-dominated, narratives. Once on the farm, several authors have noted the importance of interviewer positionality, particularly in relation to gender dynamics – with Pini (2004) acknowledging the importance of reflexivity in considering the multiple identities employed during farm interviews. This is something extended on by Chiswell and Wheeler (2016), who recognise the importance of intersecting positions in noting that despite experiencing issues of sexism (implicitly and explicitly), their positions of “young” and “non-farming” allowed them to be considered “non-threatening” and gave access to very full narratives from farmers.

Being mobile and moving around the farm may give an insight into how people (re)interpret particular places, while being *in place* means that visual cues – such as particular landscape features or pieces of farm machinery – may stimulate narratives and take the interview in unexpected directions (Mackay et al., 2018). Conducting interviews in and around places such as the workplace or the home may have the practical benefit of allowing the researcher to tag onto the tasks of the day (and feel less of an intrusion on interviewees’ time), while surrounding artefacts and environments may embellish the interview narrative and move from a seemingly more confrontational face-to-face approach to a more “side-by-side” encounter (Holton & Riley, 2014). Not only might such approaches allow more incidental (and equally fruitful) encounters with people and places, they might also give an appreciation of the socialisation in oft-repeated routines (Kusenbach, 2003).

### 3 | METHODOLOGY

The material considered in this paper is drawn from a project focused on farmers' understandings of river and riparian environments, including interviews (conducted between August 2017 and January 2018) with 26 participants. The specific aim of our project was to assess the extent of farmers' knowledge of riparian environments (and how they articulate this), how their treatment of these environments has changed over time and what (if any) their level of engagement was with conservation and environmental activities relating to these.<sup>1</sup> Farmers were located in a river catchment in the North-West of England. The catchment extends across a geology of predominantly carboniferous rocks, flowing from upland acid moorland areas and peat and peaty loam soils to more deep loam in the lower catchment. These conditions result in predominantly grassland farming. Our specific sample reflected the range of farming types in the catchment (four dairy and sheep; four beef and sheep; eight sheep; eight dairy; and two dairy, beef and sheep – with two of these growing some crops). Farmers interviewed also represent a variety of locations across the catchment (higher up along tributary rivers and also those along the main river), including those with land along the main river channels as well as farms that only had small becks/brooks. Initial contact was made with the local Rivers Trust to gain access to the first wave of respondents and chain-referral sampling was used to locate subsequent respondents. The interviews were all conducted on farm and lasted between one and 3.5 hours, with a “walking” interview approach adopted wherever possible. Walking interviews were largely co-constructed, with the interviewer requesting to visit the farm's riparian environments, but the farmers left in control of the route taken and parts of the farm visited, which helped gain an insight into farmers' lived experiences of their surroundings. A research diary was completed – extracts from which are used here – as an aide memoire, but also to record reflections on positionality within the research and to comment on non-verbal aspects of the interviews not captured in the interview recordings. The interviews were recorded using a handheld voice-recorder, transcribed verbatim and interview transcripts and research diary extracts were read through several times and coded manually following Reisman's (2008) framework. Several themes were identified using this narrative thematic coding, which are discussed in the following sections.

### 4 | GETTING ACROSS THE RIVER

Previous research has suggested that accessing the farm for the more emplaced research encounter is heavily shaped by researcher positionality and subsequent interviewer–interviewee rapport – in particular their positioning, by farmers, as being “trustworthy” and worthy of the farmer's time (Chiswell & Wheeler, 2016). Our own research encounter revealed how this was interlaced with how *useful* farmers felt they themselves would be to the perceived research objective(s). The following interview and research diary extracts illustrate a number of facets to this:

You're not allowed to do certain things and they get quite concerned don't they? They seem to think ... we're out to destroy everything. (F-1)

[We have] wild birds, wild flowers and that's about all I can say ... you can ask questions, you can ask what you want ... [Later in the same interview when asked about river management] you can see where it were fenced in, and they say its clean now as it's ever been ... I don't know much more about the water, that's it. (F-5)

After the distribution of participation information sheets many farmers suggested that they may not be helpful because they ‘don't know much about rivers.’ I have tried to stress that I am also interested in land management – this element proved useful with many farmers saying ‘oh yes well I can talk about that all day long.’ Although it seemed the topic of water and rivers appeared to put some off, I think it is still vital for me to include this within the information sheet to make it as transparent as possible as to what my intentions are as a researcher. (Research diary extract)

Taken together, the extracts highlight the difficulty in accessing talk about rivers and riparian environments and, in subtly different ways, highlight the potential lack of ownership by farmers in relation to rivers. The first illustrates a prominent issue in gaining initial access for interview – the extent to which rivers have become a very politically sensitive topic. This recent scrutiny – both in terms of environmental regulation and public attention<sup>2</sup> – was something that left many farmers wary of engaging in conversation about them. As noted in the research diary extract, sometimes the mere mention of rivers could serve to block

access, with farmers cautious that their interview may be associated with some sort of monitoring of their action, or that they would get into trouble (or at worst be fined) for information revealed, with one noting that rivers had “become something else we’re negatively contributing to, along with everything else” (F-12).<sup>3</sup> The way in which such words carry a toxicity offers the wider methodological insight that it is important to recognise the political climate within which interviews are set and to give careful consideration to how the objectives of the research are articulated. For several farmers, rivers represented a politically-laden topic that served to make them, initially at least, reluctant participants in discussing them.

The second interview and research diary extracts highlight that even when the sensitivity of the topic did not foreclose interviews, accessing detailed narratives about rivers was problematic. Although previous research with farmers has highlighted that they are often quite willing to discuss their farm space and farm practices – as they are often a clear demonstration of their objective and embodied cultural capital (skill) (see Burton et al., 2008) – our research revealed that rivers do not offer this same type of association. This, it was revealed, related both to structural and cultural challenges of ownership as well as the relative lack of experiential knowledge farmers had developed of rivers on their farms. The aforementioned reference to it “didn’t affect me” reflected a wider uncertainty among farmers regarding who had management responsibility for rivers:

They do fish counts in the stream and they tell us the rivers are better [...] So ... I think it has improved [I couldn't] put my finger on a cause of it... (F-2)

Interviewer: Do you know if it's actually changed the quality of the river?

F: That I don't know, that's, outside my comfort zone, but I can only go on what people tell me about what they have actually measured in, you know, water quality. (F-6)

These and many similar responses revealed how the specific nature of engagement with rivers shaped farmers’ knowledge. As Stuiver et al. (2004) note, the continuous interaction between mental and physical labour, and the continuous (re)interpretation and evaluation of actions, create an experiential form of knowledge that farmers draw on. While the cultivation of crops and tending to livestock – that is, *land-based* management – developed this knowledge, engagement with rivers was reported by farmers as much more sporadic and ephemeral. In some cases this historically involved dredging rivers,<sup>4</sup> their use as a water source for livestock in the predominantly livestock region under study and engagement when the river was flooded at certain times of the year. The interview responses revealed that such intermittent engagement meant that farmers’ narratives were disjointed, with relatively little understanding of the specifics of rivers themselves (cf. the detailed species and field knowledge that farmers may have of their land (Riley, 2008)). The nature of this engagement poses a methodological challenge for using interviews to understand farmers and rivers, with two main narrative approaches demonstrated by farmers in the research. First, as in the case of the farmer referred to in the research diary extract, was a refusal to discuss them and second, as in the case of farmers 2 and 6, an articulation of rivers (in this case water quality and fish levels) that borrows heavily from second-hand understandings passed by others (in this case information offered by their local Rivers Trust).

In seeking to overcome such barriers of access and articulation, our research approach was to alter the usual question order within the interview. Rubin and Rubin (2011) note that interviews are built around “main questions,” “follow-up questions” and “probes,” and while rivers should have made up our initial main questions, it was necessary to open with questions around land management, using these as orientating main questions in order to ask follow-up and probe questions where rivers featured. This had the advantage that it started from a topic with which farmers were familiar and comfortable and, accordingly, allowed interviewers to bring rivers into the discussion in their own time and in a way they felt appropriate. Moreover, adjoining interview topics in this way revealed that many of farmers’ understandings of rivers were deeply enmeshed in narratives of their land management and that it was only in probing these narratives that details of rivers and riparian environments began to emerge. Rarely did we encounter farmers’ standalone narratives of river management or use, but instead found them, often hidden, as a side issue – such as how they hinder, limit land or interrupt land use – to discussions of wider land management.

## 5 | GOING WITH THE FLOW

The aforementioned discussion of interview questions and how they might allow access to various understandings are interwoven with the wider issue of interviewer positionality – something previously noted as a crucial aspect to the

success of interviews. The interviewer's identity of "farmer's daughter" proved significant within the research, exemplified by one farmer's claim that "it's ok, you're one of us" (F-4). Pini (2004) suggests that sometimes there is a need to move between different subject positions within and across interviews, but to this we add a need to recognise two issues: first, that project-specific constraints might restrict the ability to move between these different positions and second, that multiple (and potentially conflicting) positions may, necessarily, be performed simultaneously. The position(s) of "farmer's daughter," "young woman" and "researcher" were enacted at one and the same time. The position of researcher was stated in all cases (and young woman inferred) from the contact material sent to all farmers – these positionings were subsequently fixed and inseparable.<sup>5</sup> While the status of farmer's daughter was volunteered, rather than formally stated, working in the project-specific context of a river catchment (and utilising chain-referral sampling) often meant that this information was shared between farmers. Although in the majority of cases these three positions worked in tandem to generate a generally positive reception – with statements such as "I like to help students if I can you see" (F-8) – the legitimacy afforded through being a farmer's daughter was, in some cases, challenged by the more "outsider" position of being associated with a University:

A lot of these universities, they try to breed the common sense out of you. (F-2)

Implicit within the extract is a distinction drawn by farmers between the validity of their experiential knowledge and the more codified understandings perceived to be associated with institutions such as Universities. While the position of farmer's daughter served to counter this positioning as lacking common sense – or more specifically lacking experiential knowledge – as well as allowing access to interviews, it also served to impact on the type of information accessed *within* interview. As Berger (2013) notes, interviewees may reveal more if they perceive the researcher to be sympathetic to their situation – and while this may be a positive for uncovering information within the interview, it was also found to offer potential challenges. At one level, being a farmer's daughter was taken to imply that similar views would be held, with farmer 2 noting "oh good, so you're on our side then" – with assumptions made about the researcher's particular perspective. More significantly, this particular positioning led to what can be described as short-handing of responses, where assumptions were made about the interviewer's understanding of particular farming practices:

Just the usual problems that come with excess water on fields really, but you'd know about that. (F-4)

Such assumptions presented a dilemma within the research process. On the one hand, maintaining the status quo meant that much of the fine-grained, nuanced, data central to the research may be glossed over and missed. On the other hand, the interview approach of "confessions of ignorance" (Shakespeare, 1993), which present an invitation for respondents to offer more fine-grained detail, ran the risk of interviewer losing credibility and the potential benefits as an insider. To the observation that moving between subject-positions may aid the interview (cf. Pini, 2004), we add the caution that moving may undermine a positive research encounter. Our approach, therefore, was to move to the position of being "geographically ignorant." Here, insider status (farmer's daughter) was kept largely intact, but finer-grained information was requested on account of "not being from around here." Qualitative studies are replete with references to the geographically contingent and very context-specific knowledge of farmers – and the ensuing antipathy of others (such as scientists) who fail to recognise context-specific differences and who make general assumptions relating to farm practices (see Riley, 2008) – and this approach of not being familiar with their specific context was taken as a mark of respect by interviewees and positively elevated the interviewer's position as qualified informant.

## 6 | LIQUID NARRATIVES – (RE)POSITIONING THE INTERVIEW

In addition to access, *where* the interviews took place was central to the narratives gleaned. Farm spaces arguably have a micro-politics with more frontstage (productive) and backstage (reproductive) spaces (Bennett, 2006) and moving between these during interview allowed access to a wider range of participants on the farm. The extract below highlights the multiple advantages that this offered:

Our land has quite a good amount of fall and then it goes very steep to the river [...] they [the rivers] are too far away from the farm to cause any hassle... (F-9)

Am I right in saying your problem is, if you put some slurry on there and it rains, it goes into the dykes and then into the river, and the fisherman complain, because of the fish and the nitrate? (Wife of F-9)

Interviewer: so there is a fishing group here then?

Yes, the fisherman will mention it and they'll say ... 'we don't want to get you in trouble, there looks like a bit of stuff was running through there the other day, can you bear that in mind and not do that' [...] they know us well enough to sort anything out before it goes anywhere else. (F-9)

The opening extract echoes the earlier point that a comfortable starting point for the interview was the land management practices of the farmer. Here, his discussion was framed in relation to the management of land and its accessibility, near the river. Such information was important to this dairy farmer, as slurry application was a significant aspect of his farming routine.<sup>6</sup> The interjection of the farmer's wife had a twofold importance. First, and seen too in other interviews, they acted as a bridge between the farmer and the interviewer, often helping an articulation of the research questions to the farmer and helping target the discussion toward the perceived objectives of the research. Second, they demonstrated their own knowledge of those rivers. This formed an important observation across the interviews – that farm members beyond just the principal farmer held important understandings of riparian environments. Seeking out such alternative, as well as complementary, narratives is arguably an important lesson for wider research on farming, but is especially pronounced in this context of farmers and rivers given our earlier observation that much farmer knowledge is production-orientated and land-centric. Significant in this and similar interview exchanges is that such knowledge is often wrapped within the recollection of wider biographical events – such as the encounter with fishers in this case – which the principal farmer may either not remember or not wish to bring forward.

Moving *to*, being close *to*, and walking *alongside* rivers was an important aspect of our approach. The following extracts illustrate different examples of this:

These trees help the area where the fish would be nesting, laying their eggs ... trying to keep those waters shaded and cool before they reach the main rivers, right? (F-16)

Some volunteers planted these trees [...] shading the river as well ... She talks about riparian habitats and that ... and I don't mind as long as a few fish come up every now and again... (F-1)

Taken together, the examples highlight how being *at* the river led to an articulation of things not previously mentioned in the static part of the interviews. Farmer 9's earlier reference to the steepness/inaccessibility of the land adjoining the river reminds us how many contemporary farmers come to experience their land through their machinery and how walking to the river – a place not often visited because of its inaccessibility to machinery and cultivation – might offer a fresh interpretation. For farmers 16 and 1, it was the visual prompt of trees/planting that led them to discuss the issue of shading.<sup>7</sup> As expected, given the points made earlier in the paper, it was land management that provided a way into the discussion, and being confronted by the river forced an articulation of what was present and how and why it was important. While previous mobile-interview research has highlighted its usefulness in (re)interpreting familiar environments (and the practices associated with them) afresh “in-the-moment” (Holton & Riley, 2014) and moving away from the rehearsed and more unreflexive accounts, drawn from memory, in static interviews (Mackay et al., 2018), our application highlights that they too can be used to add colour to the blackspots of interview narratives. The discussion of shading had not arisen within the first, static, part of the interview, and being confronted by trees not only initiated an articulation of their relevance, but also gave an insight into the farmers' understandings therein, revealing the uncertainty (i.e. stating their response as a question for farmer 16) and giving an insight into how, in the case of farmer 1, they have taken on board the knowledge (“what she says”) of river conservation groups. Not only does such an emplaced approach help give voice and articulation to those things otherwise missed, it also offers the opportunity to use such visual cues to better understand those specific places and/or practices which farmers have difficulty in articulating.

## 7 | CONCLUSIONS

Given the contemporary importance of rivers and riparian environments within discussions such as flooding, climate change and pollution, engaging farmers' understandings of them is crucial. This paper has considered some of the methodological

issues in undertaking such research interviews on farms, offering suggestions for emplaced methodologies in general, as well as specific insights into working with farmers and researching environmental management(s) and issues on the farm. We have seen that subtly different skills, research approaches and (re)placings may be required from those used, hitherto, for more conventional land-focused interviews. The dual issues of negative press attention (as well as increasingly stringent environmental regulations) and farmers' general lack of sustained engagement with river environments (compared with their land management) mean that farmers were, initially, less forthcoming in their discussions. This example highlights how a need for flexibility in interview (re)design may be necessary – with the approach of adjoining questions on rivers with those of wider land management in which discussions of rivers may be couched or hidden. Such an approach offered a comfortable starting ground for discussion and allowed an excavation and unpicking of farmers' knowledge that was often hidden within these land management narratives.

Our insights are important for the more general discussion of positionality within the interview. Working with communities in close geographical proximity to one another (catchment areas in this case) means that they may share information about the researcher, making the movement between subject positions advocated in previous research somewhat more problematic. Although previous research has discussed the relative merits and challenges of taking up the position of “insider” and “outsider,” our approach of “geographical ignorance” illustrated how an interplay between these two positions can be worked out – allowing the development of trust, shared identity and credibility (in terms of farming knowledge) with interviewees, while leaving open the possibility to ask further probing questions and request finer detail without compromising this insider position.

Getting *onto* the farm is central to the success of such farmer interviews. At one level – and we offer this as a clear recommendation for broader research on farms – being *on* the farm allows a movement away from a myopic focus on the perspective of one, often male, principal farmer. The specific riparian focus here shows how the input offered by other farm members can both usefully alter the interview dynamic – taking on roles such as facilitator, translator, challenger or confirmer – in what may be considered hard to reach subjects, and may also offer their own understandings to a more detailed picture of these environments, which may offer even greater nuance and detail than offered by the principal farmer. Although such methodological approaches may help uncover more detail on riparian environments, they also reveal the relative lack of detailed understandings (certainly in comparison to terrestrial environments) and the associated lack of ownership taken by many in relation to rivers running across their farms. Moving around the farm may both allow access to micro-spaces and practices not discussed in static interviews and we would argue that this approach offers a valuable in-the-moment (in)articulation by farmers which can tell us much about their understandings and perspectives on riparian environments. Although our intention has been primarily to show the methodological *potential* here, it leads us also to reflect on how transcribed interview extracts, such as those used here, might lose the “richness and messiness of talk and human experience” (Laurier, 1999, p. 37) that we have sought to capture. While we share the view that such critiques of the singularly verbal should not lead to underplaying value of the in-depth (and in our case mobile) interview (Hitchings, 2012), we echo the call for methods that help us capture and, importantly, (re)present the non-verbal, which might include the use of geo-narratives (Bell et al., 2015) and video recording (Simpson, 2011). Our interview approach of moving around highlights the importance of farmers' different embodied engagements with their land – such as that mediated via agricultural machinery – but it is also important to note how new technologies and decision-making tools (see Rose et al., 2018) may be changing this engagement and might require further methodological sophistication to examine them in the future.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to acknowledge the ESRC (Northwest Doctoral Training Partnership) for providing the funding for this research and to thank the farmers interviewed for the project.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> It was made clear to farmers that we would not relay any specific information from their interviews to regulatory authorities, but that we hoped our general findings would contribute towards a greater understanding of how farmers' knowledge of riparian environments might be used in future policy or to develop information available to farmers.

<sup>2</sup> See for example media reports on “Careless farming adding to floods”: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-26466653> and “How we ended up paying farmers to flood our homes”: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/feb/17/farmers-uk-flood-maize-soil-protection>

<sup>3</sup> Interestingly, although fines for pollution were mentioned in nearly all interviews, there were only two farmers who knew someone who had actually been fined.

<sup>4</sup> Mechanically removing sediment from river beds.

<sup>5</sup> Participant Information Sheets and Consent Forms were necessary for pre-research ethical clearance.

<sup>6</sup> Riley (2006) has noted how slurry application is often prioritised by farmers (sometimes over conservation-orientated managements), not only in relation to soil fertility and grass growth, but through concern around storage issues and pollution.

<sup>7</sup> See <http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/mediafile/100814410/pg-wt-060216-keeping-rivers-cool.pdf>.

## ORCID

Mark Riley  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3259-323X>

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. (2004). Talking whilst walking: A geographical archaeology of knowledge. *Area*, 36, 254–261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0004-0894.2004.00222.x>
- Anderson, J., & Jones, K. (2009). The difference that place makes to methodology: Uncovering the ‘lived space’ of young people’s spatial practices. *Children’s Geographies*, 7, 291–303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14733280903024456>
- Bell, S. L., Phoenix, C., Lovell, R., & Wheeler, B. W. (2015). Using GPS and geo-narratives: A methodological approach for understanding and situating everyday green space encounters. *Area*, 47, 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12152>
- Bennett, K. (2006). Kitchen Drama: Performances, patriarchy and power dynamics in a Dorset farmhouse kitchen. *Gender Place and Culture*, 13, 153–160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09663690600573775>
- Berger, R. (2013). Now I see it, now I don’t: Researcher’s position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 15, 219–234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794112468475>
- Browne, A. L. (2016). Can people talk together about their practices? Focus groups, humour and the sensitive dynamics of everyday life. *Area*, 48, 198–205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12250>
- Burton, R., Kuczera, C., & Schwarz, G. (2008). Exploring Farmers’ Cultural Resistance to Voluntary Agri-environmental Schemes. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 48, 16–37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2008.00452.x>
- Casey, E. (2001). Between geography and philosophy: What does it mean to be in the place-world? *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 91, 683–693. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0004-5608.00266>
- Chiswell, H. M., & Wheeler, R. (2016). ‘As long as you’re easy on the eye’: Reflecting on issues of positionality and researcher safety during farmer interviews. *Area*, 48, 229–235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12257>
- Dowling, R., Lloyd, K., & Suchet-Pearson, S. (2016). Qualitative methods 1: Enriching the interview. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40, 679–686. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132515596880>
- Gray, J. (1998). Family farms in the Scottish borders: A practical definition by hill sheep farmers. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 14, 341–356. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0743-0167\(98\)00010-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0743-0167(98)00010-2)
- Hitchings, R. (2012). People can talk about their practices. *Area*, 44, 61–67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2011.01060.x>
- Holton, M., & Riley, M. (2014). Talking on the move: Place-based interviewing with undergraduate students. *Area*, 46, 59–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12070>
- Ingram, J. (2008). Are farmers in England equipped to meet the knowledge challenge of sustainable soil management? An analysis of farmer and advisor views. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 86, 214–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2006.12.036>
- Kusenbach, M. (2003). Street phenomenology: The go-along as ethnographic research tool. *Ethnography*, 4, 455–485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/146613810343007>
- Laurier, E. (1999). Geographies of talk: ‘Max left a message for you’. *Area*, 31, 36–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.1999.tb00167.x>
- Mackay, M., Nelson, T., & Perkins, H. C. (2018). Interpretive walks: Advancing the use of mobile methods in the study of entrepreneurial farm tourism settings. *Geographical Research*, 56, 167–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-5871.12275>
- Maye, D., Enticott, G., Naylor, R., Ilbery, B., & Kirwan, J. (2014). Animal disease and narratives of nature: Farmers’ reactions to the neoliberal governance of bovine Tuberculosis. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 36, 401–410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2014.07.001>
- Naylor, R., Maye, D., Ilbery, B., Enticott, G., & Kirwan, J. (2014). Researching controversial and sensitive issues: Using visual vignettes to explore farmers’ attitudes towards the control of bovine tuberculosis in England. *Area*, 46, 285–293. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12113>
- Pini, B. (2004). On being a nice country girl and an academic feminist: Using reflexivity in rural social research. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 20, 169–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2003.08.003>
- Pitt, H. (2015). On showing and being shown plants – a guide to methods for more-than-human geography. *Area*, 47, 48–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12145>
- Reisman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Riley, M. (2006). Reconsidering conceptualisations of farm conservation activity: The case of conserving hay meadows. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22, 337–353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2005.10.005>
- Riley, M. (2008). Experts in their fields: Farmer-expert knowledges and environmentally friendly farming practices. *Environment and Planning A*, 40, 1277–1293. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a39253>



- Riley, M. (2010). Emplacing the research encounter: Exploring farm life histories. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16, 651–662. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410374029>
- Riley, M. (2016). How does longer term participation in agri-environment schemes [re]shape farmers' environmental dispositions and identities? *Land Use Policy*, 52, 62–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.12.010>
- Rose, D. C., Morris, C., Lobley, M., Winter, M., Sutherland, W. J., & Dicks, L. V. (2018). Exploring the spatialities of technological and user re-scripting: The case of decision support tools in UK agriculture. *Geoforum*, 89, 11–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.12.006>
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2011). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. London, UK: Sage.
- Shakespeare, P. (1993). Performing. In P. Shakespeare, D. Atkinson, & S. French (Eds.), *Reflecting on research practice: Issues in health and social welfare* (pp. 95–105). Milton Keynes, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Simpson, P. (2011). 'So, as you can see.': Some reflections on the utility of video methodologies in the study of embodied practices. *Area*, 43, 343–352. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2011.00998.x>
- Steinberg, P. E. (1999). Navigating to multiple horizons: Toward a geography of ocean-space. *The Professional Geographer*, 51, 366–375. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-0124.00172>
- Stuiver, M., Leeuwis, C., & van der Ploeg, J. (2004). The power of experience: Farmers' knowledge and sustainable innovations in agriculture. In J. Wiskerke & J. Van-Der Ploeg (Eds.), *Seeds of transitions* (pp. 93–118). Assen, the Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Whatmore, S. J., & Landström, C. (2011). Flood apprentices: An exercise in making things public. *Economy and Society*, 40, 582–610. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03085147.2011.602540>
- Winter, M., Oliver, D. M., Fish, R., Heathwaite, A. L., Chadwick, D., & Hodgson, C. (2011). Catchments, sub-catchments and private spaces: Scale and process in managing microbial pollution from source to sea. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 14, 315–326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2010.10.011>

**How to cite this article:** Thomas E, Riley M, Smith H. A flowing conversation? Methodological issues in interviewing farmers about rivers and riparian environments. *Area*. 2018;00:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12507>