

A Communication Framework for Worthington's Sustainable Initiatives



Milana Novgorodsky, Gregory Goldberg, and Greyson Rusher

12.13.2016

AEDE 4567

Professor Jeremy Brooks

Table of Contents

- **Executive Summary..... 2**
- **Introduction..... 3**
- **Phase 1: Personas..... 4**
 - **Methods..... 4**
 - **Complications..... 5**
 - **Findings..... 6**
- **Phase 2: Environmental Communication and Comparable Cities Research... 7**
 - **Methods..... 7**
 - **Environmental Communication Findings..... 8**
 - **Comparable City Findings.....12**
- **Phase 3:..... 13**
 - **Methods..... 13**
 - **General Communication Recommendations 14**
 - **Persona Recommendations..... 15**
 - **Complications..... 17**
- **Conclusion..... 17**
- **Bibliography..... 20**
- **Figure 1..... 22**
- **Figure 2..... 24**
- **Figure 3..... 25**
- **Appendix..... 26**

Executive Summary

The purpose of this project is to develop a communication framework for Worthington's future sustainable initiatives. We broke the process down into three phases all with distinct research objectives. The first was to develop two personas representative of the typical Worthington resident. These personas were data driven, based on a survey administered to residents to better understand their values, priorities, and concerns. Phase two's research objective was to compile research on environmental communication methods and comparable cities. The final objective was to synthesize phase one's primary data with phase two's secondary data into recommendations for communication strategies for the successful implementation of a sustainability framework.

Our research revealed that Worthington residents hold largely similar values, especially in regards to the love they have for their community. We were able to create personas to represent female residents of the two biggest segments of the population of Worthington, 25-34 and 55-64 year olds. These create a visual tool that identify priorities, aspects of development where residents are more apt to give their support, as well as those where they're completely unwilling.

Worthington is in a unique situation, as it has an obligation to protect the cultural heritage of the community, as well as ensure the continued success of the community into the future. We hoped to identify leverage points within community values that would allow Worthington to best communicate that its strong cultural heritage and sustainable development are not mutually exclusive.

Given the preliminary stages of Worthington's sustainability strategy decisions, we wanted to provide the city with a general framework from which they can better understand how to best communicate with residents regarding sustainability. We present our final recommendations as broad guidelines to be conscious of demonstrating local benefits, reinforcing sense of community and increasing citizen input in the decision making process. We also provide suggestions for community outreach as tailored to each persona.

Introduction

Our overall research goal was to create a communication framework that identifies framing techniques that convey sustainable development in a way that resonates positively with Worthington residents, based on survey and demographic data.

We believe this communication framework to be essential to the future success of Worthington's sustainable strategy, as the support of its residents is contingent on the communication techniques used.

The first phase of research was to develop two personas representative of the Worthington resident. This phase required our team to develop a survey in collaboration with other teams. We also developed a picture of the city of Worthington based on demographic information. Personas are solely based on data obtained through the survey. The second phase of research was broken down into two steps. One half of our team researched the most effective communication and framing methods relevant to each persona. The other half of our team researched cities that are comparable to Worthington and how they have achieved sustainable action. The third phase of our study was to combine our primary and secondary data to make recommendations that could be tailored to the concerns of Worthington residents.

We aim to present research that provides Worthington with community leverage points, successful framing methods, and a marketing strategy that can be applied to current and future generations of Worthington residents.

Phase 1: Develop Two Personas Representative of the Worthington Resident

Methods

In order to best recommend communication strategies, we thought it was important to first collect data on residents' values, concerns, priorities, and thoughts on sustainability. We created a survey from which we were able to glean this information with the intention of using this data to create personas for Worthington to best visualize the residents with whom they would be communicating. The survey was available from October 19, 2016 to November 4, 2016. Among the 36 total questions, our group used responses gathered for 26 questions for the development of the personas. All survey questions relevant to our project can be found in Figure 1. In order to analyze the results, we organized the data by filtering it according to two demographic categories: gender and age. By organizing the data this way, we were best able to do side by side comparisons of Worthington's various demographics segments. We have included an excerpt of the tables used to organize persona data in Appendix A. For the purposes of persona creation, we chose to focus on 22-34 and 55-64 year old females. Our reasoning was twofold: these age brackets comprise the two largest population segments of Worthington and our survey responses were skewed female.

Complications

Before we give an overview of our findings, we feel it is important to qualify the following information with certain limitations. It is important to note that because of the

channels through which our survey was disseminated, we may have had a high number of respondents with positive bias toward sustainability. Another complication we encountered was a lack of sampling diversity. Ideally survey results would have reflected Worthington's gender distribution, which is 52.5% female to 47.5% male. The final statistics for our survey were 65.32% female and 34.68% male. Furthermore, survey respondents lacked diversity, with over 98% of respondents identifying as white. We must also note that while we had a total of 391 survey respondents, only two thirds of survey responses were completed, thus rendering a third of responses unviable for the purposes of our research.

Findings

The personas are meant to be a visual tool that presents a snapshot of the average Worthington resident and provided for easier comparison between two demographic segments. Each persona represents the cohesive aggregation of their representative female age bracket's data as revealed by the survey. Personas are included in Figures 2 and 3, respectively. Each includes a biography, priorities, concerns, as well as identifies both sensitivities and opportunities with regards to opinions on development. Later in the paper we will elaborate on communication strategy suggestions tailored to each persona based on both survey data and phase 2 research.

Initially, we chose personas because we thought it could be a method that would efficiently identify very distinct differences in values, priorities, and technological preferences among a heterogeneous population. The survey data shows, however, that Worthington's residents are much more homogenous in beliefs than we previously thought. Using Appendix A for reference one can see that both age brackets value Worthington's sense of community,

walkability, friendliness, and green space. Both age brackets are concerned with quality of schools as well as equity within the community. There is a shared concern for development moving forward. However, the two personas express this differently. We found that the younger generation, people aged 25-34, is somewhat worried about population density but emphasizes the need to attract younger families to live in Worthington. The 55-64 age bracket is largely weary of development that may negatively affect traffic congestion or increase population density.

One commonality between the two personas is that each acknowledged a desire to interact more with Worthington through the use of Facebook. This suggests that there is an opportunity for Worthington to take advantage social media as a platform of communication with all of its residents. There was also a very strong sense of place identity expressed by all survey respondents regardless of age or gender. Over 90% of respondents answered that they either somewhat or very strongly identified with Worthington. Recurring themes of the “Why do you love Worthington” question were: great schools, small town feel in metropolitan area, the green space, great city services, and strong sense of community.

Phase 2: Environmental Communication and Comparable Cities Research

Methods

In this phase, we compiled and analyzed research regarding environmental communication and comparable cities. We were interested in how values affect perception/adoption of environmental behavior, how framing of environmental issues is important, which barriers exist to environmental behavior, how place identity affect attitudes toward the environment, and how perceived social normative behavior affects pro-environmental

action. We used digital journal articles from various publications, such as: Environmental Science and Policy, Urban Affairs, and the Journal of Applied Social Psychology.

When conducting our comparable city research we thought it appropriate to look for a city located in the region of the country that lends Worthington its characteristic aesthetics; New England. From there, we searched for a city that was similar in demographics and was successful at the implementation of sustainability initiatives. We settled upon Newburyport, Massachusetts.

Findings

Environmental Communication

In order to best determine communication strategies, one must first understand certain elements of psychology that drive the way people perceive environmental information. Values are the stable “building blocks” upon which human personalities and behavior are built (Corner, Markowitz, Pidgeon, 2014). They color the lens through which each individual sees the world. Researchers throughout time have determined certain dimensions of values, along which environmental psychology has been built: openness to change vs the conservation/respect of tradition and self-transcendence vs self-enhancement (Corner, Markowitz, Pidgeon, 2014). Generally a fault line exists between self-transcendence (altruistic) thinking and self-enhancement (self-interest). Self-transcendence is typically the value in accordance with respect for the environment.

In any given situation the human mind is constantly evaluating situations and reprioritizing values based on which it determines are most relevant to a given situation (de Groot, Steg, 2008). When confronted with complicated information the human brain subconsciously calls on mental reasoning devices, called “frames”, that essentially allow it to

determine which parts of a complex system are most important for it to retain (Willhelm-Rechmann and Cowling, 2010). Frames are the vehicle by which a communicator can strategically “influence opinions by stressing specific values, facts, and other considerations, endowing them with greater apparent relevance to the issue than they might appear to have under an alternative frame” (Willhelm-Rechmann and Cowling, 2010). This concept is key to a successful environmental communication strategy because it gives the communicator the chance to frame purposefully in order to elicit support or affect behavior. As the literature shows, certain framing devices are more effective than others.

Given an environmental decision, a person with egoist values will emphasize costs and benefits to him/her personally and will choose the environmental action only if benefits are greater (de Groot, Steg, 2008). Those examining the decision from an altruistic point of view would reach a decision by evaluating costs and benefits to others, while a bio centric person will consider first the effect on the environment (de Groot, Steg, 2008). This might imply that in order to resonate with egocentrics, Worthington ought to always frame environmental messaging from an economic point of view. However, there is a caveat. Environmental campaigns whose main motivators surround extrinsic rewards are only successful for as long as economic incentives can be maintained (Linden, Maibach, & Leiserowitz, 2015). Not only are these campaigns only temporarily successful, but they weaken people’s intrinsic motivations to adopt environmental behavior and decrease chance of any environmental behavior spillover (Linden, Maibach, & Leiserowitz, 2015). It is intrinsic motives that lay the foundation for long-term support of environmental behavior (Linden, Maibach, & Leiserowitz, 2015).

It is important to note that humans are largely social creatures who will often use their perception of social norms as a reference against which to compare their own behavior (Schultz, Nolan, Cialdini, Goldstein, & Griskevicius, 2007). There are two types of normative messages relevant to environmental marketing: injunctive and descriptive (Cialdini, 2003). Injunctive norms communicate what society largely approves (or disapproves) of, while descriptive norms communicate what society largely does (or doesn't do) (Cialdini, 2003). One must be careful, however, to use descriptive messages in a way that demonstrates the pervasiveness of pro-environmental behavior, and not inadvertently highlight the absence of it. For example, when confronted with the phrase "4 out of 5 people don't recycle. Don't be that person", the human brain is more likely to retain that recycling is not normalized behavior than the suggestion that not recycling is discouraged (Schultz, Nolan, Cialdini, Goldstein, & Griskevicius, 2007). Normative messaging is most persuasive when descriptive norms are communicated in alignment with injunctive norms (Cialdini, 2003).

There are certain barriers to environmental behavior that sometimes prevent people from participating in environmental behavior. Communication strategies that aim to cater to people of all ideologies cannot successfully be based around fear, nor can they neglect to emphasize locus of control (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002). When faced with information that elicits feelings of pain or loss, the human brain will use denial and rational distancing as defense mechanisms to protect itself from these emotions (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002). More barriers to pro-environmental behavior may lie in distrust of the government, lack of efficacy, and lack of personal responsibility (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002).

One way to overcome differing belief systems and levels of support that residents may have for any given initiative is to identify a common objective relevant to all residents and frame all proposed municipal action as working toward this common goal (Bain, Hornsey, Bongiorno, & Jeffries, 2012). Perhaps the most common theme throughout all survey responses, regardless of gender, age, or economic status, was a strong sense of community. From this, we gathered that Worthington residents have an extremely established place identity.

A potent place identity, defined as “identity formation and sustenance in relation to a specific geographical area”, has a few implications in terms of environmental communication (Wester-Herber, 2004). First, it is important to understand the four dimensions of place identity that converge to influence a person’s identity of self: Distinctiveness, what distinguishes a place from other communities, Continuity, the persistence of the emotional, metaphorical and symbolic values associated with one’s community, Self-Esteem, or the reflection of one’s values and norms as defined by your residence, and Self-Efficacy, the ability of one’s environment to support a person’s lifestyle choices (Wester-Herber, 2004). In a city as committed to a sense of community as Worthington is, any development initiatives undertaken need to take into account how they may or may not affect the four dimensions of place identity listed above.

If distinctiveness is diminished in the eyes of the community members it can decrease the pride they feel of being from Worthington and instead only bring forth feelings of negativity (Wester-Herber, 2004). Any changes inflicted on the land, either physically or culturally, may disrupt residents’ feeling of continuity, which can result in the perception of the loss of purity or degradation of quality (Wester-Herber, 2004). This fear is augmented with age, as older

populations are temporally invested in the meaning that they inflict on their community (Wester-Herber, 2004).

In a community with such a rich sense of tradition, if “a landscape changes...the context of the area changes, leaving inhabitants without any social, cultural or economic ties left to their surroundings” (Wester-Herber, 2004). Therein lies the most essential framing aspect of any sustainability initiative Worthington hopes to propose: any and all sustainability initiatives presented by the city can only be successful if council members are able to demonstrate how these programs can **strengthen** the social, economic, and cultural ties residents have with the community. One must also take care to ensure that the self-esteem dimension of place identity is preserved by preserving the positive reinforcement that Worthington’s character gives community members (Wester-Herber, 2004). While the kind of place attachment demonstrated by Worthington residents is not supportive of, perhaps, new technology or any development that may detract from the aesthetic character that defines their city, there is very strong support for local conservation and promotion of green space. This indicates that sustainability framed in a way that highlights global benefits will be unsuccessful, while an environmental campaign that promotes sustainable action that is rooted in local benefits that contribute to the community will garner greater support.

Comparable Cities

Worthington is a city that is proud and protective of its New England heritage. Thus, we thought it appropriate to research a city that has had success in sustainable progress without compromising its New England Heritage. The city that we elected to focus on is Newburyport, Massachusetts. As of 2014 it had a population of 17,926, whereas Worthington had a population

of 14,384 (Newburyport, Massachusetts- City Data, 2016). Newburyport and Worthington are almost identical in terms of gender distribution. Both Worthington and Newburyport have income levels that are significantly higher than the state average. Their similar demographics make them easy to compare.

Newburyport has had some noticeable success with several sustainability initiatives in recent years. In 2015 the Newburyport city council approved the adoption of a smart growth district (Smart Growth District). The aim of this project is to allow the redevelopment of a currently underutilized area of land allowing for multi-family condos, apartments, and mixed-use buildings (Smart Growth District). Newburyport has also undertaken a pilot program that promotes zero waste in the community. The pilot program had a total of 141 households participate in its initial program rollout (Toward Zero Waste). Newburyport has also implemented a plastic bag ban that went into effect on March 29, 2015(Plastic Bag Ban, 2014).

The project that we felt would be of most interest to Worthington was the Smart Growth District. Newburyport has managed to revitalize an overlooked part of its city, thereby strengthening the sense of community while enjoying the benefits of sustainable growth as well. We felt this was relevant to Worthington because they too are a city with a historic district whose development is a sensitive issue for residents. Newburyport was able to bypass that issue altogether by refocusing their efforts on a peripheral part of the community without such rigid aesthetic standards. Furthermore, the commercial revitalization of an area of the community that had previously been ignored is beneficial as yet another platform for residents to feel connected, both with each other and to their city.

One relative advantage that Newburyport has in regards to its sustainable initiatives is that they have a city department dedicated to recycling, energy, and sustainability. This obviously helps with implementation of sustainability programs, as well as with citizen outreach. We understand Worthington is under budget constraints, however, perhaps City Council can set a goal to delegate a leadership role to someone in their existing cabinet in the near future in order to add legitimacy to any initiatives implemented.

Phase 3:

Methods

Methods used for our final strategy recommendation are the creative discussion and synthesis of all research done in previous phases. We looked at the priorities and values of Worthington residents, combined with environmental communication literature in order to determine how we can give Worthington general guidelines that will be applicable regardless of which sustainability initiatives they decide to pursue. We also included suggestions of community outreach ideas tailored to each persona.

Findings

General Communication Guideline Recommendations

One factor that will influence the success of any environmental campaign is the degree to which Worthington makes an effort to include its residents in the discourse surrounding its creation and implementation. In a place with such strong place identity it is important to understand that the imposition of unwanted development will inevitably result in strong opposing sentiments from the public, and will essentially doom any sustainability initiative from its inception. Worthington's city council must take every step necessary to increase public trust,

transparency, and promote the notion that Worthington is a community that is the sum of the values of its residents and fosters sense of belonging. This can be done through the continuing of public meetings that give residents the opportunity to voice their opinions. We recommend that Worthington might also consider creating a citizen panel of relevant community opinion leaders that can assist in representing the needs and wishes of the community in the development of the environmental initiatives. This group should be present at all city council meetings regarding sustainable development, as a way to represent residents “by proxy”. Opinion leaders are not members of formal city leadership, but rather respected community members whose voices are considered credible and influential among a large network of residents. This will lend any proposed initiative credibility, while also fostering a sense of democracy in the decision making process of Worthington’s city planning. Part of the panel’s task can be to determine framing techniques that can be used to further disseminate information and garner support for any planning done by the city council.

When undergoing preliminary discussions regarding which sustainability projects to pursue, we recommend that Worthington city council consider these questions:

- How does this initiative create benefits for our residents locally? For our community as a whole?
- Does this initiative strengthen the social, cultural, or economic diversity our community has to offer its residents? How can we demonstrate this?

We feel it is important to bear these questions in mind from the very beginning, because these are the frames through which future communication ought to be built on. These questions can act as a sort of “litmus test” for Worthington decision makers to determine issues that could hold

salience with its residents and lay the foundation of a strong communication framework for whichever idea is in discussion.

Persona Recommendations

Our personas lay out several areas where Worthington might consider treading lightly if it hopes to garner community support. Protection of green space and the historic district were recurring themes among all demographics. In order to anticipate inevitable concern from its residents regarding any kind of development, Worthington should prepare traffic congestion and population density mitigation strategies.

Our recommendation for the 55-64 persona would be to identify an opinion leader within this age bracket to write a monthly blog to be disseminated via Facebook. The blog could touch on a wide variety of topics, not restricted to sustainability, all to be framed locally. This recommendation is based on several of our research indications. First, this would use a platform identified by all demographics to have potential as a communication outlet for the city. Second, this recommendation allows local stories to be showcased, which keeps issues (and the lives they touch) in a framework that feels relevant to Worthington's residents. A blog also comes built in with a platform for discussion in the form of a comments section, which encourages dialogue among residents and gives city workers insight into community disposition. This is a low cost way for the city of Worthington to leverage our research findings to direct public relations.

One easy and cost effective communication method that Worthington could explore would be a blog led by a respected community opinion leader. This blog could feature issues on all topics, not just sustainability, but it would give credibility to community endeavors and provide a platform through which a credible resident could use framing techniques to

disseminate information strategically. This would also provide a platform for residents to engage via a social media channel they've identified as their preferred method of communication, while giving city council members insight into community sentiments, both positive and negative. This could provide a consistent feedback mechanism for Worthington leadership to continuously be up to date on potential framing mechanisms, tailored specifically toward proposed issues. This method would allow both city planners and city residents to feel more connected and in tune with their community.

Another communication opportunity that we identified for the 25-34 year old bracket is the organization of family friendly events that allow for resident involvement in the sustainability of the community. Some suggestions include: documentaries projected in green spaces during the summer, community tree planting events, and composting seminars. Ideally, these events could be hosted/organized by library and community center employees. While these are merely suggestions, we feel that events such as these would capitalize on the strong feelings of place identity Worthington residents feel by providing yet another outlet for them to feel a sense of community, as well as pride in the city resources available to them.

Complications

One complication is that since we are not necessarily providing a marketing strategy for the promotion of a single, determined initiative, but rather providing a general framework and suggestions that will build any city-wide sustainable endeavor up for success, we are recommending general actions that, to the best of our ability, will address Worthington's unique needs and attitudes.

Conclusions

In closing, we are happy to present Worthington with a general communication framework for whichever sustainability initiatives they choose to pursue.

Through the administration of a survey we found that Worthington is more homogenous than expected. Both personas share intense feelings of pride in their community, which is tied to the city's green space, great schools, walkability, and historic district. There is also shared opportunity for technological outreach to all age brackets via Facebook.

A literature review in phase two focused on how values affect perception/adoption of environmental behavior, how framing of environmental issues is important, which barriers exist to environmental behavior, how place identity affects attitudes toward the environment, and how perceived social normative behavior affects pro-environmental action. We also found a comparable New England city whose success with sustainability initiatives can provide inspiration for Worthington's journey into sustainable development.

Based on all data synthesis, we were able to come up with questions for Worthington to bear in mind at the inception of any and all sustainability planning, in order to set them up for support among its residents. We also included suggestions tailored to each persona individually.

Moving forward, we suggest that Worthington conduct a more extensive materiality survey that is more conscious of diverse sampling, sampling size, and bias. By gathering more comprehensive information regarding environmental values, with emphasis on male and minority residents, Worthington could address the shortcomings of our survey create an even more complete look into resident values, motivations, and priorities to best educate future communication strategies.

Bibliography

- Bain, P. G., Hornsey, M. J., Bongiorno, R., & Jeffries, C. (2012, 07). Promoting pro-environmental action in climate change deniers. *Nature Climate Change*, 2(8), 603-603. doi:10.1038/nclimate1636
- Cialdini, R. B. (2003, 08). Crafting normative messages to protect the environment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12(4), 105-109. doi:10.1111/1467-8721.01242
- Corner, A., Markowitz, E., & Pidgeon, N. (2014, 01). Public engagement with climate change: The role of human values. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 5(3), 411-422. doi:10.1002/wcc.269
- Evans, L., Maio, G. R., Corner, A., Hodgetts, C. J., Ahmed, S., & Hahn, U. (2012, 08). Self-interest and pro-environmental behaviour. *Nature Climate Change*, 3(2), 122-125. doi:10.1038/nclimate1662
- Groot, J. I., & Steg, L. (2009, 01). Mean or green: Which values can promote stable pro-environmental behavior? *Conservation Letters*. doi:10.1111/j.1755-263x.2009.00448.x
- Kollmuss, A., & Agyeman, J. (2002, 08). Mind the Gap: Why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior? *Environmental Education Research*, 8(3), 239-260. doi:10.1080/13504620220145401
- Linden, S. V., Maibach, E., & Leiserowitz, A. (2015, 11). Improving Public Engagement With Climate Change: Five "Best Practice" Insights From Psychological Science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(6), 758-763. doi:10.1177/1745691615598516
- Manzo, L., & Devine-Wright, P. (2014). *Place attachment: Advances in theory, methods, and applications*. London: Routledge.
- Newburyport, Massachusetts- City Data. (2016). Retrieved November 8, 2016, from <http://www.city-data.com/city/Newburyport-Massachusetts.html>
- Nisbet, M. C. (2009, 03). Communicating Climate Change: Why Frames Matter for Public Engagement. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 51(2), 12-23. doi:10.3200/envt.51.2.12-23
- Opp, S. M., Osgood, J. L., & Rugeley, C. R. (2013, 12). Explaining The Adoption And Implementation Of Local Environmental Policies In The United States. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 36(5), 854-875. doi:10.1111/juaf.12072
- Plastic Bag Ban. (2014, December 24). Retrieved November 12, 2016, from <http://www.cityofnewburyport.com/home/news/plastic-bag-ban-update-0>
- Sapiains, R., Beeton, R. J., & Walker, I. A. (2016, 04). Individual responses to climate change: Framing effects on pro-environmental behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 46(8), 483-493. doi:10.1111/jasp.12378
- Schultz, P. W., Nolan, J. M., Cialdini, R. B., Goldstein, N. J., & Giskevicius, V. (2007, 05). The Constructive, Destructive, and Reconstructive Power of Social Norms. *Psychological Science*, 18(5), 429-434. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01917.x
- Wester-Herber, M. (2004, 04). Underlying concerns in land-use conflicts—the role of place-identity in risk perception. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 7(2), 109-116. doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2003.12.001
- Wilhelm-Rechmann, A., & Cowling, R. M. (2010, 10). Framing biodiversity conservation for decision makers: Insights from four South African municipalities. *Conservation Letters*, 4(1), 73-80. doi:10.1111/j.1755-263x.2010.00149.x
- Worthington, Ohio- City Data. (2016). Retrieved October 25, 2016, from <http://www.city-data.com/city/Worthington-Ohio.html>


Figures

Figure 1: Questions asked in the survey.

For how many years have you lived in Worthington?
How strongly do you identify with Worthington?
What social media do you use on a regular basis?
How do you prefer to receive information from the city of Worthington about local issues, initiatives, and city programs?
How knowledgeable do you consider yourself to be when it comes to local issues, initiatives, and city programs related to the community and community development in the City of Worthington?
What formal Worthington organizations do you participate in?
What are your favorite Worthington community events that occur on a weekly, monthly, or annual basis?
What do you love about Worthington? Specifically, why did you move here and/or why have you stayed here?
Which of the following factors are most important to you when you are considering your support for a large-scale development project in Worthington?
Which of the following factors are most important to you when considering your support for a small scale program or initiative in Worthington (for example: bike path expansion, walkable infrastructure expansion, etc.)?
How supportive would you be of Worthington making sustainability an important component of future development plans?
If you have any concerns about how Worthington might develop or change over the next 10-20 years - which of the following are your main concerns?
If you had \$100 to devote as you wish to the issues below, how would you divide it up?

What is your immediate reaction to the word “sustainability”?
Which would you choose if only one option were possible? Choice 1: expanding police presence to increase safety Choice 2: making Worthington School buildings more energy efficient
Which would you choose if only one option were possible? Choice 1: Investing in renewable energy sources (wind, solar, etc.) To power 25% of Worthington Choice 2: Granting a tax break to a large company to place its headquarters in Worthington
Which would you choose if only one option were possible? Choice 1: Organizing an annual festival to generate economic activity in the historic district and build a sense of community Choice 2: Investing in the development of a strategic framework that would allow Worthington to be carbon neutral by 2035.
Which would you choose if only one option were possible? Choice 1: Renovating infrastructure in and around local watersheds to protect Worthington's drinking water Choice 2: Expanding K-12 after-school programs at Worthington Schools and Rec Centers
What is your gender?
What is your household’s approximate total annual income before taxes?
What is the highest level of education you have completed?
Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin?
What is your race?
How many children or dependent minors currently live in your household?
What is your age?
What is your marital status?

Figure 2: Age 55-64 Persona



ESTABLISHED ELLEN

59 year old
Married
Empty nester
Household income greater than or equal to 110k
Graduate Degree holder

I will support:

- The green space and cleanliness of our community
- Worthington schools
- Small business growth

I will not support:

Anything that dilutes the aesthetic character of Worthington
I am weary of new development in general

Priorities/Concerns:

Traffic
Population density
Overdevelopment/corporate development

About me:

I moved to Worthington because in the 1980s it was the leafy-est, greenest, most historic and safe suburb of Columbus. I love that there is a mix of both young and old community members, which results in a diverse mix of opinions, cultures, and skills. I am worried about the development that is being proposed around the city, however, because I feel that it threatens the "small town feel" nature of the community that brought me here in the first place

I would love to see:

An opinion leader from my age bracket begin writing a blog on Facebook that would touch on many things, including sustainability issues, but only as they pertained to Worthington and its residents. The comments section would also give me a platform to voice my opinions regarding current events.

Figure 3: Age 25-34 Persona



JUST SETTLED JESS

28 years old

Married

1.5 kids

Household income greater than 120k
Bachelor's with some graduate experience

I will support:

- Equity within my community
- Community growth through cultural and social outlets
- Increased walk-ability and bike paths

I will not support:

- Anything that takes away from Worthington's green space
- Big-box business development

Priorities/Concerns:

- My children and their educational opportunities
- Ability to attract younger populations
- Traffic

About me:

I moved to Worthington because it has a "small town feel" while still being in proximity to the metro areas of Columbus. I love the walkability of Worthington and the unique characteristics of the homes surrounding the area. I appreciate that there is a focus on family within the community and am thankful for the various community services the city provides. You're most likely to catch me at the Farmer's Market on the weekends. .

I would love to see:

Events that allow my family and I to be involved in the sustainability of our community, such as: documentaries in our green spaces, community tree planting and composting seminars. I would be proud of our community to see these events sponsored by the local library or community centers

Appendix:

A: Personas Table

Female	Age Bracket 55-64: 24 Respondents	Age Bracket 25-34: 14 Respondents
If you had \$100 to devote as you wish to the issues below, how would you divide it up?	\$14.17 Ensuring equal access to education \$13.96 Preservation of the historic district \$11.57 Infrastructure improvements \$11.08 Promoting art and cultural events \$10.21 Eliminating hunger within the community \$9.17 Promoting a diverse economy \$7.92 Reducing water use \$7.29 Promoting small businesses \$7.08 Investing in renewable energy \$3.75 Expanding bike paths	\$19.29 Ensuring equal access to education \$15.50 Promoting small businesses \$11.79 Eliminating hunger within the community \$9.64 Preservation of the historic district \$9.57 Promoting art cultural events \$9.36 Expanding bike paths \$6.64 Infrastructure improvements \$5.00 Investing in renewable energy \$4.64 Reducing water use \$4.36 Promoting a diverse economy
How many years have you lived in Worthington?	25.3 years	9.5 years
How strongly do you identify with Worthington?	66.67% very strongly 25.00% somewhat strongly 8.33% not very strongly	71.43% very strongly 28.57% somewhat strongly
What social media do you use on a regular basis?	Facebook is the most popular form of social media	Facebook is the most popular form of social media
How do you prefer to receive information from the city of Worthington about local issues, initiatives, and city programs?	Email is the preferred method for receiving information	Facebook is the preferred method for receiving information

<p>How knowledgeable do you consider yourself to be when it comes to local issues, initiatives, and city programs related to the community and community development in the City of Worthington?</p>	<p>12.5% extremely knowledgeable 37.50% very knowledgeable 45.83% moderately knowledgeable 4.17% slightly knowledgeable</p>	<p>21.40% very knowledgeable 78.60% moderately knowledgeable</p>
<p>Which of the following factors are most important to you when you are considering your support for a large-scale development project in Worthington?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How it will impact natural areas in Worthington. 2. How it will affect traffic and congestion within the city. 3. Whether the project will impact Worthington's image. 4. How it will impact my property. 5. How it will impact air/water pollution within the community. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How it will impact natural areas in Worthington. 2. How it will impact my property. 3. Whether the project will impact Worthington's image. 4. How much it will cost me. 5. Whether the project has potential to generate revenue for Worthington.
<p>Which of the following factors are most important to you when you are considering your support for a small-scale development project in Worthington?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How it will impact natural areas in Worthington. 2. How it will impact my property. 3. How it will impact traffic and congestion in Worthington. 4. How much it will cost the city 5. How it will impact other community members. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How it will impact my kids 2. Whether the project will impact Worthington's image. 3. How it will impact natural areas in Worthington. 4. How it will impact my property 5. Whether the project has potential to generate revenue for Worthington.
<p>How supportive would you be of Worthington making sustainability an important component of future development plans?</p>	<p>39.13% very supportive 17.39% pretty supportive 21.74% support certain efforts 13.04% neutral 4.35% not supportive 4.35% strongly against</p>	<p>28.57% very supportive 64.29% pretty supportive 7.14% neutral</p>

<p>If you have any concerns about how Worthington might develop over the next 10-20 years what are your main concerns?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic 2. Population Density 3. Land Use 4. Adequate Public Transportation 5. An Aging Population 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ability to attract younger population 2. Public Safety 3. Ability to Attract New Business 4. Population Density 5. Adequate Public Transportation
<p>What do you love about Worthington? Specifically, why did you move here and/or why have you stayed here?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clean ● Safe ● Historic ● Affordable ● Nice community ● Blend of older and younger ● Mix of cultures and opinions ● Mixture of old/historical and new/trending ● Great Schools ● Alternative schooling option ● Tree lined streets ● Bike paths ● Responsive community ● Recreational facilities ● Shopping and restaurants ● Proximity to metroparks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Walkability ● Shops ● Library ● Schools/rec centers ● Small town feel with nearby city ● Amenities/services ● Walkable neighborhood ● Aesthetics ● Picturesque ● Charm of Old Worthington ● Clean ● Friendly people ● “Like minded” people ● Focus on family ● People get out and talk ● Lots of opportunities to get involved
<p>What is your immediate reaction to the Word Sustainability?</p>	<p>33.33% extremely positive 41.67% positive 16.67% slightly positive 8.33% neutral</p>	<p>42.86% extremely positive 42.86% positive 7.14% slightly positive 7.14% neutral</p>
<p>What is your household's approximate total annual income (before taxes)?</p>	<p>45% greater than 140 Thousand 10% 100-119 Thousand 10% 80-99 Thousand 25% 60-79 Thousand 10% 40-59 Thousand</p>	<p>50.00% greater than 140 Thousand 21.43% 120-139 Thousand 14.29% 100-119 Thousand 7.14% 60-79 Thousand 7.14% 40-59 Thousand</p>
<p>What are your favorite Worthington community events</p>	<p>Farmers Market</p>	<p>Farmers Market</p>

that occur on a weekly, monthly, or annual basis?		
What is the highest level of education you have completed?	33.33% Graduate Degree 20.83% Some Grad School 41.67% College Degree 4.17% High School Degree	42.86% Graduate Degree 50.00% College Degree 7.14% Some College
Which would you choose if only one option were available?	83.33% Renovating infrastructure in and around local watersheds to protect Worthington's drinking water 16.67% Expanding K-12 after-school programs at Worthington schools and recreation centers	57.14% Renovating infrastructure in and around local watersheds to protect Worthington's drinking water 42.86% Expanding K-12 after-school programs at Worthington schools and recreation centers
Which would you choose if only one option were available?	39.13% Organizing an annual festival to generate economic activity in the historic district and build a sense of community 60.87% Investing in the development of a strategic framework that would allow Worthington to be carbon neutral by 2035	64.29% Organizing an annual festival to generate economic activity in the historic district and build a sense of community 35.71% Investing in the development of a strategic framework that would allow Worthington to be carbon neutral by 2035
Which would you choose if only one option were available?	70.83% Investing in renewable energy sources (wind, solar, etc.) to power 25% of Worthington. 29.17% Granting a tax break to a large company to place its headquarters in Worthington.	78.57% Investing in renewable energy sources (wind, solar, etc.) to power 25% of Worthington. 21.43% Granting a tax break to a large company to place its headquarters in Worthington.
Which would you choose if only one option were available?	41.67% Expanding police presence to increase safety. 58.33% Making Worthington School buildings more energy efficient.	7.14% Expanding police presence to increase safety. 92.86% Making Worthington School buildings more energy efficient.

What is your race?	78.26% White 4.35% White of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin 17.39% Choose Not To Say	100% White
How many children or dependent minors currently live in your household?	70.83% None 20.83% with one 8.33% with two	21.43% with none 35.71% with one 28.57% with two 14.29% with three
What is your marital status?	86.96% Married 4.35% Widowed 8.70% Divorced	92.86% Married 7.14% Divorced