

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Lyndsay Hughes Dawson entitled “Stewards of the Mountains: A Case Study of the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship, A Faith-Based Environmental Organization.” I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts with a major in Sociology.

Dr. Sherry Cable, Major Professor

We have read this thesis  
and recommend its acceptance:

Dr. Robert Emmet Jones

Dr. Donald W. Hastings

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges, Vice Provost and  
Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

Stewards of the Mountains: A Case Study of the Lindquist Environmental  
Appalachian Fellowship, a Faith-Based Environmental Organization

A Thesis  
Presented for the  
Master of Arts  
Degree  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Lyndsay Hughes Dawson  
May 2009

Copyright © 2009 Lyndsay Hughes Dawson  
All rights reserved.

## Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, Alan and Lynda Dawson, who have given continual support in the advancement of my education, to the memory of my beloved grandmother, Peggy Hughes, to my soon to be husband, Jordan Mynatt, with whom I will be embarking on life's adventure, to Dr. Sherry Cable, who has given encouragement and ensured the success of my degree, and to the ladies of LEAF, who made it possible to complete my research.

## Acknowledgements

Foremost, I would like to thank the Giver of strength and peace who guides my life and encourages endlessly: “He is like a tree planted by streams of water, which yields its fruit in season and whose leaf does not wither. Whatever he does prospers” (Psalms 1:3).

For my professional acknowledgements, I would like to thank my major professor, Dr. Sherry Cable who has opened the door to her home many times. She has not only been an incredible mentor, but also a supportive friend who has taught me the perfection of a messy draft. I would also like to thank the other committee members, Dr. Donald “Chip” Hastings and Dr. Bobby Jones, for their assistance. Chip’s meticulous readings of the many drafts, specifically the bibliographical and mechanical details, were invaluable; his efforts and advice have been greatly appreciated. Bobby helped to narrow down the focus of my thesis to the overlap of religious and environmental concern. A special thanks goes to Bobby for the many articles, references, borrowed books, and discussions that he shared.

Exceptional thanks goes to the members of the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship for participating in my thesis research. Within LEAF, I would like to give a special acknowledgement to Pat Hudson for patiently answering questions, responding to emails, and helping gather participants for my project. She is an inspiring example of faith in action.

For my personal acknowledgements, I would like to thank my family for their generous support; my friends for the much needed study breaks; and my former teachers for fostering my aptitude for learning. Two former professors that I would like to thank

in particular are Dr. Greg Hoover and Dr. Ray Dalton, professors of Sociology at Carson-Newman College. Completing the Master of Arts degree has been the biggest mountain that I have academically climbed and I want to thank everyone who has provided encouragement along the way.

## Abstract

The case study explores the concepts of the mental constructions of humans' perceptions of their relationships to the environment. The ancients were intricately connected with the biophysical environment. Ancient religions such as Paganism and Pantheism produced environmental sentiments to revere and respect nature. As pantheistic and pagan ideologies transitioned to Judeo-Christianity, humans' mental constructs of nature and their environmental attitudes substantially shifted. Environmental attitudes transitioned from a deep connection with the biophysical world to dominance, superiority, and hierarchy.

To explore subjects' perceptions of the relationship between humans and the environment, my primary research question investigates the influence of LEAF members' religious values on their environmental attitudes. The secondary research question compares LEAF to the characteristics of grassroots environmental groups. Together, the two research questions provide a framework to examine the human mental constructions of the biophysical environment.

The social movement and environmental concern literature are explored for concepts pertaining to the two research questions: 1) how does LEAF compare to grassroots environmental organizations? and 2) how do the religious values of LEAF members influence their environmental attitudes? The six characteristics of grassroots environmental movement organizations are used to analyze the first question. Data were gathered from interviews, participant observation, and document research. To analyze the second question, established concepts on value bases are engaged. The data collection for the second question was limited to interviews.

Analyzing the responses to the first question, I found LEAF to be a new genus of organization as it exhibits characteristics beyond grassroots environmental organizations and mainstream organizations. Analyzing responses to the second question, I find that the members of LEAF care for the environment because of a religious value basis. Religion causes a theocentric paradigm influencing LEAF members' perceptions of their relationship to the environment. That is, their faith creates reasons for environmental concern. LEAF members perceive humans' relationship to the environment as damaged by the consequences of sin. To resolve the issue, the individuals become missionaries with the goal of ecological conversion to create a renewed relationship of environmental stewardship.

## Table of Contents

|                                                                                                                                             |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Chapter I: Plotting the Garden: Introduction .....                                                                                          | 1  |
| Brief Overview of Ancient Religions and Environmental Attitudes .....                                                                       | 1  |
| Contemporary Scholarship on Religion and Environmental Concern.....                                                                         | 3  |
| The Case Study .....                                                                                                                        | 6  |
| Chapter II: The Farmer's Almanac: Literature Review of the Grassroots Environmental<br>Movement and Environmental Concern Literatures ..... | 10 |
| Planting the Seeds: Background of the U.S. Environmental Movement.....                                                                      | 10 |
| Fertilizing the Seeds: The Love Canal.....                                                                                                  | 12 |
| Sprouting the Seeds: The Emergence of Grassroots Environmental Movements .....                                                              | 14 |
| Taxonomy of the Seeds: Characteristics of Grassroots Environmental Movements<br>Organizations .....                                         | 15 |
| Mobilization.....                                                                                                                           | 15 |
| Activists and Leaders.....                                                                                                                  | 16 |
| Grievances.....                                                                                                                             | 18 |
| Goals .....                                                                                                                                 | 18 |
| Tactics .....                                                                                                                               | 20 |
| Digging the Holes: Background of Environmental Concern.....                                                                                 | 21 |
| Why Dig the Holes: Environmental Values.....                                                                                                | 24 |
| The Yardstick: Theoretical and Empirical Approaches to Measuring Values .....                                                               | 25 |
| Rokeach Value System .....                                                                                                                  | 26 |
| Regressive Equation.....                                                                                                                    | 27 |
| Values-Beliefs-Norm Theory.....                                                                                                             | 28 |

|                                                                |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Value Bases for Environmental Concern.....                     | 29 |
| Altruism .....                                                 | 30 |
| Egoistic Values .....                                          | 30 |
| Biospheric Values .....                                        | 31 |
| Religion as a Value Basis for Environmental Concern .....      | 32 |
| The Gardner's Tools: Analytical Framework .....                | 36 |
| Chapter III: Plowing the Garden: Methods.....                  | 40 |
| Participant Observation.....                                   | 41 |
| Interviews.....                                                | 43 |
| Analysis of Interview Guideline .....                          | 46 |
| Data Organization .....                                        | 48 |
| Analysis of Biographical Data .....                            | 49 |
| Document Research .....                                        | 52 |
| Chapter IV: LEAF's Origins, Activities, and Organization ..... | 59 |
| The Origin and Activities of LEAF .....                        | 60 |
| Phase 1: Education.....                                        | 61 |
| Phase 2: Lobbying.....                                         | 64 |
| LEAF as a Grassroots Environmental Movement Organization ..... | 69 |
| Activists and Leaders.....                                     | 69 |
| The Role of Women.....                                         | 71 |
| Grievances.....                                                | 71 |
| Goals .....                                                    | 73 |
| Tactics.....                                                   | 74 |

|                                                                                                                               |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Summary: Grassroots, Hybrid, or New Genus?.....                                                                               | 76  |
| Chapter V: The Influence of Religious Values on LEAF Members' Perceptions of the Relationship between Humans and Nature ..... | 79  |
| Religious Composition of Movement Members .....                                                                               | 79  |
| Pro-environmental Norms.....                                                                                                  | 82  |
| Pro-environmental Behaviors .....                                                                                             | 83  |
| Members' Value Bases for Environmental Concern .....                                                                          | 84  |
| Members' Religious-based Perceptions of the Relationship between Humans and the Environment.....                              | 85  |
| Summary .....                                                                                                                 | 87  |
| Chapter VI: Results, Caveats, and Conclusions.....                                                                            | 88  |
| Results .....                                                                                                                 | 88  |
| Policy .....                                                                                                                  | 92  |
| Future Research .....                                                                                                         | 92  |
| Caveats .....                                                                                                                 | 90  |
| Conclusions .....                                                                                                             | 92  |
| List of References .....                                                                                                      | 96  |
| Appendices.....                                                                                                               | 110 |
| Appendix A.....                                                                                                               | 111 |
| Appendix B .....                                                                                                              | 117 |
| Appendix C .....                                                                                                              | 119 |
| Appendix D .....                                                                                                              | 120 |
| Appendix E .....                                                                                                              | 122 |

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| Appendix F..... | 126 |
| Vita.....       | 128 |

## List of Tables

|                                                                                   |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1 LEAF Members' Demographics.....                                           | 53 |
| Table 2 LEAF Members' Occupations, Level of Education, and Number of Children ... | 54 |
| Table 3 LEAF Members' Experiences with Activism and Income .....                  | 55 |
| Table 4 LEAF Members' Religious & Political Views .....                           | 56 |
| Table 5 Core Versus Non-Core Members of LEAF .....                                | 57 |

## Chapter I

### Plotting the Garden: Introduction

The phenomenon of religious values as the basis for environmental concern is a vaguely explored concept in the sociological literature. The root of environmental concern within religion is visible through the rich languages describing the natural environment found in the religious texts of Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism and Jainism, Confucianism, and Pantheism. Religious impressions shape individuals' perceptions of the relationship between humans and nature. In the following section, a brief overview of ancient religions and environmental attitudes is provided. Following is the contemporary scholarship on religion and environmental concern, and closing is a description of the case study.

#### *Brief Overview of Ancient Religions and Environmental Attitudes*

Humans' treatment of the biophysical environment has been due in large measure to our perceptions of the relationship between humans and nature. That is, humans' characteristic mental constructions of nature largely determine their environmental attitudes.

Hunters and gatherers depended on nature for survival and likely realized their interconnectedness with their natural environment, a phenomenon that deeply rooted the hunter-gathering economy in nature. As the hunter-gathering economy transitioned to agricultural civilization, the human-nature relationship also began to change. Agriculture, the domestication of selected plants and animals, caused radical changes in organizational structure such that not everyone participated in food procurement (Ponting 1992). Occupations such as craftsmen, chiefs, bureaucrats, and priests, and

innovations such as writing, metallurgy, cities, and scientific principles emerged with the onset of civilization (Weisdorf 2003).

The shift from the nomadic lifestyle of the hunter-gatherers to the organizational structure of agricultural civilizations noticeably disrupted the balance between humans and nature, evidenced in ancient Greece and Rome (Hughes 1993; Ponting 1992). The ancient Greek and Roman civilizations experienced deforestation, overpopulation, depletion and extinction of plants and animals, and air and water pollution due to anthropocentric attitudes toward the environment (Hughes 1993; Ponting 1992). Anthropocentric, human-centered, attitudes were derived from the Western ideologies of humans' superiority set forth by the ancient Greek and Roman philosophers.

Religion was often a factor in shaping ancients' mental constructions of nature and their environmental attitudes. They were closely connected to their biophysical surroundings and viewed the world as a sacred place where the gods of nature were present (Hughes 1993). Sensing the presence of the gods, the earliest Greeks and Romans held attitudes of reverence for nature that was reflected in their actions toward the Earth. Paganism was intricately connected to their attitudes to the extent that "all the major gods had associations with nature and the minor ones were divinized natural features such as winds and rivers" (Hughes 1993:46). Particularly important in Greco-Roman religion was Pan, the universal god of Nature. Pan was regarded as "the all-god nature personified who ruled all things" (Hughes 1993:48). The presences of major gods such as Pan as well as lesser spirits were most fully experienced in "wild beautiful locations" and places with "panoramic inspiring views" (Hughes 1993:49). Finding the gods and spirits in sacred places of the wilderness exemplifies the ancients'

characteristic mental constructions of nature as a place to be regarded with awe, not a place for exploitation and destruction.

As pantheistic and pagan ideologies transitioned to Judeo-Christianity, humans' mental constructs of nature and their environmental attitudes substantially shifted. The views of ancient philosophers who questioned or denied the activities of the gods in the world weakened the older attitudes of interconnectedness with nature and reinforced humans' belief in their superiority. Aristotle gathered a hierarchical schema for viewing the universe with men (humans) as the superior creature to both animals and nature (Preus 1975). He announced that the highest purpose of everything in nature was to serve man, the single rational animal (Hughes 1993).

The mental constructions of nature and environmental attitudes also changed in Rome. Living by pragmatism and profitability, the Romans seem to have thought that they had conquered nature as well as the political world (Hughes 1993). The anthropocentric philosophies as well as the emergence of Christianity in late Roman times have shaped the mental constructions of nature and environmental attitudes throughout Western Civilization (Hughes 1993).

#### *Contemporary Scholarship on Religion and Environmental Concern*

In the contemporary United States some viewed Judeo-Christianity's perceptions of the relationship between humans and nature as the source of environmental problems because of the interpretations of the creation account in the Hebrew scripture (White 1967). The dominance of man over nature, interpreted from Genesis 1:28, has been purported to produce anti-environmental attitudes and anthropocentric constructs of nature (White 1967; Hand and Van Liere 1984; Eckberg

and Blocker 1989). Sociological researchers have investigated the connection between religious attitudes and environmental concern, but findings have been inconclusive (Sherkat and Ellison 2007; Hitzhusen 2007).

The intersection of religion and environmental concern has received increased public and scholarly attention in the last decade. Much of that interest has focused on Protestant Evangelicals because of their influence in political matters. Protestant Evangelicals are one of the three largest faith groups in the U.S. A 2004 survey by the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life reveals high support of environmental policy across various faith traditions. Fifty-two percent of Evangelical Protestants favor stronger environmental regulation and 48% include the environment as a voting priority (Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life 2004). A 2008 Pew Survey reveals continued support of environmental protection. Fifty-four percent of a sample of 9,472 congregants of Evangelical churches believed that stricter environmental laws and regulations for the environment are worth the cost (Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life 2008). A 2008 Sierra Club survey shows that 67% of Americans proclaim that they care about the environment because it is “God’s creation.”

National attention of faith-based environmentalism has not been limited to national surveys. Articles have appeared in environmental media such as *Grist* as well as major newspapers including the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, and *U.S. Today*. Democrat president nominee Barak Obama stated that his religious beliefs would influence his environmental protection plans as president (Lorentzen 2007). Interest in the human/environment connection was also signaled in the 2008 release of *The Green Bible* by Harper Collins Publishing Company. *The Green Bible* takes a

“green lens” to the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) of the Bible and includes excerpts from key religious leaders such as: N. T. Wright, Barbara Brown Taylor, Brian McLaren, Matthew Sleeth, Pope John Paul II, and Wendell Berry (Harper Bibles 2008).

Evangelicals’ expressions of environmental concern are referred to as “Evangelical environmentalism” or “Creation Care.” Creation Care is a central concern to Christians who reject attitudes that devalue creation (Gottlieb 2006). Creation Care emphasizes Biblical scripture that promotes worship of God as the Creator and human’s duty to protect and be stewards of His creation. Creation Care Evangelicals are careful not to “fashion biblical Christianity into worship of the Earth” (Fowler 1995:41; Gottlieb 2006a). Evangelical refers to the many religious people who take the Bible seriously as ruling life and practice and believe that the teachings of the Bible should be publicized (DeWitt 1997). Within Evangelicals, individuals are generally classified as conservative or progressive (Fowler 1995; Gottlieb 2006a).

Conservative Evangelicals are associated with the Christian right and tend to be more politically and socially conservative. ‘Fundamentalist’ is a synonym for Conservative Evangelicals who “defend the Bible as inerrant and advocate very high boundaries between the community of the faithful and the larger society” (Fowler 1995:45). Progressive Evangelicals are politically and socially liberal and are associated with the Christian left. Progressive Evangelicals “employ the Bible as an important part of their faith, as a document that is inspired by God but that is also a historical and cultural work” (Fowler 1995:3). From Biblical attitudes and the interpretation of its scripture, Conservative Evangelicals tend to adhere to the dominion set forth by Genesis 1:28 (White 1967) while the ideas of stewardship in the second

creation account, Genesis 2:15, resonate with Progressive Evangelicals (Fowler 1995). Dominion is the belief of human's superiority over the natural world and all of the animals in it. Stewardship is the belief of that humans are apart of and connected to nature and must take responsibility to care for it because the Earth is God's creation.

The division between Conservative and Progressive Evangelicals' interpretations of the creation account shapes their mental constructs of nature and their environmental attitudes (Berry 2006). Dominion, interpreted as such in Genesis 1:28, refers to human anthropomorphism and the authority of humans and their managerial role in creation (Gottlieb 2006). The dominion belief reflects the influence of Greek philosophers on Western Civilization in the hierarchical schema of humans as superior to the biophysical environment. The idea of stewardship, reflected in the practices of Progressive Evangelicals, is that God is the ultimate and absolute owner of the Earth and that humans have a responsibility to care for nature on behalf of God; human ownership is secondary and subordinate (Fowler 1995; Gottlieb 2006; Gottlieb 2006a; Berry 2006). Therefore, Progressive Evangelicals view environmental degradation as a spiritual crisis that must be addressed through faith (DeWitt 1997). It seems likely that the perception of environmental degradation as a spiritual crisis would be associated with holding religious values as the basis for environmental concern.

### *The Case Study*

My thesis project is a case study of an environmental organization comprised mostly of Progressive Evangelicals. The Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship (LEAF) waged a campaign against mountain top removal coal mining practices in Tennessee. My research contributes to the field of Environmental

Sociology by examining the environmental attitudes of Progressive Evangelicals and religious values as the basis for environmental concern. It also contributes to social movement research by comparing the characteristics of LEAF to the characteristics of typical grassroots environmental organizations.

LEAF's existence is attributed to Kathy Lindquist, a member of Church of the Savior United Church of Christ (COS-UCC) who died in 2005 from cancer. Kathy introduced the local injustices of mountain top removal (MTR) coal mining practices to COS-UCC. MTR was an issue important to Kathy because she could empathize with the health related issues prevalent within mining communities, especially the children who are most susceptible to toxins. Kathy was an instrumental figure in the Church, so friends and members within the congregation wanted to do something special to commemorate her spirit.

Occurring throughout the thesis is an imagery of nature through the metaphors of seeds and gardening. I, the gardener, am looking for the answer to the overarching question of how mental constructions of nature based on religious values influence environmental concern. My research addresses two research questions: 1) How does LEAF compare to the characteristics of typical grassroots environmental organizations? 2) How do the religious values of LEAF's members influence their environmental attitudes? These questions explore important analytical concepts in the field of Sociology. The first question provides an analysis of the characteristics of LEAF compared to the characteristics of typical grassroots environmental organization: activists and leaders, the role of women, grievances, goals, and tactics. The second question probes for environmental stewardship as a motivator for religion as a value

basis for concern. Finding religion as an orientation for concern suggests an additional value base to the established altruistic, biospheric, and egoistic value bases within environmental concern literature.

The thesis consists of five remaining chapters. Chapter II presents the literature review in the fields of environmental grassroots movements and environmental concern. It begins with a history of the U.S. Environmental Movement as a backdrop for the emergence of grassroots environmental movements. The primary focus within this area of literature is the characteristics of the grassroots environmental organizations. My review of the environmental concern literature emphasizes value orientations, the measurements thereof, and the emergence of religion as a value basis for environmental concern. Concluding Chapter II is the presentation of the Analytical Framework, or tools, employed in my study.

Chapter III discusses the research strategy to guide the study. The chapter begins with discussing the type of case study and the types of methodologies including: participant observation, interviews, and document research. Methods of analyzing and organizing the data are also included within Chapter III.

Chapter IV presents the chronological history of LEAF from the information gathered from document research and interviews. The chapter begins with LEAF's origins and establishment. Next, the two phases of the movement, educational and political, are discussed. Each phase is described in full detail of the members involved, their grievances, the goals to address the members' concerns, and the tactics used in attempt to achieve the goals. Concluding the chapter is an analysis of the concepts

within the first research question: how does LEAF compare to the characteristics of grassroots environmental organizations.

Chapter V analyzes the concepts explored in the second research question: how do the religious views of LEAF's members influence their environmental attitudes? Concepts within the environmental concern literature are explored through the categories of religious composition, pro-environmental behaviors, pro-environmental norms, value bases for environmental concern, and religious-based perceptions of the relationship between humans and the environment. Data were collected from the interviews to analyze the conceptual framework of the second research question.

Chapter VI explores the findings, caveats, and conclusions of the research. Future research and policy implications are briefly discussed. The chapter concludes with reflections on the relationship between religious values and environmental attitudes specifically and on humans' mental constructions of nature and environmental use more generally.

## Chapter II

### The Farmer's Almanac: Literature Review of the Grassroots Environmental Movement and Environmental Concern Literatures

The Farmer's Almanac is the source for reviewing both the environmental grassroots movement and the environmental concern literatures to develop an analytical framework for understanding how religious values shape perceptions of the relationship between humans and the environment.

The first section reviews the grassroots environmental movement. I begin with background information on the U.S. Environmental Movement to preface the emergence of the grassroots environmental movement through the case history of the Love Canal. The history of the Love Canal sets the stage for the review of grassroots environmental movement organizations in which the characteristics are assessed. The second section draws from the environmental concern research to illuminate value bases for environmental concern, the measurements of values, and the emergence of religion as a value-base. The final section addresses how I specifically use the previous research as tools to guide my study as well as the gaps that my research is addressing.

#### *Planting the Seeds: Background of the U.S. Environmental Movement*

The U.S. Environmental Movement is not a recent phenomenon. The emergence of environmentalism in the United States dates back to the rivalry of the Conservationist versus Preservationist perspectives in the 1800s. Conservationists viewed nature as a commodity to be managed because natural resources are essential to the maintaining of society. In contrast, Preservationists developed a more spiritual and

psychological relationship with nature that promoted preservation instead of management of the wilderness (Brulle 2001).

Prompted by the publication of Rachel Carson's (1962) *Silent Spring*, the two environmental perspectives were challenged and broadened from aesthetics and the protection of the natural environment to deeper issues such as health, hazards, and toxins. Taking a human welfare ecological view, people began to realize:

The accumulation of toxic chemicals or 'intractable wastes'; the intensification of ground, air, and water pollution generally; the growth in new 'diseases of affluence' (e.g., heart disease, cancer); the growth in urban and coastal high rise development; the dangers of nuclear plants and nuclear wastes; the growth in the nuclear arsenal; and the problem of global warming and the thinning of the ozone layer have posed increasing threats to human survival, safety, and well-being (Eckersley 1992 cited in Taylor 1993:53).

Increased awareness of environmental problems coupled with media attention generated the contemporary environmental movement and actions to address critical environmental, safety, and health-related issues (Freudenberg and Steinsapir 1992).

Environmental movement activists adopted the tactics of the civil rights movement and the anti-war movement. Individuals who had participated in those movements created a pool of experienced and passionate leaders for community-led activism that erupted in the late 1970s and 1980s in response to local environmental issues (Freudenberg and Steinsapir 1992). The seeds of the grassroots environmental movement were planted within increased environmental awareness and the history of the social movements. The seeds were fertilized by the 1978 revelations of environmental contamination at Love Canal (Beck 1979; Levine 1982; Layzer 2002).

### *Fertilizing the Seeds: The Love Canal*

Love Canal is the site of a forty-acre chemical landfill in Niagara Falls, New York. The canal--a mile-long, ten to forty deep and fifteen-foot wide trench--was built by late nineteenth century entrepreneur William T. Love (Layzer 2002). Originally, Love intended the canal to be used as a hydropower electrical source to provide cheap power. Due to financial problems, Love was forced to abandon his plans, and the canal was sold at a public auction and became a municipal disposal site (Levine 1982).

In 1947, the partially dug canal and sixteen surrounding acres were resold to the Hooker Chemical and Plastics Corporation (Layzer 2002). For the next five years, the Hooker Company continued to use the site, dumping 25,000 tons of toxic chemical waste, until the canal was almost full (Layzer 2002). Hooker then sealed the site with an impermeable concrete layer and sold the property in 1953 to the Niagara Falls Board of Education for one dollar. The deed of sale included a clause relieving the company of any responsibility for physical injury or death resulting from the buried wastes (Levine 1982).

The city built an elementary school atop the landfill. Further development quickly followed and the La Salle neighborhood emerged. By the 1970s, the area surrounding the sixteen-acre rectangle that was once the canal became a thriving working-class community whose residents were unaware of the closed landfill (Levine 1982). Although complaints emerged throughout the 1950s and 1960s of foul odors and odd health afflictions, Hooker and city officials ignored the problems (Layzer 2002).

During an unusually rainy season in the mid-1970s, problems appeared that could not be ignored: chemicals bubbled from below and formed puddles of contaminated liquid; trees and shrubs turned black and died; and, in one backyard, an in-ground swimming pool raised two feet out of the ground (Beck 1979). These highly unusual problems raised media attention, which in turn, signified to the local community that the Love Canal was a health threat (Layzer 2002; Beck 1979). Over two hundred compounds with twelve known carcinogens including benzene, known for causing leukemia, and dioxin, the most deadly of all chemicals were discovered in and around the Love Canal (Levine 1982).

Although they were not fully aware of the effects of these discoveries, community residents began to question the connection between local health problems (such as disproportionately higher incidences of miscarriages and alarmingly high percentages of white-blood-cell counts) and the location of their residences to the toxic waste site (Layzer 2002). Lois Gibbs was one of the first to make the connection between health and their surrounding environment (Gottlieb 1993). Levine (1982) describes Gibbs as a modest, painfully shy, stay at home mom who was transformed into a dedicated, devoted outspoken activist who organized the community to form the Love Canal Homeowners Association (LCHA).

Gibbs attempted to link the residents' illnesses to Hooker's dumping of hazardous chemicals. Through LCHA actions, a solution was proposed for the evacuation and financial compensation for all the families in the area. But no government officials would take responsibility; they passed the problem over to other levels of the government (Layzer 2002). A second round of media attention in August

1978 forced officials to respond. Eventually, families in the 239 houses closest to the waste site were relocated, but 564 affected homes remained. LCHA members continued to mobilize for the relocation of the remaining families. In 1980, President Carter signed an agreement for the voluntary evacuation and relocation of all residents of the Love Canal area (Layzer 2002). Love Canal remains a worldwide symbol of the paradox of the technological effluvia that produces unfathomable marvels and wealth yet includes the accompanying side effects of environmental pollutants of all kinds (Levine 1982).

*Sprouting the Seeds: The Emergence of Grassroots Environmental Movements*

Love Canal fertilized conditions for the emergence of grassroots environmental movements and catalyzed local organizations across the United States to organize against area-specific and single-issue problems (Bullard 2000). Residents in communities throughout the nation developed a sense of empowerment by speaking out about their adverse conditions (Gottlieb 1993). Media coverage contributed to increased grassroots environmental activism in the following decades. The grassroots organizations grew from 600 to over 7,000 in a period of roughly ten years (Dunlap and Mertig 1992). The increase is associated with a focus extended beyond hazardous waste sites to other issues such as solid waste disposal and medical waste disposal; the siting of locally unwanted land uses (LULUs) such as landfills, hazardous waste disposal sites, resource recovery plants, various sludge facilities, and nuclear waste disposal sites (and nuclear power plants); potentially hazardous industries, microwave towers, and power lines (Gottlieb 1993; Edelstein 1988). The grassroots environmental movement sprouted from the fertile soil of the Love Canal incident and evolved into a

movement that encompasses a multitude of concerns addressed by thousands of grassroots environmental organizations (Freudenberg 1984; Dunlap and Mertig 1992).

As the seeds of the grassroots environmental movement have sprouted and grown, scholars have identified the distinct characteristics of the organizations.

### *Taxonomy of the Seeds: Characteristics of Grassroots Environmental Movements*

#### *Organizations*

Just as seeds are categorized by different species, grassroots environmental movement organizations feature a set of characteristics that distinguish them from the mainstream, national movement: mobilization, activists and leaders, grievances, goals, and tactics. Characteristics of grassroots organizations within this section are referenced from the anti-toxics movements and the environmental justice movement literatures (Almeida and Stearns 1998; Freudenberg and Steinsapir 1992; Mertig, Dunlap, and Morrison 2001; Cable and Cable 1995; Cable, Mix, and Hastings 2002).

#### *Mobilization*

Mobilization is the act of individuals assembling around a particular cause. In the case of grassroots movements, mobilization occurs primarily in response to the desires of individuals to protect the health and safety of their families against some perceived environmental threat (Cable and Cable 1995; Freudenberg 1984).

Environmental activism generally generates a loss of legitimacy in authorities as well as a new sense of efficacy for individuals in the effected community. Individuals experience a shift in political consciousness and realize the need for change and their power to effect change (Piven and Cloward 1979).

Usually an energizing event such as a government edict, an activist's speech, or a sudden illness or death amplifies individual dissatisfaction to the point of forming organizations to address the issue collectively (Cable and Cable 1995). Whether the event is sudden, anticipated, or longstanding, energizing actions provide the salience needed to generate mobilization. Individuals then form organizations through interpersonal social networks in which they interact daily, for example occupational, friendship, or neighborhood; members can also be mobilized from public meetings (Cable and Cable 1995). Recruitment within grassroots environmental movement organizations in the black community often emerges from established social organizations such as the black church, which has deep roots in movement history (Bullard 2000). The formation of an organization, whether through social networks or public meetings, allows for a growth of activists and the establishment of leaders to direct the movement.

#### *Activists and Leaders*

Activists are concerned individuals who become members of an organization to collectively address an environmental problem; leaders emerge from an activist position to a principal organizer, coordinator, or director role of the particular movement organization. Perhaps the most distinguishing feature within the characteristics of grassroots environmental movement organizations are the roles of women. Women, often housewives and mothers with no previous political activism or organizational experience, have emerged as a significant portion of the members as well as leaders (Levine 1982; Mertig *et al.* 2002; Cable and Cable 1995; Freudenberg

and Steinsapir 1992). A survey of grassroots environmental organizations showed that the single most common occupation for leaders was homemaker (Freudenberg 1984).

Some sociologists attribute women's roles as activists to the motherhood effect (Cable and Cable 1995). The motherhood effect holds that mothers are more apt to perceive the hazards of environmental problems because they tend to be more in touch with their children's health and safety. Women's participation is associated with traditional gender roles in working class families—women in working class families stay at home with children.

Members tend to be unpaid volunteers (Mertig *et al.* 2002; Freudenberg and Steinsapir 1992). Activists are frequently from the lower/working classes, minorities, and people of color because of the tendency to locate facilities within those communities (Mertig *et al.* 2002; Bullard 2000). The constituency of the grassroots movement is clearly distinguished from the young, well-educated, politically liberal constituency of the “mainstream” environmental movement (Freudenberg and Steinsapir 1992). Freudenberg's (1984) survey offers more precise demographic details: the median size of groups was two hundred active members and twenty core participants; members' ages ranged from twenty-six to forty; two-thirds of members were minorities; and nearly all groups had both male and female members. Another common factor among grassroots organizations is that the environmental struggle, or grievance, becomes the dominant passion in activists' lives, and they adopt new social roles as activists: speaking in public, arguing with political leaders, researching and studying topics such as chemistry and environmental law, and interacting with lawyers and other experts (Cable and Cable 1995).

### *Grievances*

Grievances are the concerns that motivate people to organize. The grievances of grassroots environmental organizations are two-fold: health concerns from hazardous exposures of noxious facilities, and the unequal distribution of hazardous exposures. While the primary grievances encountered by typical grassroots environmental organizations are human health and the unequal distribution, the mainstream environmental concerns are aesthetics or wilderness preservation. As a consequence, tensions accompany many attempted coalitions between grassroots organizations and national organizations (Freudenberg and Steinsapir 1992; Cable, Mix, and Hastings 2002). Grassroots environmental organizations look beyond exterior problems to the deeper layers of class, race, political power, and the exposure to environmental hazards.

The deeper issues within grassroots environmental movements were emphasized through the inclusion of African American groups. African Americans had faced similar battles of justice and equality through the civil rights movements and were aware of the “environmental racism” through the disproportionate exposure of toxins to people of color, the lower or working income, and/or minorities (Bullard 1993; Bullard 2000; Freudenberg and Steinsapir 1992; Mertig *et al.* 2002). Most grassroots environmental movements are motivated by the grievances of health affects of hazardous exposure and unequal distribution of hazardous exposure, but other issues have also been included (Bullard 1993).

### *Goals*

The goals of a grassroots movement organization largely depend on the issue, or grievance, that the group mobilizes around. Two grievances of typical grassroots

environmental organizations were discussed above: the health effects of hazardous exposure and the distribution of hazardous exposures. Freudentberg (1984) asserts that the most common goal of grassroots environmental organizations is to eliminate threats and reduce hazardous exposure in communities. The second goal of a more equal distribution of hazardous exposures involves environmental justice. Environmental justice is “the belief that both environmental benefits and environmental costs should be equally distributed in society, and that corporations should be obliged to obey existing laws, just as individuals are so obliged” (Cable, Mix, and Hastings 2002; Cable and Cable 1995:124). The goals of grassroots environmental organizations reflect their grievances.

Successes of grassroots environmental organizations include: forcing the clean-up of contamination dump sites, blocking construction of garbage incinerators and hazardous waste disposal facilities, winning bans on aerial spraying of pesticides, and forcing corporations to consider environmental consequences of action (Freudentberg and Steinsapir 1992; Cable and Cable 1995). More generally, environmental grassroots organizations have accomplished: creating pressure for corporations to take preventative action, improving public health by preventing problems associated with exposure to hazardous contaminants, offering networks of self-help and group support to effected communities, influencing public attitudes toward the environment and health, winning legislative victories to expand the rights of citizens for decision making, bringing environmental concerns and actions to working class and minority Americans, and shifting from a “not in my backyard” (NIMBY) to a “not in anyone’s

backyard” (NIABY) standpoint (Freudenberg and Steinsapir 1992; Cable and Cable 1995; Mertig *et al.* 2002).

### *Tactics*

Tactics are the methods or activities employed by leaders and activists to secure goals. Most grassroots environmental groups carry out several types of action including distributing flyers, circulating petitions, letter writing, public meetings, educational forums, demonstrating, legal action, and civil disobedience (Freudenberg 1984; Cable, Mix, and Hastings 2002). Typically, grassroots environmental organizations do not become involved with political agendas and legislature; national mainstream organizations usually employ such tactics. Actions of grassroots environmental organizations tend to be more direct and immediate, while actions of national mainstream movements are more conservative in their tactics.

Tactics of grassroots environmental organizations serve to educate and organize the broader community. They begin by approaching established community organizations such as neighbor-to-neighbor, church groups, block associations, and social clubs with detailed information about the reason(s) for concern (Freudenberg 1984). If activities change to a litigation strategy, then the tactic will change from an educational standpoint to one of grant writing and hearings. The support and the resources of the group will then be affected because some activists may not feel comfortable with a legislative battle and the litigation process is time consuming and expensive (Cable and Cable 1995). Despite the type of method is being employed by grassroots environmental organizations, research has found that the most effective tactic is to gain media coverage (Freudenberg 1984).

### *Digging the Holes: Background of Environmental Concern*

To plant a seed, it is first necessary to dig a hole. For environmental movement organizations to emerge, individuals collectively organize around an environmental concern or grievance. Thus, to better understand the shared characteristics of environmental grassroots movement organizations, one must engage the environmental concern literature to examine individual bases for concern. The environmental concern literature consists of two major streams of literature: the identification of sociodemographic variables associated with environmental concern and the social psychological factors underlying environmental concern (Dietz *et al.* 2005; Kempton *et al.* 1995; Gardner and Stern 1996; Dunlap and Van Liere 1984; Dietz *et al.* 1998). My focus is limited to the social psychological factors underlying environmental concern to investigate mental constructions of the relationship between humans and nature.

Environmental concern refers to the degree to which an individual is aware of environmental problems and the individual's level of support for solving environmental problems and personally contributing to solutions (Dunlap and Jones 2002).

Environmental concern is an expression of the "New Ecological Paradigm" (NEP) and a rejection of the "Dominant Social Paradigm," (DSP) that predated the worldviews of environmentalism (Dunlap and Van Liere 1978; Dunlap and Van Liere 1984; Dunlap, Van Liere, Mertig and Jones 2000; Dunlap 2008). The DSP emphasized the social and cultural environment with a view of progress, technology, and an abundance of resources. In contrast, the NEP stressed the biophysical environment with an outlook of ecological limits and scarcity of resources. The New Ecological Paradigm emerged in the 1970s when environmental awareness was steadily increasing. Fundamental

views about the state of the biophysical environment shifted away from an emphasis on human ability to control and manage the environment, limitless natural resources, private property rights, and unlimited industrial growth. The NEP stressed the importance of environmental protection, limited industrial growth, the belief that resources are limited and the fragility of the state of the environment against human destruction (Dunlap and Van Liere 1978).

To conceptualize and measure the new paradigm, Dunlap and Van Liere (1978) designed a survey instrument, the New Ecological Paradigm Scale, that measures three major beliefs: belief in the ecological limits of growth, belief in the importance of maintaining the balance of nature, and rejection of the anthropocentric notion that nature exists primarily for human use (Dunlap 2008). The original Likert scale consisted of twelve NEP items using four statements to tap each of the three beliefs (Dunlap 2008). Dunlap et al. (2000) modify the scale to tap a wider range of facets of an ecological worldview, offer a balanced set of pro- and anti-NEP items, and to avoid outmoded terminology.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The revised scale is a fifteen-item version that uses three items for each of the five facets: the original themes (existence of ecological limits to growth, importance of maintaining the balance of nature, and rejection of the anthropocentric notion that nature exists primarily for human use) and two additional, the degree to which respondents feel modern industrial society is exempt from ecological constraints and the likelihood of eco-crises (Dunlap 2008). Additional revisions by Dunlap *et al.* (2000) include: developing three items for the resulting five facets of the 15 items to produce 8 pro-NEP and 7 anti-NEP items and deleting sexist terms such as “mankind.”

Weakness of the scale is that it ignores attitudes, beliefs, and values. Dunlap *et al.* (2000) address the limited measurement by grounding the NEP in social-psychological theory to argue that the “NEP items [measure] primitive beliefs about the relationship between human beings and their environment” (Dunlap 2008:9). In modifying the scale, Dunlap *et al.* (2000) also revise the terminology of the NEP from “New Ecological Paradigm” to “New Environmental Paradigm.” The New Environmental Paradigm scale has the tools to assess environmental concern, environmental values, environmental attitudes, and environmental beliefs, also referred to as ecological worldview. The NEP has been incorporated into theoretical models predicting environmental attitudes and behavior such as in the value-belief-norm (VBN) model in Stern *et al.* (1995) and Stern *et al.* (1998). Additionally, the NEP has been treated as a measure of environmental attitudes and as a useful measure to clarify the value bases of environmental concern (Shultz and Zelezny 1999; de Groot and Steg 2008).

While environmental attitudes are positive or negative evaluations of specific issues, values are the concepts or beliefs about desirable end states or behaviors that transcend specific situations, guide selection or evaluation of behavior and events, and are ordered by relative importance (Schwartz and Bilsky 1987). An important distinction is between intrinsic and instrumental values (Schwartz and Bilsky 1987; Farber, Costanza, and Wilson 2002). Intrinsic values, also referred to as terminal values, are valued as an end-in-itself. Leopold’s (1949:224) land ethic captures the essence of intrinsic value: “something is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise.”

Instrumental values are fundamentally anthropocentric—valued only for human use. Instrumental values are a means of achieving something else and do not contain value as an end-in-itself (Farber *et al.* 2002). Both intrinsic and instrumental values are found within environmental values, a topic that is explored further in the subsequent section.

### *Why Dig the Holes: Environmental Values*

Values are important to environmentalism because they influence individual and collective decisions. If values change in a pro-environmental direction, then people are more likely to make decisions that are protective of the biophysical environment (Dietz *et al.* 2005). Values influence environmental perceptions that, in turn, influence beliefs of the consequences of environmental change. Thus, people's perceptions of their ability and obligation to reduce threats are positively linked to environmental change (Dietz *et al.* 2005).

Dietz *et al.*'s (2005) concept is linked to Schwartz's (1977) theory of personal normative influences on altruism. Schwartz's (1977) activation proposition suggests that altruistic behavior is influenced by the degree of moral obligation (personal norm) and occurs when the feeling of obligation results in a behavior beneficial to others. Schwartz (1970) proposes that one of the critical factors to activating personal norms is to become aware of the consequences of one's behavior for others (Awareness of Consequences AC). The individuals' moral norms will then result in an ascription of responsibility to the self (AR) that promotes altruistic behavior.

Stern, Dietz, and Kalof (1993) extend Schwartz's (1977) theory of personal normative influences on altruism to environmental attitudes and behavior. Stern *et al.* (1993) suggest that pro-environmental behavior becomes more probable when an

individual is aware of harmful consequences (AC) to others and when that person ascribes responsibility (AR) to herself or himself for changing the offending environmental conditions. When individuals become aware and feel responsible to act, then they feel obligated to make positive changes. The application of the Schwartz norm-activation model of altruism has been further extended to include biocentric and egoistic values/value orientations<sup>2</sup> as bases for environmental concern (Stern and Dietz 1994). Stern and Dietz (1994) hypothesize:

People would commit themselves to action when proenvironmental personal norms were activated by beliefs that an environmental condition has adverse consequences for self and close kin (egoistic value orientation), for other human beings (in the social-altruistic orientation), or for other species or ecological systems (in the biospheric orientation) and by ascription of responsibility to themselves for preventing those consequences (72).

The realm of social-altruistic behavior has been broadened to include a wider range of the application of behavior regardless of the value orientation.

#### *The Yardstick: Theoretical and Empirical Approaches to Measuring Values*

Within the social psychology literature, theoretical as well as empirical approaches are used to measure individual values. The major theoretical and empirical approaches to measuring individual environmental values include: the Rokeach/Schwartz approach, regression, and values-beliefs-norm (VBN) (Dietz *et al.*

---

<sup>2</sup> Value orientations are derived from Schwartz's (1992) four clusters of value types (Stern and Dietz 1994). No clear distinction has been made between the terms "values" and "value orientations." The terms are used interchangeably to describe altruistic, biospheric, and egoistic values/value orientations.

2005). The following paragraphs include a brief description of each type of measurement.

### *Rokeach Value System*

The Rokeach Value System, developed by Rokeach (1973), is a precursor to Schwartz and Bilsky's (1987) Universal Psychological Structure of Human Values, a theoretical and empirical approach to assessing value domains. The questionnaire developed by Schwartz and Bilsky (1987), referred to as the Schwartz Value Survey, consists of 56 survey items that participants are asked to rate on a nine-point scale to indicate the importance of the stated value as a guiding principle in their lives (Dietz *et al.* 2005). Most samples of the Schwartz Survey reveal ten types of values grouped into: power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security (Struch, Schwartz, and Van der Kloot 2002). The ten types of values group into four clusters reflecting two dimensions: self-enhancement versus self-transcendence and conservation versus openness to change (Dietz *et al.* 2005). The competing dimensions reflect self-interest (self-enhancement) versus altruism (self-transcendence), the welfare of others, as well as restriction (conservation) versus readiness for new experiences (openness to change).

The Schwartz Value Survey does not distinguish between the theoretical ideas of humanistic and biospheric altruism. Stern, Dietz, and Guagnano (1995) subsequently supplemented the original items to clarify the two types of altruism, but limited their scale from the 56 survey items from the Schwartz Value Survey to 15 items. Other measurements of values following the Rokeach/Schwartz tradition include: Thompson and Barton (1994), Vaske and Donnelly (1999), and Axelrod

(1994). The Schwartz Value Survey and other measurements following this tradition are highly regarded because of their ability to be used cross nationally.

### *Regressive Equation*

The second method of measuring values extends the Schwartzian norm activation approach by using the regressive equation (Stern *et al.* 1993):

$$M = V_{ego}AC_{ego} + V_{soc}AC_{soc} + V_{bio}AC_{bio}$$

M is the motivation to take action; V<sub>ego</sub> is self-interest as a value; V<sub>soc</sub> represents humanistic altruism; V<sub>bio</sub> represents biospheric altruism. AC<sub>ego</sub> is the individual's awareness of consequences of the course of action for oneself; AC<sub>soc</sub> is the individual's awareness of the consequences of the course of action for others and AC<sub>bio</sub> is the awareness of consequences for other species, ecosystems, or the biosphere. The value orientations are measured indirectly by setting up their coefficients in a regression of behavioral intention on measures of awareness of consequences for valued objects. The motivation to act is the sum of perceived consequences times the values associated with those consequences (Stern *et al.* 1993).

Derived from Schwartz's terminology of awareness of consequences (AC), Stern *et al.* (1993) presume that AC is significant in terms of value orientations (V<sub>ego</sub>, V<sub>soc</sub>, and V<sub>bio</sub>). To determine beliefs that general environmental problems have negative consequences for self, others, and the biosphere, they use three scales of Likert-type items to measure. Thus they assert that people who believe an environmental condition has adverse consequences (AC) for things that they value will be more likely to take action. The regressive equation is limited to a single study by Stern *et al.* (1993). Although the data support the proposition that willingness to pay or

take political action to protect the environment is related to value orientations, future replications of the model are needed for it to be considered an effective means of measuring values.

#### *Values-Beliefs-Norm Theory*

The final approach is the values-beliefs-norm (VBN) theory of altruism constructed by Stern and colleagues from Schwartz's (1977) theory of personal normative influences on altruism, also referred to as moral norm activation (Stern and Black 1986; Van Liere and Dunlap 1978; Guagnano *et al.* 1995). The VBN theory proposes that values indirectly influence decisions about the environment through the process of:

Values → Worldviews → AC → AR → Personal Norms → Behaviors

Values (altruistic, egoistic, or biospheric) influence worldviews (beliefs), which in turn influence the awareness of the consequences (AC) of things that we value (others, self, or the biosphere), which in turn influence our perceptions of our ability to reduce threats to things we value (AR) (Dietz *et al.* 2005). Individuals then take action because of their moral obligations (personal norms) to do so. In the schematic representation, each arrow represents a postulated direct effect resulting in the indirect influence of values on pro-environmental behaviors (Stern *et al.* 1999). The values affecting behavior are derived from three value orientations: altruistic, egoistic, and biospheric (Stern *et al.* 1993; Stern and Dietz 1994; Gardner and Stern 1996; Fransson and Garling 1999; Dietz *et al.* 2005).

### *Value Bases for Environmental Concern*

Dietz and colleagues identify three main value bases for environmental concern from the environmental ethics literature: altruistic, egoistic, and biospheric (Stern *et al.* 1993; Stern and Dietz 1994; Gardner and Stern 1996; Dietz *et al.* 2005). De Groot and Steg's (2007) empirical cross-national study substantiate using the three orientations as an evaluation of environmental concern; in addition. The three value bases of environmental concern are derived from the four value clusters identified in Schwartz (1992): self-enhancement (power, achievement, and some hedonistic value items) versus self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence) and conservation (tradition, conformity, and security) versus openness to change (self-direction and stimulation and some hedonism)<sup>3</sup> (Schwartz 1992). Applying Schwartz's (1977) moral norm activation to environmentalism, Stern *et al.* (1993) presume that altruism is only one of at least three value orientations that may underlie environmental behavior and attitudes. Although value orientations are labeled into the three categories of altruism, egotism, and biospheric, they are not mutually exclusive and individuals may hold several orientations to a certain degree (Stern and Dietz 1994).

---

<sup>3</sup> The self-enhancement dimension reflects egoistic values while self-transcendence represents social altruistic and biospheric values. Conservation reflects a motivation to preserve the status quo and openness to change reflects the degree to which the person is motivated to follow his or her own emotional and intellectual interests (Schwartz 1992).

### *Altruism*

Altruism, the first value orientation, was the first established basis for environmental concern. To reiterate, the Schwartz's (1977) moral norm activation model assumes that individuals experience a sense of obligation (a personal moral norm) from the awareness of their consequences (AC) on interpersonal behavior, which results in ascription of personal responsibility (AR) to change a particular behavior or value in the positive direction. As a result, the moral obligation from the awareness of consequences and the ascription of responsibility produces altruistic behavior.

Heberlein (1972) broadened the application of Schwartz's moral norm activation on environmentalism through his study of the golden rule (altruistic values)/land ethic (biospheric values) debate. His study launched major empirical research on the social psychological bases for environmentalism (Stern and Dietz 1994). Continued research has discovered that altruism is only one of at least three value orientations that underlie environmental attitudes and behavior. Other established value orientations include an egoistic basis and biospheric basis (Stern *et al.* 1993).

### *Egoistic Values*

Egoistic values are derived from the self-enhancement cluster of Schwartz's Value Theory (1992) and reflect personal interests such as power and achievement (de Groot and Steg 2007). Egoistic values, also noted as self-interest from the values-belief-norms theory, counters the social altruistic values in that people act to protect the environment if it affects them personally and will oppose protective measures if the personal or social costs are deemed too high (Stern and Dietz 1994). Therefore, the economic component involved within egoistic value orientations has been ascribed as

the predominate motivation for human behavior (Stern *et al.* 1993). Contrary to the egoistic values are biospheric values, which is a value basis of concern for nonhuman species or the biosphere.

### *Biospheric Values*

Biospheric values differ from the previous two in that it is an orientation for concern that it is based out of a purely ecocentric reason for concern (Gardner and Stern 1996). Initially, biospheric values were included with altruistic values within the self-transcendence cluster of Schwartz's value types (Schwartz 1992). Stern and Dietz (1994) postulate that biospheric values may function analogous to the role of social-altruistic values in the Schwartz model of moral norm-activation in that they constitute a moral imperative for universalism and benevolence. Recent research by de Groot and Steg (2007) has found that biospheric values are distinct from altruistic values. They find that people with strong biospheric orientations base their decisions on the cost and benefits of the ecosystem and the biosphere as a whole; altruism is based on the perceived costs and benefits to other people.

Distinctions have been made amongst the three value orientations and de Groot and Steg (Accepted Article) note that all people hold some type of at least one or more of these values. For example, a person may reduce car use because the financial costs are too high (egoistic), because the pollution from the car endangers people's health (altruistic), or the pollution harms plants and animal species (biospheric) (de Groot and Steg Accepted Article). The three value orientations are not mutually exclusive.

Homocentrism (altruism), egocentrism (egocentric values), and ecocentrism (biocentric

values) are all bases for environmental concern and act in conjunction with each other to motivate pro-environmental behavior.

### *Religion as a Value Basis for Environmental Concern*

In the last decade or so, analysts have identified religion as a value basis for environmental concern (Kempton *et al.* 1995; Gardner and Stern 1996; Feldman and Moseley 2003). Kempton *et al.* (1995) conduct semi-structured interviews in addition to a survey questionnaire to look for value bases in American environmentalism.<sup>4</sup> Forty-six interviews were conducted, but only forty-three of those were transcribed and analyzed. The sample, conducted in New Jersey and Maine, included: 20 laypeople (picked at random), 21 specialists (occupations/interests related to global warming), and 2 pilot interviews to test the question protocol (a married couple in New Jersey). Kempton *et al.* 's (1995) survey sampling includes 142 respondents amongst members of the radical environmental organization Earth First!, members of the mainstream environmental group the Sierra Club, the general public, managers of dry-cleaning businesses, and laid-off sawmill workers from the various U.S. states of Wisconsin, California, and Oregon. The study does not reflect a representative sample of Americans. Kempton *et al.* (1995) purposefully use these target groups to “probe the structure, limits, and invariant bases for U.S. environmentalism” (12).

The study revealed a consistent core set of values among the five surveyed groups (Kempton *et al.* 1995; Gardner and Stern 1996). Strong support for religion as a

---

<sup>4</sup> Measurements of values are typically limited to surveys and questionnaires similar to the NEP scale or Schwartz's Value Survey.

value base is found in the following questions: religious leaders should try to do a better job of getting people to ask, “Is this the way God would have wanted us to treat the planet?” (79%); because God created the natural world, it is wrong to abuse it (78%); and, the creator intended that nature be used by humans, not worshipped by them (35%).

The semi-structured interviews elicit in-depth responses of religious and spiritual values as a basis for environmental concern. By asking open-ended questions, unexpected responses emerged. Individuals who did not claim religious practice used religious concepts to describe nature. From the responses, Kempton *et al.* (1995) identify religion along with anthropocentrism and biocentrism, as a source of American environmental values. In support of religion as a value basis for environmental concern, Curry (2006) finds that the foundational beliefs of religion spark an environmental ethic that leads to intrinsic valuing of nature.

Although several articles have mentioned religion as a basis for environmental concern, it has not been identified as one of the primary bases of environmental values within the composition of environmental values literature (Naess 1984; Naess 1989; Merchant 1992; Whitney 1993; Kellert 1993; Eckberg and Blocker 1989; Stern *et al.* 1993; Stern and Dietz 1994; Gardner and Stern 1996; Dietz, Stern, and Guagnano 1998; Stern *et al.* 1999; Fransson and Garling 1999; Karp 1996; McCarty and Shrum 1994; Dietz *et al.* 2005; Dunlap 2008; Lalonde and Jackson 2002; Cameron and Brown 1998; Schultz and Zelezny 1998, 1999; Garling 1999; Bardi and Schwartz 2003; Corraliza and Bernguer 2000; Nordlund and Garvill 2002; de Groot and Steg 2007, Accepted

Article). The citations represent research on values and value bases for environmental concern in which religion as a value basis is hinted to, but not properly identified.

The concept of religion as a value basis for concern has been inadvertently operationalized in a recent study by Feldman and Moseley (2003). They find that the underlying values of Christian faith-based environmental reform initiatives are based on a new paradigm that emphasizes a theocentric worldview. By surveying twenty leaders of Appalachian faith-based environmental initiatives, they find that these groups seek environmental reform by promoting a transformation of personal values, attitudes, and behavior (Feldman and Moseley 2003). Faith-based initiatives promote the view that the environmental crisis is a moral or spiritual crisis that must be addressed with a spiritual solution, conversion. Once personal values and attitudes have been converted to a theocentric worldview, the desirable end behavior is based from the Biblical concept of environmental stewardship (Feldman and Moseley 2003).

Sociological research on the connection of religion and the environment ignited in response to the Lynn White thesis (1967). White (1967) claims that monotheistic religion such as Judeo-Christianity is both cause of and solution to the environmental crisis. White (1967) attributes the ecological crisis to both Christian dogma and the fundamental interpretation of the creation account in Genesis (Hitzhusen 2007). He claims that fundamental Christians take the creation account in Genesis 1:28 as a mandate for dominion over nature: “And God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion...over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth the earth’” (King James Version).

Original studies by social scientists such as Weigel (1977), Kellert and Berry (1980), Hand and Van Liere (1984), and Eckberg and Blocker (1989) find that church affiliation and biblical belief correlate with low levels of environmental concern, thus confirming White (1967) (Hitzhusen 2007; Sherkat and Ellison 2007). Shaiko (1987) questions the validity of White's (1967) thesis and exposes a flawed metric by identifying that political ideology, not religious beliefs, affects environmental concern. Subsequent studies supporting Shaiko's claim include: Greeley (1993), Guth *et al.* (1993), Eckberg and Blocker (1996), Woodrum and Wolkomir (1997). The studies find that dominion, as a belief, is not reinforced by Christian affiliation and doctrine (Hitzhusen 2007). Cross-national studies find similar conclusions and reject the ideas of dominion from White's (1967) thesis (Hayes and Marangudakis 2001).

Contrary to the dominion belief is stewardship. The stewardship effect cross-references Genesis 2:15: "The Lord God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and take care of it" (King James Version). Hence, stewardship is conceptualized as the idea as humans as guardians, stewards, over God's creation (Fowler 1995). Social scientists such as Shaiko (1987), Kanagy and Willits (1993), Wolkomir *et al.* (1997), and Woodrum and Wolkomir (1997) identify stewardship as an ethic different from the "anti-dominion-mastery-anthropocentrism" view.

Hitzhusen (2007) finds no subsequent studies supporting White's (1967) thesis. Rather, positive links between religious affiliations and environmental concerns have recently been published (Sherkat and Ellison 2007). By analyzing data from the 1993 General Social Survey (GSS), Sherkat and Ellison (2007) find that beliefs in the inerrancy of scripture have a strong positive impact on support for environmental

stewardship. Although a progression of studies has examined the role of religion as a factor for environmental concern, the findings have been marred by ambiguity (Hayes and Marangudakis 2001). Religion has the potential to be an important source of transformation with the capacity to promote substantial environmental change (White 1967).

One of the problems of existing research on religious attitudes and environmental concern is the type of methodology used to measure attitudes, beliefs, and values. The survey approach does not allow for respondents to explain their attitudes, beliefs, or values; rather, items are numerically ranked on a scale. To further explore religious attitudes, beliefs, and values in regards to environmental concern, I conduct semi-structured interviews. My research attempts to provide clarity to the highly complex and contentious issue of the relationship between Judeo-Christianity and nature through a qualitative analysis of a group of Progressive Evangelicals within Protestant Christianity. My study is limited to a small sample from a faith-based organization in Knoxville, Tennessee, and does not solve the ambiguity of previous studies. It does, however, reveal an environmental stewardship ethic that is consistent with most recent literature. The study exemplifies religion as a value basis for environmental concern through LEAF's participants' behaviors of stewardship.

#### *The Gardner's Tools: Analytical Framework*

My study explores the perceptions of the relationship between humans and the environment through the case study of LEAF, an organization that takes a faith-based approach to environmental concern. The research questions for the study were

developed to fill gaps in the social movement and environmental concern literature of Sociology.

The first research question analyzes the similarities of grassroots environmental movements to other kinds of grassroots movements, a missing element in the social movements literature. LEAF's characteristics were compared to the grassroots environmental characteristics: mobilization, activists and leaders, grievances, goals, and tactics. The data sources for the question were interviews, observation, and documents. The interviews asked specific questions about the organization's concerns, goals, and tactics. Observation provided insight on the activists and leaders and mobilization of the group. The documents served as a primary source for the tactics employed by the leaders of LEAF.

Characteristics of grassroots organizations are referenced from the anti-toxics and environmental justice movement literatures. Mobilization is the act of individuals assembling around a particular cause. The individuals mobilizing around the cause who form a group to collectively address the issue are referred to as activists. Leaders will emerge from the activist position to a role of principal organizer, coordinator, or director of organizations. Grievances are the causes or concerns that motivate individuals to organize. The goals of a group will depend on the grievance. Within the literature, two main grievances have been identified, health hazards and unequal distribution of hazardous exposure. The goals have been to reduce threats, eliminate exposure, and distribute hazardous exposure more equally. Tactics are the activities used by members of organizations to secure goals.

The second research question analyzes the influence of religious values on environmental attitudes, a study that has generated ambiguous results in the religious/environmental concern literature. The environmental concern literature only identifies three value bases for environmental concern: altruistic, egoistic, and biospheric. By conducting semi-structured interviews, I generated in-depth responses to learn about a fourth value basis, religion, and the role of religion in influencing pro-environmental attitudes and behavior.

Religion as a value basis is an understudied concept in the environmental concern literature of Sociology. The environmental concern literature suggests altruism, biospheric values, and egoistic values as the three primary value bases for environmental concern. The idea of a fourth orientation, religion or spirituality, has been mentioned, but with relatively low importance.<sup>5</sup> To explore the concept of a religious value orientation, I propose the following research question: how do the religious values of LEAF members influence their environmental attitudes? My conceptions come from the religious/environmental theories in the Sociology literature of environmental concern to analyze the role of religion in influencing pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors. Because the literature makes a distinction between conservative and progressive Evangelicals, the religious composition (denomination, attendance, and beliefs) of LEAF members is also examined.

---

<sup>5</sup> There is not a clear distinction between “religion” and “spirituality” in the literature. Religion is more of an organized belief while spirituality is universal and more of an individual feeling. Since respondents in this research refer to themselves as “Christians,” the term religion will be used.

The primary data source for the second research question was in-depth interviews, developed similar to Kempton *et al.* (1995). Following an interview guideline, I prompted respondents for the term “environmental stewardship.” Environmental stewardship, taking care of the environment because it is God’s creation, suggests religion as a basis for environmental concern. Respondents were asked questions related to religious composition, pro-environmental norms and behaviors, religion as a value basis for environmental concern, and their perceptions of the relationship between humans and the environment.

## Chapter III

### Plowing the Garden: Methods

Chapter III presents the comprehensive strategy of my research, a qualitative approach through a case study of the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship (LEAF). In qualitative research, a case study is “the study of a ‘bounded system’ with the focus being either the case (intrinsic case study) or an issue that is illustrated by the case (instrumental case study)” (Creswell 2007:73; Stake 1995). My research strategy includes both an instrumental and an intrinsic study to address my research questions: 1) how does LEAF compare to Grassroots Environmental Organizations and 2) how do the religious views of LEAF’s members influence their environmental attitudes. The first question requires a study of the case itself, an intrinsic study, while my second question examines a particular issue illustrated by the case, an instrumental study. I chose LEAF as a representative bounded system to be examined because it is a faith-based organization with strong pro-environmental attitudes, elements that satisfies my research interest of the affect of religious values on environmental attitudes.

To address problems with construct validity and reliability, multiple data sources were collected through the process of data triangulation. The convergence of evidence was gathered through participant observations, interviews, and documentation. The design of this case study follows Yin’s (2009) example of a single, embedded descriptive case in which two units, the organization and the individual members, were analyzed through the methods of participant observation, interviews, and documentation to address the following research questions: 1) how does LEAF

compare to Grassroots Environmental Organization characteristics? and 2) how do the religious values of LEAF's members influence their environmental attitudes?

### *Participant Observation*

Participant observation is the process of gathering data through close observation of the daily activities, rituals, interactions, and events of a group of people (Dewalt and Dewalt 2002). Gaining access to a group as an insider allows for a close intimate insight into the functions of the group as well as the behavior of the particular set of individuals that would otherwise be unnoticed (Whyte 1984). The method of participant observation was chosen to analyze and collect data for the case study of LEAF because it allowed a close view that enhanced the quality of the interpretation of data and the quality of data obtained during fieldwork (Dewalt and Dewalt 2002). Participant observation was the first method employed in the case study of LEAF.

I was introduced to LEAF through a campus minister who informed me of LEAF's Creation Care gathering at Central Baptist Church of Bearden on October 24, 2008. I immediately emailed the contact person for the gathering, one of the co-founders of LEAF, and was permitted to attend the meeting. She has since served as the gatekeeper—the person with the power to grant or restrict access to the research settings (Arksey and Knight 1999).

Briefly meeting the gatekeeper for the first time at the gathering, I presented an introductory letter from my Thesis Chair and a copy of my UT identification card for verification. At the meeting, I adopted a participant-as-observer role; that is, I was involved in the meeting but also took detailed notes of my observations (Gold 1969; Zigarmi and Zigarmi 1980). My research was conducted overtly. I immediately

introduced myself and attempted to build relationships with the two leaders of LEAF, three prominent members, and five members in the outer tier.

Following the examples of Chiseri-Strater and Sunstein (2001) as well as Bailey (1996), I took very specific notes during the meeting of key figures, their roles, the mission of the organization, the legislative activity, descriptions of environmental stewardship, and pro-environmental behaviors and actions. Key figures were established from the self-identification by LEAF leaders and core members and their statements of involvement within the organization. A speech given by one of the co-founders revealed LEAF's goals and tactics. Environmental stewardship and pro-environmental behaviors were promoted and explained by the main speaker of the workshop, Dr. Matthew Sleeth, author of *Serve God, Save the Planet*. Environmental actions were observable in that the lunches were intentionally served in recyclable containers and recycle bins were set up for discarding the wastes. At the end of LEAF's organized meeting at Central Church of Bearden, the gatekeeper agreed to a follow up meeting to further discuss my proposition of performing a case study of LEAF.

The benefit of using the method of participant observation is that it revealed the stratification of the group: the leaders, core activists, and outer tiers. The two leaders introduced themselves and the three core members ("LEAFlets"), and explained the

functioning of the outer network.<sup>6</sup> Making these identifications, I was able to recognize key informants for the next stage of analysis, the interviews. The method of participant observation was limited to the sole meeting of the Creation Care gathering that took place on October 24, 2008 because it was the only meeting hosted by the group during my three-month analysis. There was no access to records of previous meetings because minutes have not been kept. I have continued in the role of a moderate participant in that I keep informed of the functioning of the group via action alert emails.

### *Interviews*

Interviews are conversations with a purpose (Berg 2007). Interviewing as a research strategy is a powerful tool to social scientists because: they find out information that cannot be directly observed, uncover and explore meanings that are unavailable in surveys and questionnaires, clarify answers, and help people to articulate their feelings and understandings (Patton 1990; Rubin and Rubin 1995; Brenner et al., 1985; Arksey and Knight 1999). For the intent of this case study, interviews were used to explore in more depth the concept of a religious value basis for environmental concern. Respondents were asked open-ended questions on religious beliefs and environmental concern. By using interviewing as a methodology, deeper information can be gathered on the organization that is unavailable through participant observation and documents.

---

<sup>6</sup> At the meeting, I identified two leaders and three core activists to be interviewed. At the follow up meeting with the gatekeeper, she verified these names and added an additional member who was not present at the meeting.

Following a principle set forth by Rubin and Rubin (1995), the first round of interviewees were chosen for their intricate knowledge and experience within LEAF: two leaders and four core members. The second round of interviews was comprised of 14 individuals operating from the outer tier of the group, determined by the gatekeeper. A total of 20 interviews were conducted; I felt that 20 interviewees could adequately represent LEAF and provide accurate data for the research. The first round of interviews was taken through a purposeful sampling since I selected them as key informants from the participant observation of the Creation Care gathering. The two leaders and three LEAFlets' names that I identified were verified at the follow-up meeting with the gatekeeper; she included an additional name to the core members. The gatekeeper granted access to interviewing after confirming my research agenda with the other leader of the group. The gatekeeper sent an email to the first round of potential interviewees, the other leader and four core members, to request participation for the study.<sup>7</sup> Once participants volunteered, I was forwarded their contact information to set up interview arrangements. After the completion of the first six interviews, the gatekeeper sent a second round of emails to elicit participants from the outer tier of LEAF.<sup>8</sup> Again, the investigator waited until volunteers' contacts were forwarded to schedule the interviews.

The co-founders described that LEAF is not a membership organization and never intended to be, although its functions are similar. LEAF serves as a connection

---

<sup>7</sup> See Appendix B.

<sup>8</sup> See Appendix B.

point in that it alerts individuals who have joined the listserv of updates on legislative work to ban Mountain Top Removal (MTR) coal mining practices. According to the gatekeeper, there are approximately 800 contacts on the listserv. After the first six interviews of the two leaders and four core members were conducted, I needed an additional 14 participants to reach the goal of 20 total interviews. The key informant provided additional contacts by self-selecting emails that she could identify with a name (the vast majority of the email list is unknown). To elicit 20 volunteers, four rounds and a total of 37 emails were sent: 6 emails to leaders and core members of LEAF in the first round, 20 to members of the outer tier in the second round, 7 to members of the outer tier in the third round, and 4 to members of the outer tier in the fourth round.

To address ethical concerns, an informed consent form was provided at the outset of the interviews. For the interview process, I conducted semi-structured interviews by following a four-part interview guideline divided by specific questions about: the organization, individual members, the overlap of religious and environmental concern, and closing comments.<sup>9</sup> Each interview was conducted in person, one-on-one. First the investigator inquired of the characteristics, grievances, and values of LEAF. Then I transitioned to a more personal section that questioned the individuals' religiosity. Next, religious/environmental concern and values were examined. Concluding the interview was a final section encouraging any closing comments that

---

<sup>9</sup> See Appendix E.

the respondent would like to make. Directly following the interview, participants received a biographical data sheet in which they promptly filled out and returned.<sup>10</sup>

### *Analysis of Interview Guideline*

My research examines two questions: 1) how does LEAF compare to the characteristics of grassroots environmental organizations? and 2) how do the religious values of LEAF's members influence their environmental attitudes? To further investigate the research questions, I developed an interview guideline that was implemented in the interviewing process.<sup>11</sup> The guide was formulated from analytical concepts in the grassroots and environmental concern literatures. To analyze the first question, I drew from the grassroots literature to discover five typical characteristics of grassroots environmental organizations: mobilization, activists and leaders, grievances, goals, and tactics.

Questions on the characteristics of LEAF are found in Section I of the four-part interview guideline. The guideline presents at least one question for each of the characteristics identified within grassroots environmental organizations literature. From the first section of the guideline, I.E through I.G explore LEAF's mobilization: what were the motivational factors that caused you to join LEAF, why do you remain a member, and what causes others to join. I.B and I.C explore the activists and leaders: how long have you been active in the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship and is this your first experience as an activist. I.H and I.I investigate grievances: what

---

<sup>10</sup> See Appendix F.

<sup>11</sup> See Appendix E.

motivates you to fight against mountain top removal (MTR) and what is the main concern of the organization. Goals are addressed by I.L and I.O: what are the accomplishments of LEAF against MTR and what are the goals of LEAF. Tactics are examined with I.K: specifically, how has LEAF been active.

Section II of the interview guideline addresses individual religiosity, religious concern, environmental concern, and values. Questions for the second section were formulated from the environmental concern literature of Sociology. Religious composition is addressed in the second part of the interview guideline, II.A through II.C: what church do you attend and how often, how would you describe your religious beliefs, do you refer to yourself as a Christian, and how do you interpret the Bible. II.F through II H explore environmental concern and attitudes: what are some pro-environmental behaviors that you engage in; why do you care about the environment; and out of the following, which best describes your reason for concern about the environment: the welfare of others, personal interest and enjoyment, the right of nonhuman species and the biosphere, or a conviction for environmental stewardship. Two questions, II.E and II.I, contain an overlap between religious values and environmental attitudes: as a Christian do you feel that you have a personal responsibility for taking care of the environment and how would you define “environmental stewardship.”

Section III looks at the macro level of the religious and environmental concern overlap of LEAF to see how a faith-based group functions comparatively to secular environmental organizations. Section IV allows for any final comment or closing

statement from the respondent. The questions from sections III and IV were not directly used in the analysis of the research questions.

### *Data Organization*

Following each interview, the data were transcribed verbatim. The details of the interviews (participant, interview number, date, time, and location) were documented in a participant key to be used during data preparation. When all interviews had been transcribed, the respondents' names were coded by the chronological order of the interview (1-20) and their responses were placed beneath the stated questions from the interview guideline. During the first pattern analysis, the questions from the interview guideline were sorted into two categories pertaining to the research questions: how do the characteristics of LEAF compare to grassroots environment organizations and how do the religious values of LEAF members influence their environmental attitudes. The categorization resulted in 14 questions pertaining to the first research question and 9 to the second research question; nine questions were unused because the responses were not applicable to either question.

In the second pattern analysis, the questions were further broken down. The first research question was broken down into: recruitment, participation, and grievances. The second research question was dissected to examine: respondents' background, religious/environmental concern, and environmental behavior. Next, each response was copied from the original coded document and pasted to the second pattern analysis. Data from participant observation and documentation were added into this document to implement the method of data triangulation.

For the final breakdown of the data, the questions were organized in a similar fashion to the first pattern analysis. Beneath each research question, the items relevant to the questions were copied from the original coded document. The items included: 18 questions from the interview guideline to answer the first research question, 9 to answer the second research question, and 5 unused questions. Four questions that were deemed inapplicable during the first pattern analysis were used to examine the first research question. Two additional documents, labeled RQ1 and RQ2 respectively, were created. In each of these documents, the coded responses were summarized into narrative form beneath each of the stated questions. The narrative summaries to the proposed questions revealed patterns and themes that were used to explore my research questions.

#### *Analysis of Biographical Data*

At the conclusion of the interview, participants were asked to fill out a biographical data sheet. The respondent biographical sheet was comprised of specific variables that may or may not have been mentioned during the interview. The additional form provided an examination of structural variables such as: age, race, residence, occupation, education, number of children, experience with environmental activism, income, and religious and political views.

Each of the tables, one through four, begins with the chronological number of the interview followed by the interviewee's pseudonym. In Table 1, the first six respondents are actively involved and the latter 14 are more loosely involved members. Table 1 shows participants' demographics: all are Caucasian, there are 10 males and 10 females, the majority live in Knox County, and their reported distances from a

mountain top removal location vary from 25-200 miles<sup>12</sup>. An interesting observation is the ages of the participants, which range from 28-81 years. Half of the members are concentrated in the baby boomer age group, the protest generation, born between 1952 and 1964. Additionally, three members are in their sixties, four are in their seventies, one is eighty-one, and two are around their thirties.

Table 2 shows occupation, education, and number of children--oldest and youngest. Twenty percent of the respondents are retired and 10% are homemakers. There are high levels of education: six B.A, nine M.A., and five Ph. D. The average number of children is two. Nine respondents still have children at home; eight have grown children; and three do not have children.

Table 3 displays experience with environmental activism and the amount of total family income. Most everyone has been involved in environmental activism: all but two have donated money to an environmental organization, all have signed an environmental petition, and 13 out of 20 have joined an environmental organization. For the total amount of income (fall last year before taxes), respondents were asked to place a check next to the most appropriate amount. The choices ranged from under \$10,000 to \$110,000 plus. Twenty percent of respondents fell in or beneath 50-60K; fifty percent had incomes of 60-110K; and 30% made over 110K.

---

<sup>12</sup> These were the distances reported by the respondents. In reality, most of the respondents within Knox County were unaware that the closest MTR site is Zeb Mountain, approximately 60 miles from Downtown Knoxville.

Table 4 is a summary of the religious and political views. Respondents were asked to rank their religious and political views on a scale ranging from 1, extremely liberal, 4, moderate, to 7, extremely conservative. The results for the religious and political views are exactly the same: an average of 2.9; a median of 2.5 and a mode of 1. The numbers reflect that the majority of the interviewed respondents are very liberal, religiously and politically. Seventy percent are members of the United Church of Christ (UCC) denomination, a progressive church. Twenty percent are affiliated with Evangelical churches and 10% are members of the Baptist denomination. Voting patterns were analyzed for the 2000 and 2004 elections. Sixty-five percent voted Democrat both elections; twenty percent voted Republican in 2000 and 2004; ten percent had a mixed Republican/Democrat vote for the separate elections; and five percent voted third party.

In Table 5, the data were broken down to analyze core versus non-core members. Within the group of core members, the data reveals: 5 females and 1 male, age ranging from 47-78 years, high levels of education (1 B.A., 4 M.A., and 1 J.D.), 4 with teenagers and 2 with grown children, all are members of the UCC, all voted Democratic, and income ranged from 60K-100+K. The core members' religious views are an average of 2.3 (on a scale ranked from 1, extremely liberal, to 7, extremely conservative) with a median of 2.5 and a mode of 1 and 3. The political views are an average of 2.6 with a median of 2.5 and a mode of 1.

The sample of the non-core members show: 5 females and 9 males, ages ranging from 29-82 years, high levels of education (5 B.A., 5 M.A., and 4 Ph. D.), 3 with preschoolers, 2 with teenagers, 6 with grown kids, and 3 with no kids. Fifty-seven

percent are members of the UCC church, voting party is mixed, and income ranged from 35K to 110+K. The religious views of the non-core members rank an average of 3.2, a median of 2.5, and a mode of 1. Their political views are an average of 3.1 with a median of 3, and a mode of 1 and 4. The data from the non-core members gave a broader perspective of the views in the outer tier of LEAF. There is more diversity within the outer network that influences the religious and political views in a slightly more conservative direction than LEAF's core.

### *Document Research*

The final point of analysis is through textual analysis of documents. Document research is an important supplemental method to complete a triangulation method of data collection. The most significant use of this type of methodology is its ability to confirm and augment evidence from other sources; for example, documents can verify spellings, titles, or names that have been mentioned in an interview, provide other specific details to substantiate information from other sources, and serve as points from which to make inferences (Yin 2009). Documents also referred to as archival records, can be from the following sources: commercial media accounts, actuarial records, official documentary records, and private archives (Berg 2007). The audience and intent of the aforementioned types of publication must be considered for factual references (Yin 2009).

For the purposes of the case study, the documents used for analysis are from three primary sources: a collection of newspaper clippings, LEAF's website, [www.tnleaf.org](http://www.tnleaf.org), and LEAF's educational notebook. Since LEAF has been active on

**Table 1 LEAF Members' Demographics**

| #  | Pseudonym | Core Member <sup>13</sup> | YOB  | Race          | Gender | County    | MTR (miles) |
|----|-----------|---------------------------|------|---------------|--------|-----------|-------------|
| 1  | Thea      | Yes                       | 1954 | Caucasian     | Female | Knox      | 25          |
| 2  | Pat H.    | Yes                       | 1956 | Caucasian     | Female | Knox      | 70          |
| 3  | John      | Yes                       | 1958 | Caucasian     | Male   | Knox      | 75          |
| 4  | Dawn      | Yes                       | 1962 | Caucasian     | Female | Knox      | 65          |
| 5  | Pat C.    | Yes                       | 1945 | Caucasian     | Female | Knox      | 70          |
| 6  | Dale      | Yes                       | 1931 | Caucasian     | Female | Knox      | 200         |
| 7  | Bill      | No                        | 1952 | Caucasian     | Male   | Loudon    | 40          |
| 8  | Doug      | No                        | 1945 | Caucasian     | Male   | Knox      | 90          |
| 9  | Keith     | No                        | 1947 | Caucasian     | Male   | Knox      | 50          |
| 10 | Ann       | No                        | 1936 | Caucasian     | Female | Knox      | 70          |
| 11 | Dave      | No                        | 1937 | Caucasian     | Male   | Knox      | 70          |
| 12 | Gladys    | No                        | 1927 | Caucasian     | Female | Knox      | 50          |
| 13 | Julian    | No                        | 1958 | Caucasian     | Male   | Knox      | 70          |
| 14 | Melissa   | No                        | 1980 | Caucasian     | Female | Jefferson | 90          |
| 15 | Jacob     | No                        | 1978 | Caucasian     | Male   | Jefferson | 90          |
| 16 | Sarah     | No                        | 1964 | Caucasian     | Female | Knox      | 70          |
| 17 | Michael   | No                        | 1961 | Caucasian     | Male   | Knox      | 75          |
| 18 | Todd      | No                        | 1964 | Caucasian     | Male   | Knox      | 60          |
| 19 | Charles   | No                        | 1937 | Euro-American | Male   | Knox      | 60          |
| 20 | Mary      | No                        | 1959 | Caucasian     | Female | Knox      | 60          |

---

<sup>13</sup> Although there are three levels of stratification within LEAF, the leaders will be identified as core members for purposes of anonymity.

**Table 2 LEAF Members' Occupations, Level of Education, and Number of Children**

| #  | Pseudonym | Occupation                 | Education | Children | Oldest | Youngest |
|----|-----------|----------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|----------|
| 1  | Thea      | Homemaker                  | B.A.      | 5        | 26     | 14       |
| 2  | Pat H.    | Freelance Writer           | M.S.      | 2        | 19     | 15       |
| 3  | John      | Minister                   | M.A.      | 2        | 16     | 14       |
| 4  | Dawn      | Attorney                   | J.D.      | 2        | 15     | 13       |
| 5  | Pat C.    | Retired Teacher            | M.A.      | 2        | 34     | 32       |
| 6  | Dale      | Craft Teacher              | M.S.      | 3        | 51     | 47       |
| 7  | Bill      | College Prof               | Ph.D.     | 4        | 31     | 20       |
| 8  | Doug      | Organizer                  | M.A.      | 1        | 37     | 0        |
| 9  | Keith     | Housing Specialist         | B.A.      | 0        | 0      | 0        |
| 10 | Ann       | Retired Speech Pathologist | M.A.      | 3        | 46     | 42       |
| 11 | Dave      | Retired Educator           | Ph.D.     | 3        | 46     | 42       |
| 12 | Gladys    | Retired Admin Asst UTK     | B.A.      | 2        | 48     | 46       |
| 13 | Julian    | Campus Minister            | M.A.      | 3        | 18     | 16       |
| 14 | Melissa   | Homemaker                  | B.A.      | 2        | 3      | 2        |
| 15 | Jacob     | Retreat Director           | M.A.      | 2        | 4      | 2        |
| 16 | Sarah     | College Prof               | Ph. D.    | 0        | 0      | 0        |
| 17 | Michael   | Eng. Manager               | B.S.      | 0        | 0      | 0        |
| 18 | Todd      | College Prof               | MFA       | 2        | 7      | 2        |
| 19 | Charles   | Archaeologist              | Ph.D.     | 2        | 43     | 40       |
| 20 | Mary      | Consultant                 | B.A.      | 1        | 13     | 0        |

**Table 3 LEAF Members' Experiences with Activism and Income**

| #  | Pseudonym | \$ to org? | Petition? | Joined org? | Income  |
|----|-----------|------------|-----------|-------------|---------|
| 1  | Thea      | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 110K +  |
| 2  | Pat       | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 60-75K  |
| 3  | John      | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 75-90K  |
| 4  | Dawn      | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 110K +  |
| 5  | Pat C.    | Yes        | Yes       | No          | 60-75K  |
| 6  | Dale      | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 90-110K |
| 7  | Bill      | Yes        | Yes       | No          | 110K +  |
| 8  | Doug      | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 110K +  |
| 9  | Keith     | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 90-110K |
| 10 | Ann       | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 90-110K |
| 11 | Dave      | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 90-110K |
| 12 | Gladys    | Yes        | Yes       | No          | 35-40K  |
| 13 | Julian    | Yes        | Yes       | No          | 50-60K  |
| 14 | Melissa   | No         | Yes       | No          | 35-40K  |
| 15 | Jacob     | No         | Yes       | No          | 35-40K  |
| 16 | Sarah     | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 110K +  |
| 17 | Michael   | Yes        | Yes       | No          | 110K +  |
| 18 | Todd      | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 75-90K  |
| 19 | Charles   | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 60-75K  |
| 20 | Mary      | Yes        | Yes       | Yes         | 60-75K  |

**Table 4 LEAF Members' Religious & Political Views**

| #  | Pseudonym | Rel. denomination | Rel. views | Pres. vote            | Pol. views |
|----|-----------|-------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 1  | Thea      | UCC               | 1          | Democrat              | 1          |
| 2  | Pat H.    | UCC               | 4          | Democrat              | 3.5        |
| 3  | John      | UCC               | 3          | Democrat              | 3          |
| 4  | Dawn      | UCC               | 3          | Democrat              | 5          |
| 5  | Pat C.    | UCC               | 2          | Democrat              | 2          |
| 6  | Dale      | UCC               | 1          | Democrat              | 1          |
| 7  | Bill      | Evang Free        | 5          | Republican            | 5          |
| 8  | Doug      | UCC               | 1          | Democrat              | 1          |
| 9  | Keith     | UCC               | 2          | Democrat              | 1          |
| 10 | Ann       | UCC               | 3          | Democrat              | 4          |
| 11 | Dave      | UCC               | 2          | Democrat              | 2          |
| 12 | Gladys    | UCC               | 2          | Democrat              | 2          |
| 13 | Julian    | Evang Presb       | 5.5        | Republican            | 4          |
| 14 | Melissa   | Evang Free        | 6          | Republican            | 6          |
| 15 | Jacob     | Evang Free        | 7          | Republican            | 7          |
| 16 | Sarah     | Baptist           | 4          | Mixed                 | 4          |
| 17 | Michael   | Baptist           | 4          | Mixed                 | 4          |
| 18 | Todd      | UCC               | 1          | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party | 2          |
| 19 | Charles   | UCC               | 1          | Democrat              | 1          |
| 20 | Mary      | UCC               | 1          | Democrat              | 1          |

**Table 5 Core Versus Non-Core Members of LEAF**

|                               | Core Members                 | Non-Core Members                      |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Gender                        | 5 Female & 1 Male            | 5 Females & 9 Males                   |
| Age Range                     | 47-78 Years                  | 29-82 Years                           |
| Education                     | 1 B.A., 4 M.A., 1 J.D.       | 5 B.A., 5 M.A., 4 Ph.D                |
| Children                      | 0 with Preschoolers          | 3 with Preschoolers                   |
|                               | 4 with Teenagers             | 2 with Teenagers                      |
|                               | 2 with Grown                 | 6 with Grown                          |
|                               | All have Children            | 3 with No Children                    |
| Income                        | 60-110+K                     | 35-110+K                              |
| Religious Views <sup>14</sup> | Avg 2.3; Med 2.5; Mode 1 & 3 | Avg 3.2; Med 2.5; Mode 1              |
| Religious Denom               | All UCC                      | 57% UCC; 29% Evang; 14% Baptist       |
| Political Views               | Avg 2.6; Med 2.5; Mode 1     | Avg 3.1; Med 3; Mode 1 & 4            |
| Presidential Vote             | All Democrat                 | 50% Dem; 29% Rep; 14% Mixed; 7% Other |

---

<sup>14</sup> The averages, medians, and modes were based from a devised scale to measure respondents' religious and political views: 1, extremely liberal, 4, moderate, and 7, extremely conservative.

the campaign against mountain top removal (MTR) throughout the past year, it has gained growing attention from the media and several newspapers such as *Knoxville's News Sentinel*, the *MetroPulse*, and the *Tennessean* have documented the group. The Historian of the organization has provided a notebook of all of the newspaper clippings in which LEAF has been mentioned; also, there is an archival link on LEAF's website to its media appearances.

The newspaper clippings, LEAF's website, and the educational notebooks have been extensively researched to verify names, dates, and activities that were mentioned in the interviews. The documents also provided detailed information on LEAF's two phases of tactics, education and political. Through LEAF's online archives of the "action alerts," I closely followed the group's campaign against MTR in the 2008 Tennessee legislative session. Current information about the functioning of LEAF has been obtained by joining the listserv available on their website. The archives and the listserv emails are my primary points of analyses for the organization's activity.

The action alerts provide factual detailed agendas and goals of the group's political advocacy and tracks the bill to ban MTR, the Tennessee Scenic Vistas Act, throughout the legislative process. The remaining documents for my investigation were the flyers, packets, and notebook that LEAF has created to distribute within Knoxville's Christian community. These explained LEAF's initial educational goals and tactics. Documentation has not only supplemented my data, but has served as a primary source of analysis for the political aspect of the organization. Since the group operates primarily from an email base, it is only natural for the content of these action alerts to be a significant part of the research.

The method of data triangulation provided a more complete case study than relying on a single method. The use of participant observation, interviews, and documentation as forms of analyses were important to establish credibility within the study. The data gathered from each of the three methods were compared to generate a factual account of LEAF. In addition, each method offered a deeper insight to the organization. Participant observation allowed for the location of the key informants and clarified the nature of the organization; interviewing extracted candid responses of religious values and environmental attitudes as well as explained the characteristics of the organization; documentation provided a detailed factual analysis of the legislative advocacy of the organization. Used in isolation, each one of these types would not uphold; in combination, they provide a wholesome case study of the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship.

## Chapter IV

### LEAF's Origins, Activities, and Organization

The data for this chapter were gathered through document research to address the research question: how does LEAF's characteristics compare to the characteristics of grassroots environmental organizations. Sources included newspaper clippings, LEAF's educational packet, and the action alerts in the archives of LEAF's website, [www.tnleaf.org](http://www.tnleaf.org). The responses from the interviews of the two leaders of the group were used in addition to the document research to present an accurate account of the chronological history of LEAF and an analysis of its organization. This chapter describes LEAF's establishment, reports on the organization's campaign to make

Tennessee the first state to prohibit MTR coal mining, and compares LEAF's characteristics to those of other grassroots movements documented in the literature.

### *The Origin and Activities of LEAF*

The Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship (LEAF) is a nonpartisan organization in Knoxville, Tennessee whose members' faith led them to take action for Tennessee's environment. The acronym 'LEAF' is significant to the organization's core. 'L' stands for Lindquist, in memory of Kathy Lindquist. 'E' stands for Environmental and connotes Creation Care. 'A' refers to Appalachian, the mountains targeted for mountain top removal (MTR) in East Tennessee, West Virginia, and Kentucky. The final letter, 'F', is for Fellowship because LEAF was founded in faith.

The group was established in response to the death of Kathy Lindquist in the fall of 2005. Kathy died from terminal cancer. During the last years of her life, she had been active against mountain top removal and had informed her church, Church of the Savior-United Church of Christ (COS-UCC), of the social, political, and environmental problems surrounding the issue. Her fellow congregants from COS-UCC were also aware of the ideas of Creation Care from Kathy's environmental and spiritual advocacy.

In the following weeks of Kathy's passing, a statement about Creation Care was posted in the church bulletin. One member, Dale, felt especially drawn to the matter. Aware of mining issues from her activism in the sixties, she suggested that the church follow-up on Kathy's work and called for volunteers to take up the mining issue because it "is back and worse than ever!" Following her announcement, two interested individuals approached Dale in the parking lot. She suggested that they meet to discuss

the logistics of collective opposition to mountain top removal (MTR). LEAF was established in October 2005 by Dale, LEAF's "Godmother," and the two current leaders, as an informal, non-membership organization with the goals of educating the Knoxville Christian community on the local issue of MTR and introducing the concept of Creation Care—taking responsibility as a Christian to be a steward of God's creation. The tactic in the first phase of the movement was educational.

#### *Phase 1: Education*

The primary issue that LEAF members addressed was mountain top removal (MTR). MTR, also referred to as "cross-ridge" coal mining, is the process of blowing off the tops of mountains to extract a seam of coal. The process involves five steps ([www.ilovemountains.org](http://www.ilovemountains.org); [www.mountainjusticesummer.org](http://www.mountainjusticesummer.org)). First, forests are cleared out and topsoil is scraped away, often causing floods and landslides. Explosives blast from 800 to 1,000 feet off the mountaintops, damaging home foundations and wells ([www.stopmountaintopremoval.org](http://www.stopmountaintopremoval.org)). "Fly rock," the massive boulders that are dislodged from the blasting, causes danger to the lives and homes of residents in mining communities. Second, huge shovels dig into the soil, and the dirt is either hauled away or pushed into adjacent valleys. Third, draglines dig into rock to expose the coal. Draglines are massive machines—up to 8 million pounds with a base as big as a gymnasium and as tall as a 20-foot story building—that only require few employees ([www.mountainjusticesummer.org](http://www.mountainjusticesummer.org)). Fourth, the coal is scooped out by giant machines. In this step, millions of tons of "overburden," that is the rubble left from the former mountaintops, is dumped into narrow adjacent valleys creating valley fills ([www.stopmountaintopremoval.org](http://www.stopmountaintopremoval.org)). In the final step of the process of MTR, the

land is supposed to be reclaimed, but it is usually left bare. When companies attempt to re-contour the land, invasive non-native species are sown in the attempt to stabilize the slopes ([www.tnleaf.org](http://www.tnleaf.org)). The land will never return to its original state.

The effects of MTR coal mining to the surrounding land and communities are substantial. The biophysical affects of the land include: flooding due to the lack of topsoil, trees, and hydrological pollution resulting from valley spills and the waste released from slurry impoundments ([www.mountainjusticesummer.org](http://www.mountainjusticesummer.org)). Evidence suggests that the community is affected by health problems related to the pollution caused by the contaminated wastes to nearby streams ([www.stopmountaintopremoval.org](http://www.stopmountaintopremoval.org); [www.unitedmountaindefense.org](http://www.unitedmountaindefense.org)). Toxins from coal impoundments also contaminate soil and groundwater. Mountain top removal coal mining also has severe economic consequences for mining communities ([www.appvoices.org](http://www.appvoices.org); [www.tnleaf.org](http://www.tnleaf.org)). Whereas traditional mining towns benefited from the labor created from coal mining, the process of MTR requires only few workers to operate the massive machines used to extract the coal. Fewer workers are actually required, so the coal companies are the principal recipients of the profit.

LEAF members described having a divine calling to address the issue of MTR. The primary tactic during the first phase of the movement, the educational phase, was to distribute materials explaining MTR and Creation Care. Creation Care is taking care of the Earth because of a scriptural mandate to do so. The leaders drew their concepts for Creation Care from the resources of the Evangelical Environmental Network (EEN). An Evangelical Declaration on the Care of Creation is posted on the EEN website, [www.creationcare.org](http://www.creationcare.org), that states why biblical faith is essential to the solution

of our ecological problems. The leaders posted additional resources on LEAF's original website, [www.discoveret.org/tnleaf/](http://www.discoveret.org/tnleaf/), launched in the spring of 2006. On the website, they provided information on MTR and Creation Care, described the activities of LEAF, and included contact information for the group.

For the first two years, LEAF primarily consisted of two leaders with the help of LEAF's "Godmother," and the support of additional congregants of COS-UCC. LEAF's initial focus was distributing educational notebooks, "LEAF packets," in the Knoxville Christian community to address local mountain top removal issues and emphasize Creation Care. The LEAF packets consisted of Creation Care information, facts about MTR, educational materials, information on becoming active, environmental scriptural mandates, DVDs, and information about LEAF. The leaders began recruiting members through church members of their congregation, COS-UCC. Then, they asked fellow congregants to think about potential contacts from other congregations throughout Knoxville.

The tactic was to identify a contact person in a congregation, give them the LEAF packet, and let them reshape it in a way that resounds with their denominational teaching. Then, the packet was to be passed on to a different congregation in the same fashion. By using this tactic, the LEAF packets were spread throughout various congregations in Knoxville through the hands of trusted individuals in a noninvasive manner. Individuals interested in the contents of the packets were encouraged to educate themselves on MTR and environmental stewardship, conserve, spread the word, and pray. In this manner, LEAF originally served as a resource for Creation Care materials to be distributed throughout Knoxville.

## *Phase 2: Lobbying*

In December 2007, LEAF members participated in lobbying policymakers for a ban on MTR mining. The leaders never intended for LEAF to become active politically, but became so involved after discovering that nothing was being done legislatively. The lack of action was unsettling. In this worried state, one of the leaders ran into a long-time colleague who agreed to register as LEAF's pro bono lobbyist in Nashville. At this point, the leader became the Legislative Coordinator with the responsibility of drafting a bill against mountain top removal. Although she had drafted child-welfare legislation, she was not experienced with environmental law. At this juncture, she asked Don Barger, the Regional Director of the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), to help with the technical merits of drafting of the bill. Barger, who had fought against MTR for years, agreed.

The first draft of the Tennessee Scenic Vistas Protection Act was ready within two weeks. Careful considerations were made to ensure that the bill remain bi-partisan. The bill "was not simply an environmental bill--it was a bill about building bridges among communities that had a vested interest in seeing that the mountains were not destroyed." The bill prohibited the Commissioner from issuing or renewing a permit, certification or variance that would allow: surface coal operation, or resulting waste, fill or in-stream treatment within 100 feet of any waters of the state and/or surface coal mining operation to alter or disturb any ridge line that is above 2,000 feet elevation above sea level. Proposing these items, members of LEAF were not taking a stance against all mining, but against the specific type of mining, MTR, that pollutes streams, causes valley fills, and destroys the mountains. The Tennessee Scenic Vistas

Protection Act was aimed to be the first law banning mountain top removal coal mining practices in the nation.

After the legislation was drafted, sponsors were needed to introduce the bill in the 2008 legislative session in Nashville. Republican state Senator Raymond Finney's name kept surfacing as LEAF's leaders inquired of veteran environmentalists about a sponsor for the bill. One of the leaders met with Senator Finney to request his vote on the bill. Instead, he volunteered to sponsor it. Since the leaders intended the bill to be bi-partisan, the next contact was a Democrat in the House. Soon after Finney sponsored the bill, House representative Joe McDonald joined him as co-sponsor.

Preceding the legislative activity of the bill, LEAF's leaders set up a listserv through their current website, [www.tnleaf.org](http://www.tnleaf.org), for individuals to subscribe to receive alerts on the legislative progress. The "action alerts" were weekly emails sent out on either Thursday or Friday from January through April to update the members and inform them of opportunities to act in support of the bill, such as contacting their senators and representatives and voicing opinions through phone calls and letters. Initially, the listserv was comprised of about 50 email addresses, but in a period of 12 months it grew to around 800 addresses. Eight hundred is just the tip of the iceberg because the listserv is not only for individuals, but also a connection point for leaders of various religious and environmental organizations that forward the action alerts to their entire address lists.

In January 2008, the Tennessee Scenic Vistas Protection Act was proposed in the Senate and House to stop mountain top removal coal mining in Tennessee. Three lobbyists worked in the 2008 legislative session: LEAF's Legislative Director, her

voluntary colleague, and a volunteer from the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA). They met with senators and representatives to inform them of the proposed bill and the benefits of sponsoring it. The bill's first committee hearing before the Tennessee Senate's Environment, Conservation, and Tourism Committee was slated for February 6, when the leaders of LEAF would be allowed twenty-five minutes to plead their case. But the vote was delayed for three weeks so that the coal industry would have an opportunity to present their side of the story.

Because of the delay in the Senate, LEAF was simultaneously working toward the vote in the Senate scheduled for February 27<sup>th</sup> and preparing for the House Committee hearing scheduled for April 2<sup>nd</sup>. By the second week of February, three Senators were solidly behind the bill: Finney, Jackson, and Roller. During the third week of February, Dawn secured the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> cosponsors, Williams and Ketron, to complete the full vote needed to move the bill out of the Senate committee. Williams and Ketron solidly supported the bill after the Legislative Director of LEAF explained the importance of a ban against MTR. The Senate committee vote was again delayed to March 5<sup>th</sup>, because the speakers ahead took longer than expected, and the coal industry had been promised time for a presentation.

In the meantime, the coal industry became increasingly active. Their lobbyist, public relations specialist, Chuck Laine of Laine Communications in Oak Ridge, secured support from the Tennessee Chamber of Commerce on behalf of National Coal, the state's largest coal company. LEAF's Legislative Director witnessed the coal industry pressuring senators supportive of the bill with threats of generous donations to their opponents in the next election. National Coal was the most active player in

fighting this legislation. On the day of the intended presentation from the coal industry, Laine was unable to give the full presentation. Instead, he introduced six coal company owners to the Senate Environmental Committee.

The bill gained momentum in the first week of March. Grammy-award winning singer and West Virginian native Kathy Mattea created a public service announcement in support of the bill that was sent to radio stations across Tennessee. LEAF's mission received favorable media attention in the *Tennessean*, *Metro Pulse*, *Knoxville News Sentinel*, and *Chattanooga Times Free Press*.

Because the Attorney General did not think Tennessee was empowered to regulate mining, the Senate vote was again delayed until March 12<sup>th</sup>, then again to March 26<sup>th</sup>. In the House Environment Subcommittee, LEAF leaders were scheduled to give a 15-minute formal presentation of the bill at the March 12<sup>th</sup> hearing of the House committee but her presentation was delayed because of time constraints. During the last two weeks of March, the Attorney General agreed to LEAF's resubmitted bill. LEAF leaders revised the bill to remove the Environmental Impact Statement provision, the root of the Attorney General's concerns. He approved the revisions and stated that Tennessee could regulate mining if state laws did not conflict with federal laws. Governor Bredesen announced support for the bill after a phone call from singer Kathy Mattea. LEAF's Legislative Director presented the bill to the House Environmental Subcommittee on March 26<sup>th</sup>. Although the Senate Environment Committee approved the bill eight to one, it was defeated in the House Environment subcommittee three to six. LEAF members accepted the results, packed up, and returned to Knoxville.

The leaders of LEAF continued their primary educational mission of distributing Creation Care materials and planned for the Creation Care workshop for October 24, 2008, at Central Baptist Church of Bearden. Individuals from extreme-liberal to extreme-conservative churches throughout Knoxville attended the meeting. The gathering featured Dr. Matthew Sleeth, author of *Serve God Save the Planet* as the guest speaker and included other speakers such as: the leaders of LEAF, Knoxville City Councilman, Chris Woodhull, and Knoxville Mayor, Bill Haslam. Excerpts from three films were shown: *Renewal: Stories from America's Religious Environmental Movement*, *A Crime Against Creation*, and *Going Green*. The workshop offered tips on becoming a Creation Care congregation and resources such as handouts, books, and DVDs. The point of the workshop was to educate individuals on Creation Care so that they could take their knowledge and apply it to their own congregations.

On February 4, 2009, LEAF sent out its first action alert for the current year. An additional member was added to the leadership team as the Volunteer Coordinator with the duties of helping volunteers find work to match their talents and availabilities within the organization. The leaders remained in their positions as Church Outreach/Media Director and Legislative Director. LEAF members plan to push for a ban on mountain top removal coal mining through the Tennessee Scenic Vistas Protection Act in the 2009 Legislative Session. Two additional core members of LEAF will join the two lobbyists from last year, the Legislative Director and her fellow colleague, in attempts to contact a larger number of legislators to bill supporters.

### *LEAF as a Grassroots Environmental Movement Organization*

The first research question is: how does LEAF's characteristics compare to those of other grassroots environmental organizations. Concepts presented in the grassroots literature are explored to compare LEAF's organizational characteristics with typical grassroots environmental organizations. Specifically, I will be examining the following: activists and leaders, the role of women, grievances, goals, and tactics.

#### *Activists and Leaders*

Activists are concerned individuals who become members of an organization to collectively address an environmental problem. Leaders emerge from an activist position to a principal organizer, coordinator, or director role of the particular movement organization. Members of grassroots environmental organizations tend to be women, unpaid volunteers, and from the lower/working class, minorities, and people of color.

Within LEAF there are three stratifications of members: the leaders, the core members, and the outer network. Three women founded LEAF to spread Creation Care in the Knoxville Christian Community. Since the establishment of the organization, it has consisted of two unpaid leaders with a surrounding core of two to three other women. The two primary leaders have made the grievances of LEAF the dominant passion in their lives. An outer tier of members is involved in the political phase of the group's activities. Opportunities for members to support the organization include: financial donations, political involvement such as writing letters and contacting important political figures, networking through forwarding action alerts, attending LEAF's meetings and workshops, and encouragement.

Most of the respondents became acquainted with LEAF through their membership of Church of the Savior, United Church of Christ (COS-UCC). Non-members of COS-UCC heard about LEAF through friends, activities sponsored by LEAF, LEAF's distributed 3-ring binder, and presentations given by LEAF in their churches. Nine of the interviewees have been active in LEAF since the establishment of the group in 2006; all nine are members of COS-UCC. Two members have been active since 2007; seven individuals became active with the onset of the legislative action in 2008; and two respondents have joined LEAF within the past six months.

Although many have had experience with activism, LEAF was their first experience with *environmental* activism and provided a venue to operate from a faith basis. Dale, who worked on passing the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMACRA) in the seventies, initiated the formation of the group. One of the leaders of LEAF reports that she has always acted from a "faith basis" even with secular activism, but LEAF has "been very freeing because I'm able to combine both of them; it feels very organic, very whole, very holistic." LEAF attracted individuals such as Doug and Mary who are experienced in activism, and Charlie who is not a "marcher" or a "sign carrier" and describes himself as "shy in that respect."

Compared to the literature on movements, LEAF's activists and leaders are more similar in comparison to those in the national, mainstream environmental groups. The majority of the group is comprised of well-educated, politically liberal, white, and middle to upper class individuals. Unlike the mainstream groups, the core of LEAF consists of unpaid female volunteers who have taken on the grievances of the group as the dominant passion in their lives.

### *The Role of Women*

Women are typically more involved than men in grassroots environmental organizations. The literature explains two reasons for this phenomenon: the motherhood affect and traditional gender roles. The motherhood affect refers to the keen sensitivity of women to environmental hazards because of the dangers to the health of their children and family. The other factor, gender roles, account for a higher participation for women in grassroots organizations because working-class women stay home with their kids and have more time to be active.

LEAF has mainly consisted of two women who mobilized in honor of another woman. The core activists are five women and one man. All six are parents. Four out of the six have teenagers and two of the members' children are grown. The data support the motherhood effect, but not the gender role effect. One core member is a Homemaker and only 10% of the interviewed respondents are Homemakers. Inconsistent with grassroots environmental organizations, the female members of LEAF are highly educated women who are not considered "working-class."

### *Grievances*

Grievances are the concerns that motivate people to organize. The environmental justice literature identifies two primary grievances of grassroots environmental organizations: health concerns from hazardous exposures of noxious facilities and the unequal distribution of hazardous exposures. Mainstream environmental organizations primarily organize around aesthetics and wilderness preservation.

Respondents of LEAF described three main reasons for activism: love of the mountains, the injustices of MTR practices, and a faith-based outlet for expressing environmental concern. Pat C.'s motivation exemplifies all of the three reasons:

I have always loved the mountains. I grew up in the mountains so I have a deep personal love and desire to protect them. I also have a belief, faith-based, that it is our responsibility as Christians and people of the earth to not only help to protect and save the mountains but for ecosystems to thrive and to also help the people who live in those (affected) areas to also be able to thrive from what is there for them.

Dawn's response reflects love for the mountains, "We are mountain people and that is a physical part of us." Pat H. sympathizes with the destruction that the devastation causes to people that live in the mining communities. John highlights the social justice issue by stating, "They (people in affected communities) don't have a strong voice against being affected by the power coal companies and economic industries." Respondents' descriptors of the practice of MTR include: sin, wrong, and greed. Doug exclaimed, "It's an abomination. It's one of the greatest forms of hubris and human idolatry, at least the clearest, that we have." Since members of LEAF view the practices of MTR as a spiritual dilemma, they address the issue from a religious basis. John states:

When the LEAF opportunity came up, it seemed like one of the first times we really had a concrete way to make a difference, both through education and increasing awareness among people of faith because for many years there has been a paramount of apathy if not resistance from some of Christians about how to respond to the environmental crisis.

LEAF provides an opportunity for faith-based individuals concerned about the environment to connect with the larger Christian community in the Knoxville area. Thus, LEAF provides an outlet for people like Sarah: "It's always been hard for me to find an outlet for my concern...aside from throwing money at various organizations."

LEAF members express two main grievances. The underlying issue is to raise awareness of the need for Christians to be responsible for taking care of creation. “Set up on the shoulders” of that (as Pat H. phrases it) is the issue of mountain top removal. MTR is the only political issue of LEAF because that is what they felt called to address. A co-founder of LEAF, states, “We want Christians to wake up! The theme is that Earth is a present from God and we need to take care of that.”

LEAF’s grievances do not fit into the characteristics of grassroots environmental organizations. Although some of the members expressed social justice as a reason for activism, they address the health-related issues of mining as outsiders to the communities--conscious constituents. Conscious constituents are direct supporters who do not benefit directly from the success of a movement (McCarthy and Zald 1977). Like traditional groups, LEAF members were also motivated to preserve the aesthetics of the mountains. Unlike grassroots or traditional environmental organizations, LEAF’s primary grievance is the lack of Christian environmental concern, a unique facet to the environmental movement literature.

### *Goals*

The goals of a grassroots movement organization largely depend on the issue, or grievance, that the group mobilizes around. The redistribution of hazards that is a typical goal of grassroots environmental groups does not apply to LEAF. LEAF is unique in that it has a spiritual grievance with MTR as a manifestation of the spiritual crisis.

Banning mountain top removal through the passing of the Tennessee Scenic Vistas Act is LEAF’s most visible goal, but not the primary goal. LEAF members did

not intend to propose legislation to stop MTR. The political phase occurred after the group's leaders realized that no other organization was making an effort to stop the process. Beneath LEAF's visible goal is the "mission of helping individual Christians and congregations as a whole understand the role they play in taking care of what God has given us and that each of us is a critical part of this" (Pat H.). LEAF founders recruited the faith community because they see MTR as a spiritual issue, and they are aware of the powerful source of change those faith communities can offer by "having a powerful voice in democracy because they have credibility and moral authority" (LEAF's Legislative Director). Since LEAF is a Christian organization, it contains a fundamental Christian philosophy for solving environmental problems and protecting the environment.

In the political phase, the goals of LEAF are similar to the concepts of goals in the literature. Dawn drafted legislation to ban MTR in Tennessee. Like typical grassroots environmental groups, LEAF wants to eradicate the practice of MTR coal mining to eliminate its destruction of adjacent communities. From the beginning, LEAF has remained a source of information for the Creation Care movement with the goal of distributing materials throughout the Knoxville community. Education is central to every social movement because activists want to inform the public of the grievance. Although most grassroots environmental groups do not adopt a political agenda as a tactic, they do push for a reformation of the problem.

### *Tactics*

Tactics are the methods employed by leaders and activists within a group to attempt to reach the goals of the movement organization. Tactics tend to differ between

grassroots environmental groups and mainstream environmental groups in that the former tend to more radical and the latter more conservative. Most grassroots environmental groups carry out several types of action including passing out flyers, circulating petitions, letter writing, lobbying local elected officials, public meetings, educational forums, demonstrating, legal action, and civil disobedience (Freudenberg 1984; Cable, Mix, and Hastings 2002).

For the first two years, LEAF served as an educational resource to teach the local Christian community about Creation Care, humans' responsibility for God's creation, and the local issue of mountain top removal. To increase awareness and educate others, LEAF created extensive packets that included information on the ideas of Creation Care, the facts of MTR, resources for using worship services and studies within churches, and DVDs about MTR and other environmental issues. LEAF handed these notebooks to religious and environmental contacts throughout the local Knoxville area free of charge. LEAF has sponsored workshops, the premier of *Kilowatt Ours* (a film about energy usage), and has spoken at a multitude of events and churches in its three-year lifespan.

Since taking up the legislative agenda, the educational aspect has taken a backseat to the more pressing issue of passing the ban on MTR. In December 2007, LEAF's Legislative Director co-drafted a bill with the Regional Director of Knoxville's National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) and then introduced and lobbied for the bill in the 2008 TN legislative session. The other leader helped with the legislative work, but was busy on the home front as LEAF's Outreach Director. Since the bill did not pass, LEAF is back in Nashville for the 2009 Tennessee legislative session. Like

last session, the action alerts will be sent to update members of the status of the bill and to provide them with opportunities for support.

Unlike most grassroots environmental groups, LEAF has remained conservative in tactics. There have been two phases of activity, the educational and political. Within the educational phase, LEAF has held meetings, distributed packets, and served as a Creation Care resource for the Knoxville Christian community. The first phase of tactics is consistent with the characteristics of grassroots environmental groups. In the second phase, members of LEAF adopted political tactics and became more directly involved. The leaders of the group drafted, introduced, and almost passed the first bill to ban MTR coal mining in Tennessee. Core members and activists in the outer tier contacted representatives and senators through face-to-face visits, phone calls, emails, and letters. LEAF's tactics have been direct results of the particular goal. The first goal, to circulate Creation Care materials, is consistent to tactics of grassroots environmental organizations. The second goal, to push for the ban on MTR, is more typical of mainstream environmental organizations.

*Summary: Grassroots, Hybrid, or New Genus?*

The results of the data analysis of the first research question are interesting in that LEAF functions as both grassroots and mainstream environmental organization, depending on the characteristic. Even more unusual is some instances where LEAF does not function as either/or. In some ways, the characteristics of activists and leaders, the role of women, goals, and tactics are similar to grassroots environmental organizations. Activist and leaders are typically women who work voluntarily. Women active in grassroots environmental organizations tend to be mothers. The goals

of the movement are to both educate the local community of the hazards associated with the issue and attempt to eliminate the exposure to them. The tactics described in the social movement literature is similar to those of LEAF: education, letter writing, public meetings, and lobbying.

In other ways, the characteristics of activists and leaders, the role of women, grievances, goals, and tactics are similar to mainstream, national environmental organizations. Usually, grassroots environmental organizations consist of the working class, people of color, and minority groups and mainstream environmental groups consist of young-well educated, politically liberal individuals. In this respect, LEAF members are more similar to the characteristics of mainstream environmental groups: highly educated, mostly Caucasian, upper middle class, and politically liberal.

The demographic factors that separate LEAF members from their grassroots environmental organization counterparts reveal an interesting phenomenon. Most LEAF members live approximately 60 miles from affected mining communities. Their primary grievance is the responsibility for Christians to care for the environment. In the opinions of the leaders, Christian care for the Earth is needed to stop destructive practices such as MTR that destroys surrounding landscapes and communities.

Although LEAF's faith-based grievances and goals are unlike mainstream environmental organizations, their tactics are similar. A co-founder of LEAF, along with the Regional Director of the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) co-drafted the first bill in the nation to ban mountain top removal. Typically, grassroots environmental action is direct and radical. Drafting legislation is reticent behavior, comparable to mainstream environmental organizations.

To a certain degree, LEAF acts as a hybrid organization between the characteristics of grassroots and mainstream environmental organizations. Labeling LEAF as a hybrid group would be oversimplifying their grievances and their goals. Unlike either grassroots or traditional environmental organizations, LEAF's grievances and goals are faith-based and Biblically grounded. For the sake of the gardening metaphor throughout the thesis, LEAF will be referred to as a new genus to the species of movement organizations. The discovery of a new movement organization genus within sociological literature will be further discussed in Chapter VI.

## Chapter V

### The Influence of Religious Values on LEAF Members' Perceptions of the Relationship between Humans and Nature

The second research question addresses the influence of LEAF members' religious values on their environmental attitudes. The question is analyzed through the concepts established by the environmental concern literature in Sociology. Scholars have identified three value bases for environmental concern: altruistic, biospheric, and egoistic. A fourth basis has been identified, spirituality, but is less commonly referred to as a reason for environment concern.

The research question implies that LEAF members care about the environment because of a religious orientation and investigates the religious composition of movement members, members' pro-environmental norms and behaviors, members' value bases for environmental concern, and members' perceptions of the relationship between humans and the environment. The value literature indicates that as values change, so do decisions and behavior. If environmental values are upheld through a scripturally based perspective, the attitudes, decisions, and behaviors of Christians should change in a positive direction that reflects environmental stewardship.<sup>15</sup>

#### *Religious Composition of Movement Members*

Previous studies concerning religion and the environment have found ambiguous relationships between religiosity and pro-environmental sentiments.

---

<sup>15</sup> Within the text, the term environmental stewardship has been limited to the scriptural Christian mandate to care for the environment.

Fundamental Christians, Evangelicals who interpret the as Bible literal and inerrant, have been blamed for the environmental crisis. Past findings have shown that individuals who interpret the Bible literally and go to church regularly have negative environmental attitudes. Most recent studies have found positive relationships between Christians and the environment and have related them to the concept of environmental stewardship, caring about the environment because it is God's creation. The religious composition of the members was explored in the interviewing process through the following questions: what church do you attend and how often, how would you describe your religious beliefs, do you refer to yourself as a Christian, and how do you interpret the Bible.

Fourteen out of the twenty interviewed participants attend Knoxville's Church of the Savior-United Church of Christ (COS-UCC). Other represented churches include: Fellowship Evangelical Free Church, Cedar Springs Presbyterian Church, and Smithwood Baptist Church. Nineteen respondents reported attending church weekly; four out of the nineteen participate more than once a week. The data suggest that the respondents are devout followers of their faith.

Answers describing the respondents' religious beliefs varied from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. According to the respondents' rankings of their religious views on the biographical data sheet, most of the views are liberal. In the interview, a couple of people labeled themselves somewhere near the middle of the spectrum: "probably a little more liberal on some things than a lot of Christians, but maybe a little more conservative on some things than others" (Pat H.), and "everybody at my church thinks that I am a liberal and all of the liberals that I'm around think that

I'm a fundamentalist" (Sarah). Pat H. and Sarah's open-ended responses were consistent with the rankings of their religious views. Both women labeled themselves as a 4, moderate, on the scale from 1, extremely liberal, to 7, extremely conservative.

Despite where the individuals viewed themselves along the range of conservative versus liberal religious views, they are all sincere about their religious beliefs. It is an intricate part of their identity that guides their actions, beliefs, and values. Mary describes her religious beliefs as "deep and very personal and very meaningful to me. They feed my heart and soul." The descriptions of the respondents' religious beliefs produce sentiments of passion, depth, and sincerity.

Inquiring of the label, "Christianity," was important to accurately present respondents' beliefs. I did not want to infer in my research that everyone is a "Christian." Most of the interviewees referred to themselves as Christians, but there were a couple of respondents that said it depended on the context and the interpretation of "Christian."

Explaining personal interpretations of the Bible was difficult for respondents. It required deep thought and reflection of their faith—the deepest part of them. Literal interpretations of the Bible are generally referred to as a conservative Evangelical or Fundamentalist approach to Christianity. The study found that the six members involved in more conservative churches than COS-UCC interpret the Scripture literally.

The other, Progressive respondents see the scripture as "inspired." To them, "faith is informed through scripture but also through other sources of knowledge and experience in the world today" (John). Many look to the Biblical scriptures as metaphors in which basic moral concepts, ways of behaving, and relationships to God

are described. Descriptors for the Bible included: a book of records of the spiritual journey of people, the telling of sacred history of people over centuries, a book of beliefs, a book of metaphors, a useful document, and a wonderful and inspired book. Descriptors for what the Bible is not included: a book of science, a book of history, or the only scripture. All fourteen of the respondents from COS-UCC do not interpret the Bible literally.

The overwhelming majority of the respondents (14) are Progressive Evangelicals from the United Church of Christ-Church of the Savior who do not interpret the Bible literally, but are devout followers of their faith. The outliers of the study were the six LEAF members from moderate to conservative churches. These six Conservative Evangelicals believe the Bible to be the literal word of God. Religious composition distinguished between conservative and progressive Evangelicals through personal beliefs and interpretations of the Bible. Whether conservative or progressive, the data revealed that religious beliefs are an intricate part of LEAF members' identity that guide their actions, beliefs, and values.

#### *Pro-environmental Norms*

The NEP scale is a survey measurement of primitive beliefs. The survey style research performed with the NEP scale does not permit respondents to explain their motives for environmental concern. Because of the limitation of the survey process, semi-structured interviews were used to generate detailed descriptions of LEAF members' reasons for environmental concern.

To measure religious norms (moral obligations), respondents were asked, "As a Christian, do you feel a personal responsibility to take care of the environment?"

Everyone answered the question with an emphatic, “Yes,” “Absolutely,” or “Definitely!” Pat H. expressed that she has “always felt those moments of epiphany and those moments of deep spirituality in nature.” Mary feels responsible to take care of the environment “as a person who believes to care as scripture tells us to do.” Respondents’ explanations for their pro-environmental norms indicate a moral obligation from a faith value basis.

#### *Pro-environmental Behaviors*

Actions are putting certain beliefs or values into practice. Examining pro-environmental behaviors assesses individuals’ claims of caring about the environment. Interviewees reported recycling, reducing and conserving energy, consolidating trips, composting, engaging in advocacy groups, and shopping local and buying organic products. These items exemplify “pro-environmental behavior” because they help to leave as “small of a footprint as possible” on the Earth. Aside from the mentioned activities, there were some unique answers. Twenty-five percent of the respondents reported owning a hybrid fuel-efficient vehicle. Dale, Dave, and Jacob mention an emphasis on the education of environmental issues and their resolutions. Another interesting response was spending time in nature. According to John, being outdoors allows one to see the interconnectedness of humans to nature. From the responses generated, these people of faith who claim to take care of the environment, are attempting to be good stewards of the Earth. Pro-environmental behaviors are weaved into their lifestyles because they feel a responsibility to protect God’s creation.

### *Members' Value Bases for Environmental Concern*

The literature refers to altruistic, egoistic, and biospheric values as the three primary value bases for environmental concern. Two questions in the interview guideline assessed the notion for a fourth value orientation. First, I asked respondents why they cared for the environment. Second, they were asked to choose from the following: which best describes your reason for environmental concern: the welfare of others, personal interest and enjoyment, the rights of nonhuman species and the biosphere, or a conviction for environmental stewardship?

Responses to the first question reported environmental concern for altruistic reasons: “it is highly attached to other people” (Melissa); biospheric reasons: “there’s an intrinsic value in nature that goes beyond how we use it or how we directly experience it” (Todd); and egoistic reasons: “because I live here” (Sarah) and “it is a matter of survival” (Charlie).

A fourth religious basis was revealed through the following responses. Bill describes, “Being a Bible believing conservative evangelical Christian does call one to be a steward of creation.” Julian has a similar view, “I care about the environment because of what I believe from the Bible,” as does Jacob, “the Lord commands us to take care of His creation.” Michael describes his reasons, “As I became a stronger Christian, I understand that being a steward of God’s creation is an important part of who we are.”

The second question was asked in such a way that respondents chose from the definitions of the value orientations: altruistic (the welfare of others), egoistic (personal interest and enjoyment), biospheric (the rights of nonhuman species and the biosphere),

and spiritualistic (environmental stewardship). Six respondents answered with all of the above; nine reported caring solely because of a conviction for environmental stewardship; three responded with a combination of conviction for environmental stewardship and the welfare of others; and two reported a combination of conviction for environmental stewardship and personal interest and enjoyment. Those who care about the environment because of a conviction of environmental stewardship referred to it as “the most inclusive and encompassing all of the above.”

Value bases are complex. Pat H. explains that her value orientations are so intricately connected to religious values that they are impossible to decipher amongst. From both questions, environmental stewardship was offered as a reason for environmental concern. Following these questions, I asked respondents to define or describe environmental stewardship to explore their perceptions of the relationship between humans and the environment.

#### *Members’ Religious-based Perceptions of the Relationship between Humans and the Environment*

LEAF members’ perceptions about the relationship between humans and the environment are developed by their religious beliefs. The responses suggest an additional value orientation that comes from faith or the spiritual self that is represented through environmental stewardship. The basic definition of environmental stewardship is taking personal responsibility for the care of the Earth because it is God’s creation. Many of the questions in the interview prompt for “environmental stewardship” or elicit responses that include ideas of environmental stewardship. For this reason, it is

important to ask the interviewees their definitions of “environmental stewardship” to conceptualize their paradigm of the term.

The responses were rich in metaphor and allusions to Biblical scripture. Dawn told a metaphorical story to explain her idea of environmental stewardship:

If someone baked me a cake, I would treat it with reverence, share it, and respect it. This doesn't mean that we don't touch it. The earth belongs to God and we have a responsibility to be careful about how we treat it. In a sense, environmental stewardship means gratitude.

Christians' roles of environmental stewardship are to find the proper way to take responsibility to care for the Earth, God's gift, by leaving as little of an impact as possible and to live in a sustainable manner to pass down God's beautiful creation to future generations.

Environmental stewardship includes people, animals, the biosphere, and the whole cosmos because “it all feeds and nourishes each other” (Ann). Thea describes, “Environmental stewardship has as much to do with ecological justice and human justice. Taking care of the land is sort of foundational to everything else and the way we view people as well. It is not an isolated issue; it is really a complete care.”

The respondents referred to the second chapter of Genesis as the Christian mandate for environmental stewardship. In Genesis 2:15, God commands humans to care and tend for the Garden, God's creation. From this scripture, Christians feel called to take care of the Earth and to exhibit environmental stewardship in reverence of the gift that God has given. Every answer for this particular question is grounded in theological terminology. Respondents' environmental attitudes and constructs of concern for the environment are deeply rooted in their religious values through both the

Hebrew scripture and their experiences in God's creation. In their theocentric paradigm, LEAF members must revere the natural world, God's handiwork, with awe and respect; to destroy the natural environment is avarice and sinful.

### *Summary*

Through the analysis of the second research question, I have found that the overwhelming majority of LEAF members are liberal, but devout Christians who do not interpret the Bible literally. Interestingly, the six conservative outliers that interpret the Bible literally claimed environmental stewardship as their reason for environmental concern. Pro-environmental norms grounded in Christian ethics spurred environmental stewardship and respondents reported numerous pro-environmental behaviors. Based on the responses from the interviews, LEAF members care about the environment because of a religious value basis that encompasses altruistic, egoistic, and biospheric value orientations. Biblical scripture and religious experiences form LEAF members' religious-based perceptions of the relationship between humans in nature. They perceive that Christians are to care for the Earth because it is God's creation.

## Chapter VI

### Results, Caveats, and Conclusions

#### *Results*

The data analyses of the two research questions found interesting results through the case study of LEAF. The first analysis revealed the unique organization of LEAF—it functions beyond a hybrid organization in that it exhibits characteristics outside of grassroots and mainstream environmental organizations. The second analysis reveals the influence of religious values on LEAF members' environmental attitudes. Their faith paradigms, grounded in Biblical scripture, shape their environmental attitudes and their perceptions of humans' relationship to the environment.

In the analysis of the second research question, I label LEAF as a new genus to the social movement literature because its characteristics are unique. The characteristics of LEAF are reflective of both grassroots and traditional environmental groups, but LEAF does not fit into either category and is more than a hybrid of the two. Characteristics of LEAF's organization have yet to be explained in the social movements literature.

LEAF is a faith-based environmental organization that is spiritual and must be explained through scripturally based terminology. Taking from the six characteristics of grassroots environmental organization (mobilization, activists and leaders, goals, grievances, and tactics), I describe the LEAF with innovative terminology. The leaders and activists of LEAF are missionaries who mobilize because of a divine calling from God to educate the local Christian community about Creation Care. Mountain top

removal is a manifestation of sin's affect on the environment. The spiritual grievance of LEAF is sin, the cause of the destruction of the environment. To alleviate sin, the goal of the group is ecological conversion or a personal transformation that promotes a theocentric paradigm for viewing environmental problems. In this theocentric paradigm, converted individuals act as good Christian environmental stewards of God's creation. LEAF's tactic seeks to spread the environmental emphases within the Hebrew Gospel for Creation Care. To reiterate, activists and leaders are missionaries who mobilize because of a divine calling, their grievance is sin, their goal is ecological conversion or personal transformation, and the tactic is the spreading of the environmental message within the Gospel.

Unlike typical grassroots environmental organizations, LEAF members are not immediately threatened by the destruction caused by mountain top removal. LEAF takes the broader grievance of environmental concern and puts it into the context of spiritual values. As conscious constituents, the members of LEAF will not benefit directly from the eradication of the practice. LEAF members adopt the grievance as a broader, spiritual grievance and address the issue with religious values. Thus, religion is a value basis for environmental concern that results in the pro-environmental behavior of LEAF members.

My study supports Feldman and Moseley's (2003) discovery of a theocentric paradigm for addressing environmental problems. The discovery of a new paradigm explains religion as a value basis for environmental concern. Below I operationalize religious values and a theocentric paradigm using Stern and colleagues' values-beliefs-norm (VBN) theory:

Religious Values→Theocentric Paradigm→AC→AR→Norm→Behavior

In this example, the religious values encompass the altruistic, egoistic, and biospheric value orientations. Religious values influence theocentric paradigms. The theocentric worldview influences awareness of consequences (AC), which is the degradation of God's creation from sin. AC influences our ability to reduce threats (AR), resolving the sin issue by spreading the gospel. AR influences personal norms, the Biblical mandate of Creation Care. Norms then influence individuals to act as stewards of God's creation. Thus, my study broadens the realm of Stern and colleagues' VBN theory to include religion as a value basis for environmental concern.

#### *Caveats*

The qualitative case study of LEAF found significant insights for the social movement and environmental concern literatures, but the research has areas for improvement. I used three methods to gather data: participant observation, interviews, and document research. My research began with the method of participant observation and was limited to one meeting. At the meeting, I identified the key informants and became familiar with the function of the group. To use participant observation, the investigator needs to be involved in more than one meeting to observe close interactions of the members of the group.

For the second method, I conducted semi-structured interviews that followed a four-part interview guideline. The interviews were limited to 20 out of 800 LEAF members that were self-selected from the gatekeeper. Six out of those 20 members are core activists and fourteen operate from the outer tier. The additional fourteen

interviews do not serve as a representative sample, but they offer insight of the group's diversity.

Opposed to survey style research, the interviews let respondents speak, but certain questions may have made them compliant and persuaded their thinking. For example, respondents were asked to choose among the following reasons for environmental concern: the welfare of others, personal interest and enjoyment, the rights of nonhuman species and the biosphere, or a conviction for environmental stewardship. Another similar question was, "As a Christian, do you have a personal responsibility to take care of the environment." The respondents obviously answered with positive responses and gave reasons reflective of environmental stewardship. Instead of using the terminology, I should have hinted at environmental stewardship and Christian reasons for concern to let the interviewee candidly speak for him or herself.

Respondents filled out a biographical data sheet immediately after the interview. Upon completion of the study, I found two voids in these questions. I failed to develop a scale for inquiring how much time respondents spent in nature. Because the answers were so varied, I omitted the question in the analysis. Another question asked respondents to identify their presidential vote in the 2000 and 2004 elections. Since 2008 was an election year, it should have been included as well.

There were no problems with the document research. The combination of the three chosen methods gave a holistic account of the organization. The single occurrence of participant observation allowed for me to identify the key informants of LEAF. The interviews provided deeper insights about the characteristics of the group

and the religious values of group members. The document research was the primary source for the political phase of the movement.

Perhaps the biggest caveat was overcoming my personal biases and paradigms. Inadvertently, I made the assumption that all LEAF members operated from an environmental stewardship ethic. I failed to make the distinction between dominion and environmental stewardship. Another assumption was that the notion of environmental stewardship is limited to Christianity. I did not consider other religions such as Buddhism, Taoism, Hinduism, or Islam as apart of the religious basis for environmental concern. Even further, I assumed that nonreligious individuals such as atheists do not exemplify environmental stewardship. In future research, world religions and atheism need to be considered in addition to Christianity.

#### *Future Research*

Both the findings and caveats provide insights for future research. To expand the social movements literature, role of members as conscience constituents need to be further examined in other faith-based organizations. Conscience constituents are mentioned in McCarthy and Zald (1977), but my study is an application of the theory. It would be interesting to see if members of other faith-based groups operate in the same manner.

Within environmental concern literature, a distinction needs to be verified between ‘values’ and ‘value orientations’ and religion should be further explored as a value basis for environmental concern. There is need of a distinction between ‘religion’ and ‘spirituality’ and the difference between the religious approach of ‘dominion’ and ‘environmental stewardship.’ The literature on religious/environmental

concern needs to be clarified by future research on these topics. To reiterate, future studies of religious values and environmental concern should include non-protestant religions and atheism for a holistic examination.

### *Policy*

The results of the inclusion of a faith-based group, LEAF, on the issue of mountain top removal have resulted in the heightened awareness of the issue and the drafting of the first bill in the nation to ban MTR. The bill was almost passed in the 2008 Tennessee legislation. Evangelicals are a sector of society with massive political power to promote tremendous environmental change in public policy. Evangelicals comprise only a small fragment of the world's religious population. Examining the broader picture, the transformation of religious adherents to environmental constituents could resolve many of the Earth's environmental problems. It is important for the world's religions to find common ground because the environmental crisis is a global issue that must be addressed by both local and global policy.

### *Conclusions*

LEAF has created a venue for Christians to treat the environment with reverence and respect the Earth, God's creation. Adopting a faith-based approach, the mental constructions of the relationship between humans and the environment are changed in two ways: Christians view themselves as caretakers of the environment and Christians see the destroyed relationship between humans and the earth. The destroyed relationship is a faith issue that calls for a personal transformation to a theocentric paradigm to protect God's creation.

The theocentric paradigm for environmental concern is generated from the creation account in Genesis 2:15, “And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the Garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it” (King James Version). The scripture offers a stewardship approach contra the dominion account in Genesis 1:28:

And God blessed them, and God said unto them, be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth (King James Version).

The influence of domination shapes a paradigm consistent with exploitation, abundant living, and unlimited resources. The influence of stewardship emphasizes caring for the Earth because it is God’s creation. The concept of environmental stewardship shapes a paradigm much like the ancients’.

The ancients’ were Pagans and Pantheists that found gods and spirits in the wilderness. They treated their natural surroundings with a worshipful attitude because they believed that spirits were present in the biophysical environment. Paganism and Pantheism influenced the mental constructs of humans’ perceptions of the relationship between humans and the environment. Humans realized their interconnectedness and the religious value of protecting the environment. The Christian attitudes that spread in the Roman civilization shifted the views of humans’ place in nature from interconnectedness to superiority. The new paradigm was one of dominance and emphasized anthropocentric attitudes.

In addition to religion, the onset of agriculture contributed to shifting paradigms. Agriculture allowed for the establishment of civilization and occupational diversity. Metallurgy, writing, and the development of scientific principles were

products of job specialization. As society moved away from food procurement, new philosophies emerged. Aristotle taught the hierarchical schema of humans to the rest of the biophysical environment. The teachings of humans' superiority over the natural surroundings changed humans' treatment of the biophysical environment from reverence to domination.

The mental constructions of humans' perceptions of the relationship between humans and the environment have changed over time. The hunter-gathering societies of the ancients depended on nature for their survival and were deeply rooted to a belief of the interconnectedness of humans and the environment. As humans learned the art of agriculture, a sense of authority developed. That is, humans were no longer dependent on foraging the natural surroundings for subsistence. Humans have moved away from directly depending on nature for their survival. The influences on humans' mental constructions of human/environmental relationships have largely depended on the worldview, or paradigm, of the individual. Religions are influential of paradigms. If religions adopt environmental concern as a priority, then people of faith will be more protective of their biophysical environment and the constructed relationship between humans and the environment will more closely resemble the environmental sentiments of the ancients.

## List of References

- Almeida, Paul and Linda Brewster Stearns. 1998. "Political Opportunities and Local Grassroots Environmental Movements: The Case of Minamata." *Social Problems* 45(1): 37-60.
- Arksey, Hilary and Peter Knight. 1999. *Interviewing for Social Scientists*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Axelrod, L.J. 1994. "Balancing Personal Needs with Environmental Preservation: Identifying the Values that Guide Decisions in Ecological Dilemmas." *Journal of Social Issues* 50:85-104.
- Bailey, C.A. 1996. *A Guide to Field Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Bardi, A. and S.H. Schwartz. 2003. "Values and Behavior: Strength and Structure of Relations." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 29:1207-1220.
- Beck, Eckardt C. 1979. *The Love Canal Tragedy*. EPA Journal.
- Berg, Bruce L. 2007. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berry, R.J. 2006. *Environmental Stewardship*. New York: T & T Clark.
- Biel, Anders and Andreas Nilsson. 2005. "Religious Values and Environmental Concern: Harmony and Detachment." *Social Science Quarterly* 86(1): 178-190.
- Brenner, M., J. Brown, and D.V. Canter. 1985. *The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches*. London: Academic Press.
- Brulle, Robert J. 2001. "Environmental Discourse and Social Movement Organizations: A Historical and Rhetorical Perspective on the Development of U.S.

- Environmental Organizations.” Pp. 217-235 in *The Environment and Society Reader*, edited by R. Scott Frey. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bullard, Robert D. 1993. *Confronting Environmental Racism: Voices from the Grassroots*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Bullard, Robert D. 2000. *Dumping In Dixie*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Cable, Sherry and Charles Cable. 1995. *Environmental Problems Grassroots Solutions: The Politics of Grassroots Environmental Conflict*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Cable, Sherry, Tamara Mix, and Donald Hastings. 2005. “Mission Impossible? Environmental Justice Activists’ Collaborations with Professional Environmentalists and with Academics.” Pp. 55-76 in *Power, Justice, and the Environment: A Critical Appraisal of the Environmental Justice Movement*, edited by David N. Pellow and Robert J. Brulle.
- Camerer C., and E. Fehr. 2005. “Measuring Social Norms and Preferences Using Experimental Games: A Guide For Social Scientists.” Pp. 55-95 in *Foundations of Human Sociality: Economic Experiments and Ethnographic Evidence from Fifteen Small-Scale Studies*, edited by J. Henrich, R. Boyd, S. Bowles, C. Camerer, E. Fehr, and H. Gintis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, L.D., Brown, P.M. and J. G. Chapman. 1998. “Social Value Orientations and Decisions to Take Proenvironmental Action.” *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 28: 675-697.
- Carson, Rachel. 1962. *Silent Spring*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Chadwick, Robert. 2005. *First Civilizations*. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd.

- Chiseri-Strater, E., and Sunstein, B.S. 2001. *Fieldworking: Reading and Writing Research 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.* New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Corraliza, J.A. and J. Berenguer. 2000. "Environmental Values, Beliefs, and Actions: A Situational Approach." *Environment and Behavior* 32:832-848.
- Creswell, John. 2007. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curry, Patrick. 2006. *Ecological Ethics*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- De Groot, J.M. and L. Steg. 2007. "Value Orientations and Environmental Beliefs in Five Countries." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 38(3): 318-332.
- De Groot, J.M. and L. Steg. Accepted Article. "Promoting Environmental Behavior." *Conservation Letters*
- DeWitt, Calvin B. 1997. "A Contemporary Evangelical Perspective." Pp. 79-104 in *The Greening of Faith*, edited by John E. Carroll, Paul Brockelman, and Mary Westfall. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Dietz, Thomas, Paul C. Stern, and Gregory A. Guagnano. 1998. "Social Structural and Social Psychological Bases of Environmental Concern." *Environment and Behavior* 30:450-471.
- Dietz, Thomas, Amy Fitzgerald, and Rachael Shwom. 2005. "Environmental Values." *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 30:335-372.
- Dunlap, Riley E. 2008. "The New Environmental Paradigm Scale: From Marginality to Worldwide Use." *Journal of Environmental Education* 40(1): 3-18.

- Dunlap, Riley E. and Kent D. Van Liere. 1978. "A Proposed Measuring Instrument and Preliminary Results: The 'New Environmental Paradigm.'" *Journal of Environmental Education* 9:10-19.
- Dunlap, Riley E. and Kent D. Van Liere. 1984. "Commitment to the Dominant Social Paradigm and Concern for Environmental Quality." *Social Science Quarterly* 65:1013-1028.
- Dunlap, Riley E. and Angela Mertig. 1992. *American Environmentalism*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Dunlap, Riley E., Kent D. Van Liere, Angela G. Mertig, and Robert Emmet Jones. 2000. "Measuring Endorsement of the New Ecological Paradigm: A Revised NEP Scale." *Journal of Social Issues* 56:425-442.
- Dunlap, Riley E. and Robert E. Jones. 2002. "Environmental Attitudes and Values." Pp. 365-369 in *Encyclopedia of Psychological Assessment Volume 2*, edited by R.F. Ballesteros and D. Bartram. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dunlap, Riley E. and Robert E. Jones. 2002a. "Environmental Concern: Conceptual and Measurement Issues." Pp. 483-524 in *Handbook of Environmental Sociology*, edited by Riley Dunlap and William Michelson. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Eckberg, Douglas Lee and T. Jean Blocker. 1989. "Varieties of Religious Involvement and Environmental Concerns: Testing the Lynn White Thesis." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28(4): 509-517.

- Eckberg, Douglas Lee and T. Jean Blocker. 1996. "Christianity, Environmentalism and the Theoretical Problem of Fundamentalism." Pp. 156-169 in *The Earthscan Reader in Environmental Values*. London: Earthscan.
- Edelstein, Michael R. 1988. *Contaminated Communities: The Social and Psychological Impacts of Residential Toxic Exposure*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Farber, Stephen C., Robert Costanza, and Matthew A. Wilson. 2002. "Economic and Ecological Concepts for Valuing Ecosystem Services." Pp. 18-40 in *The Earthscan Reader in Environmental Values*, edited by Linda Kalof and Terre Satterfield. Sterling, VA: Earthscan.
- Feldman, David and Lyndsay Moseley. 2003. "Faith-Based Environmental Initiatives in Appalachia: Connecting Faith, Environmental Concern and Reform." *Worldviews* 7(3): 227-252.
- Fowler, Robert Booth. 1995. *The Greening of Protestant Thought*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Fransson Niklas and Tommy Garling. 1999. "Environmental Concern: Conceptual Definitions, Measurement Methods, and Research Findings." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 19: 369-382.
- Freudenberg, Nicholas. 1984. *Not in Our Backyards!* New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Freudenberg, Nicholas and Carol Steinsapir. 1992. "Not in Our Backyards: The Grassroots Environmental Movement." Pp. 27-37 in *American Environmentalism*, edited by Riley E. Dunlap and Angela Mertig. New York: Taylor and Francis.

- Gardner, Gary. 2002. "Invoking the Spirit: Religion and Spirituality In The Quest For A Sustainable World." *Worldwatch Institute*. Washington, D.C.: Worldwatch Institute.
- Gardner, Gerald T. and Paul C. Stern. 1996. *Environmental Problems and Human Behavior*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Garling, T. 1999. "Value Priorities, Social Value Orientations and Cooperation in Social Dilemmas." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 38:397-408.
- Gold, Raymond L. 1969. "Roles in Sociological Field Observations." Pp. 30-39 in *Issues in Participant Observation: A Text and Reader*, edited by George J. McCall and Jerry Laird Simmons. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Gottlieb, Robert. 1993. *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement*. Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- Gottlieb, Roger S. 2006. *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Ecology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gottlieb, Roger S. 2006a. *A Greener Faith: Religious Environmentalism and Our Planet's Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Greeley, Andrew. 1993. "Religion and Attitudes toward the Environment." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 32: 19-28.
- Guagnano, G.A., P.C. Stern, and T. Dietz. 1995. "Influences on Attitude-Behavior Relationships: A Natural Experiment with Curbside Recycling." *Environmental Behavior* 27: 699-718.

- Guth, James L., John C. Green, Lyman A. Kellstedt, and Corwin E. Smidt. 1995. "Faith and the Environment: Religious Beliefs and Attitudes on Environmental Policy." *American Journal of Political Science* 39(2):364-382.
- Harper Bibles. 2008. *The Green Bible*. San Francisco, CA: Harper Collins Publishing.
- Hayes, Bernadette C. and Manussos Marangudakis. 2001. "Religion and Attitudes towards Nature in Britain." *British Journal of Sociology* 52(1): 139-155.
- Heberlein, Thomas A. 1972. "The Land Ethic Realized: Some Social Psychological Explanations for Changing Environmental Attitudes." *Journal of Social Issues* 28(4): 64-78.
- Hitzhusen, Gregory. 2007. "Judeo-Christian Theology and the Environment: Moving Beyond Scepticism to New Sources for Environmental Education in the United States." *Environmental Education Research* 13(1): 55-74.
- Hughes, J. Donald. 1993. *Pan's Travail*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Inglehart, R. 1971. "The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Post-Industrial Societies." *American Political Science Review* 65:991-1017.
- Inglehart, R. 1977. *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Kanagy, Conrad L. and Fern K. Willits. 1993. "A 'Greening' of Religion? Some Evidence from a Pennsylvania Sample." *Social Science Quarterly* 74(3): 674-683.
- Karp, D.G. 1996. "Values and Their Effects on Pro-environmental Behavior." *Environment and Behavior* 28:111-133.

- Kellert, Stephen R. and Edward O. Wilson. 1993. *The Biophilia Hypothesis*.  
Washington, D.C.: Shearwater Books.
- Kempton, Willet, James S. Boster, and Jennifer A. Hartley. 1995. *Environmental Values in American Culture*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Lalonde and Jackson. 2002. "The New Environmental Paradigm Scale: Has it Outlived its Usefulness?" *Journal of Environmental Education* 33(4): 28-36.
- Layzer, Judith A. 2002. *The Environmental Case: Translating Values into Policy*.  
Washington D.C.: CQ Press.
- Lee, R.M. 1993. *Doing Research on Sensitive Topics*. London: Sage Publications.
- Leopold, Aldo. 1949. *A Sand County Almanac*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levine, Murray. 1982. *Love Canal*. Albany, NY: University of New York Press.
- Lorentzen, Amy. 2007. "Obama Links Faith to Environmentalism." *The Associated Press*, April 15.
- Lummus, Allan Craig. 1991. "Quilt or Quilts: Do the National Environmental Organizations Speak for the Grassroots Environmental Organizations?" M.A. thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Maloney, Michael P., Michael P. Ward, and G. Nicholas Braucht. 1975. "Psychology in Action: A Revised Scale for the Measurement of Ecological Attitudes and Knowledge." *American Psychologist* 30:787-790.
- McCarty, J.A. and L.J. Shrum. 1994. "The Recycling of Solid Wastes: Personal Values, Value Orientations, and Attitudes about Recycling as Antecedents of Recycling Behavior." *Journal of Business Research* 30:53-62.

- McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *The American Journal of Sociology* 82(6): 1212-1241.
- Merchant, Carolyn. 1992. *Radical Ecology: The Search for a Livable World*. New York: Routledge.
- Mertig, Angela G., Riley E. Dunlap, and Denton E. Morrison. "The Environmental Movement in the United States." Pp. 450-481 in *Handbook of Environmental Sociology*, edited by Riley E. Dunlap and William Michelson. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Naess, Arne. 1984. "A Defense of the Deep Ecology Movement." *Environmental Ethics* 6(3): 265-270.
- Naess, A. 1989. *Ecology, Community, and Lifestyle: An Outline of an Ecosophy*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Nordlund, A.M. and J. Garvill. 2002. "Value Structures Behind Proenvironmental Behavior." *Environment and Behavior* 34:740-756.
- Patton, M.Q. 1990. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life. 2004. "Religion and the Environment: Polls Show Strong Backing for Environmental Protection Across Religious Groups." <[http: www.pewforum.org](http://www.pewforum.org)>.
- Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life. 2008. "Views about Environmental Protection." <[http: www.pewforum.org](http://www.pewforum.org)>.

- Piven F. and R. Cloward. 1979. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Vintage.
- Ponting, Clive. 1992. *A Green History of the World*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Preus, Anthony. 1975. *Science and Philosophy in Aristotle's Biological Works*.  
Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Rubin, H.J. and I.S. Rubin. 1995. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*.  
London: Sage Publications.
- Satterfield, T. 2001. "In Search of Value Literacy: Suggestions for the Elicitation of Environmental Values." *Environmental Values* 10(3): 331-359.
- Schultz, Wesley P. and Lynnette Zelezny. 1998. "Values and Pro-environmental Behavior: A Five-Country Survey." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 29(4): 540-558.
- Schultz, Wesley P. and Lynnette Zelezny. 1999. "Values as Predictors of Environmental Attitudes: Evidence for Consistency Across 14 Countries." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 19(3): 255-265.
- Schwartz, S.H. 1970. "Moral Decision Making and Behavior." Pp. 128-142 in *Altruism and Helping Behavior*, edited by J. Macaulay and L. Berkowitz. New York: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S.H. 1977. "Normative Influences on Altruism." Pp. 221-279 in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 10., edited by L. Berkowitz. New York: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S.H. 1992. "Universals in the Content and Structures of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries." Pp. 1-65 in *Advances in*

- Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol 25., edited by M. Zanna. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S.H. and W. Bilsky. 1987. "Toward a Universal Psychological Structure of Human Values." *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology* 53:550-562.
- Shaiko, R.G. 1987. "Religion, Politics, and Environmental Concern: A Powerful Mix of Passions." *Social Science Quarterly* 68: 244-62.
- Sierra Club. 2008. *Faith in Action*. <<http://www.sierraclub.org/partnerships/faith>>.
- Stake, R. 1995. *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stern, PC, T. Dietz and J.S. Black. 1986. "Support for Environmental Protection: the Role of Moral Norms." *Population Environment* 8:204-22.
- Stern, PC and T. Dietz. 1994. "The Value Basis of Environmental Concern." *Journal of Social Issues* 50:65-84.
- Stern, PC, Dietz T., and Linda Kalof. 1993. "Value Orientations, Gender and Environmental Concern." *Environmental Behavior* 25:322-48.
- Stern, PC, Dietz T., Kalof L., and G. Guagnano. 1995. "Values, Beliefs and Proenvironmental Action: Attitude Formation toward Emergent Attitude Objects." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 25:1611-1636.
- Stern, P.C., T. Dietz, T. Able, G.A. Guagnano, and L. Kalof. 1999. "A Value-Belief-Norm Theory of Support for Social Movements: The Case of Environmentalism." *Human Ecology Review* 6:81-95.
- Struch N., S.H. Schwartz, and W.A. Van der Kloot. 2002. "Meanings of Basic Values for Women and Men: a Cross-Cultural Analysis." *Social Psychology Bulletin* 28(1): 16-28.

- Taylor, Dorceta E. 1993. "Environmentalism and the Politics of Inclusion." Pp. 53-61 in *Confronting Environmental Racism: Voices from the Grassroots*, edited by Robert D. Bullard. Boston: South End Press.
- Thompson, S.C. and M.A. Barton. 1994. "Ecocentric and Anthropocentric Attitudes Toward the Environment." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 14(2): 149-157.
- Van Liere, K.D. and R.E. Dunlap. 1978. "Moral Norms and Environmental Behavior: An Application of Schwartz's Norm-Activation Model to Yard Burning." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 8: 174-88.
- Vaske, J.J. and M. Donnelly. 1999. "A Value-Attitude-Behavior Model Predicting Wildland Preservation Voting Intentions. *Sociology of Natural Resources* 12:523-37.
- Weigel, Russell and Joan Weigel. 1978. "Environmental Concern: The Development of a Measure." *Environment and Behavior* 10:3-15.
- Weisdorf, Jacob L. 2003. "Stone Age Economics: The Origins of Agriculture and the Emergence of Non-Food Specialists." Discussion Paper Institute of Economics, University of Copenhagen.
- White, Lynn Jr. 1967. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis." *Science* 155: 1203-1207.
- Whitney, Elspeth. 1993. "Lynn White, Ecotheology, and History." *Environmental Ethics* 15(15): 1-69.
- Whyte, William Foot. 1984. *Learning From the Field: A Guide From Experience*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

- Woodrum, E. and T. Hoban. 1994. "Theology and Religiosity Effects on Environmentalism." *Review of Religious Research* 35:195-206.
- Yin, Robert K. 1994. "Discover the Future of the Case Study Method in Evaluation Research." *Evaluation Practice* 15: 283-290.
- Yin, Robert K. 2009. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 4th Edition. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Zigarmi, D., and Zigarmi, P. 1980. "The Psychological Stresses of Ethnographic Research." *Education and Urban Society* 12(3): 291-322.

## Appendices

*Appendix A*

IRB Form B

**FORM B**

**IRB #** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date Received in Office of Research** \_\_\_\_\_

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Application for Review of Research Involving Human Subjects

**IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECT**

**1. Principal Investigator**

Lyndsay Dawson  
College of Arts & Sciences  
Department of Sociology  
901 McClung Tower  
University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, TN 37996  
(423) 620-2147  
ldawson3@utk.edu

**Faculty Advisor**

Dr. Sherry Cable  
College of Arts & Sciences  
Department of Sociology  
901 McClung Tower  
University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, TN 37996  
(865) 974-7031  
scable@utk.edu

**Department:** Sociology

**2. Project Classification:** Thesis

**3. Title of Project:** Case Study of the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship (LEAF)

**4. Starting Date:** Upon IRB Approval

**5. Estimated Completion Date:** April 1, 2009

**6. External Funding:** N/A

1. **Grant/Contract Submission Deadline:** N/A

2. **Funding Agency:** N/A

3. **Sponsor ID Number (if known):** N/A

4. **UTK Proposal Number (if known):** N/A

## **II. PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The objective of this study is two-fold: to examine the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship (LEAF), a local Christian environmental activist group to Knoxville, Tennessee, as a social movement of Christian evangelicals and to analyze the grievances therein via the overlapping of the environmental and religious concern literature. Information will be gathered through a case study of LEAF by using the triangular methodological approach of semi-structured interviews, ethnographic research, and textual analysis. The results of this project will help to explain the emergence and motives of Christian evangelical groups within the Environmental Movement. This research will be conducted for a master's thesis.

## **III. DESCRIPTION AND SOURCE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS**

### **Study Participants**

The core members of LEAF who are adults over 18 years of age.

### **Investigator Access to Participants**

The Investigator will contact potential participants directly through a snow-ball participant recruitment method. The first potential interview is a key informant who is a spokesperson for the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship. Whether she chooses to be interviewed, she will be asked if she is willing to provide the names and contact details of one to three other adult individuals who are active in the organization. Another access method will be through the networks of close friends and acquaintances and their relationships with members of LEAF. As LEAF is a small group, I estimate between six to ten total interviews.

### **Participant selection**

This case study relies on qualitative data obtained from members of the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship. It uses, face-to-face, semi-structured interviews to gather details on the ideology and successes of the group within the Environmental Movement. Respondents will be asked about their religious views regarding environmental concern and behavior. Information describing respondents' socio-demographic characteristics is also obtained. Potential participants will be selected on those who express a willingness to be interviewed and whether they are active members of LEAF.

## **IV. METHODS AND PROCEDURES**

When a potential respondent indicates a willingness to be interviewed or an interest in the project, the investigator will provide a description of the study, a copy of an informed consent form, and ask if he/she is willing to be interviewed. If he/she is compliable, then an interview will be scheduled at a time and place convenient for the interviewee. A written description of the study and an informed consent form will be provided again to each interviewee at the beginning of each interview meeting. Interviews will only be conducted upon consent of the interviewee. Each respondent will be informed that he/she has the right to cease the interview at any desired time and/or withdraw from the study. Only the principal investigator will conduct interviews.

Interviews will follow the interview scheduled located within the appendices. The primary focus of the investigator is to analyze which social movement works best to explain the emergence and activism of this particular group within the environmental movement. The interviews will focus on the second research agenda, which is identifying how grievances are an expression of environmental concern.

The length of the interview will vary, but it is expected that none will last more than one hour. The data will be collected using a digital audio device.

All electronic or printed information will be kept confidential and securely stored. Any transcription or audio recording will be stored under lock and key at the investigator's house. Audio recordings of interviews will be transcribed into electronic files by the investigator onto a password-protected personal computer. Case numbers/and or pseudonyms will be used to indicate interview transcripts, audio recordings and other written references to participants. Only the principal investigator will be capable of matching the interview case numbers and pseudonyms to participants names and personal information using a password protection identification key. Any participant to withdraw from the study will have any documented information completely erased.

## **V. SPECIFIC RISKS AND PROTECTION MEASURES**

### **Risk**

There are no foreseeable risks to participants interviewed for this study. The interviewer is not allowed to elicit any information that jeopardizes the physical or mental well-being or legal status of the participants, the University of Tennessee, or the principle investigator.

Personal information of participants as well as interview data will be kept completely confidential. Disclosure of responses outside the research would not place participants at risk of criminal or civil liability, or damage participants' financial standing, employability, or reputation. Only the principal investigator will have access to participants' personal identifying information. Interviewees will not be personally identified in interview transcripts and publications. The investigator seeks to minimize any potential psychological or emotional stress through the voluntary participation of respondents as well as the measures of confidentiality taken to ensure protection of personal information and responses.

## **VI. BENEFITS**

This particular case study is beneficial for the sociological knowledge of the emergence of Christian evangelical activist groups who have previously been inactive within the Environmental Movement. Not only is this anomaly interesting, but also the shared grievance of the group, environmental stewardship, connects the phenomenon to the overlap of environmental and religious concern literature. Identifying stewardship, as a value of environmental and religious concern, will include new emerging Evangelical Christian groups into the movement itself. The research uses the analytical tools of Resource Mobilization and New Social Movement Theories to examine the group as a movement, and then links the New Social Movement Theories of grievances directly into religiosity. This approach provides insights into how a particular case study of one Christian evangelical group qualifies as a social movement and also, contrary to popular belief, is active in the environmental movement through a shared grievance.

The outcome of this research is a published thesis written as requirements for the master's degree in Sociology. The final product contributes to the understanding of the intersection of religious and environmental concern that has become an increasingly popular topic. A summary of the results will be available to all participants and the complete thesis will be available for the University of Tennessee library.

## **VII. METHODS FOR OBTAINING "INFORMED CONSENT" FROM PARTICIPANTS**

An informed consent form will be provided when a potential participant indicates interest in the project or agrees to be interviewed. If a respondent agrees to participate, then an interview will be scheduled. Another copy of the consent form will be provided at the onset of the interview and reviewed by the participant before commencement. The consent form describes the role of the participant in the study, measures taken to prevent harm, and contact information for the principal investigator. Next, the purpose of the study and steps taken to maintain privacy of respondents' personal information and responses will be explained. Preceding the interview, the investigator will answer any question from the participant. After both parties are content and there are no other questions, the investigator will ask the respondent to sign the consent form, followed by a witness signature by the investigator. An additional copy of the informed consent form will be given to the participant to keep for his/her personal records. The interview will begin after reminding the participants of their rights to decline to answer any questions, stopping the interview, and withdrawing from the study at any time. Interviews will be conducted only after obtaining the consent from participants. Upon completion of the project, the signed consent forms will be stored for three years in a locked storage cabinet in 919 McClung Tower.

## **VIII. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE INVESTIGATOR(S) TO CONDUCT RESEARCH**

Lyndsay Dawson is a master's student in the Department of Sociology at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Her research interest focuses primarily on environmental sociology. She has been trained in social science research methods during her studies as a graduate student. Outside of the methods training received from the program, she has researched numerous qualitative approaches to be used within the study.

The principal investigator is conducting this research under the guidance and supervision of Dr. Sherry Cable, who has twenty-one years of research experience and publishes extensively on environmental issues. She has directed several large qualitative and dissertation projects that employ interview methods to obtain research data. She also trains students in qualitative research techniques and supervises them in ethnographic data collection and analysis.

## **IX. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT TO BE USED IN THE RESEARCH**

Interviews will be recorded using a digital audio-voice recorder and then transcribed onto the investigator's personal, password-protected computer. Text-based data will be transcribed into Microsoft Word. Two devices will be used exclusively for storing the data: the investigator's personal computer and an external hard drive for a back up file. The printed copies of the coded interviews and case numbers, pseudonyms, transcripts, code sheets, and analyses will be stored in a locking filing cabinet at the principal investigator's home office. The list for matching specific respondents with interview numbers will be stored here as well.

### **Equipment**

- 1 locking file cabinet
- 1 digital audio-voice recorder
- 1 computer and external hard drive

**X. RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PRINCIPAL/CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S)**

By compliance with the policies established by the Institutional Review Board of The University of Tennessee, the principal investigator subscribes to the principles stated in the "The Belmont Report" and the standards of professional ethics in all research, development, and related activities involving human participants under the auspices of The University of Tennessee. The principal investigator further agree that:

- A. Approval will be obtained from the Institutional Review Board prior to instituting any change in this research project.
- B. Development of any unexpected risks will immediately be reported the Research Compliance Services section.
- C. An annual review and progress report (Form R) will be completed and submitted when requested by the Institutional Review Board.
- D. Signed informed consent documents will be kept for the duration of the project and for at least three years thereafter at a location approved by the Institutional Review Board.

**XI. SIGNATURES**

Principal Investigator: Lyndsay H. Dawson

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Advisor: Sherry Cable

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**XII. DEPARTMENT REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

The IRB departmental review committee has reviewed and approved the application described above. The DRC recommends that this application be reviewed as:

[ ] Expedited Review – Category(s): \_\_\_\_\_

OR

[ ] Full IRB Review

Chair, DRC \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Department Head \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Protocol sent to Research Compliance Services for final approval on (Date)

\_\_\_\_\_

Approved:  
Research Compliance Services  
Office of Research  
404 Andy Holt Tower

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix B

### Participant Recruitment Procedure

#### STEPS

1. **Identify Key Informants / Potential Participants**
2. **Send Study Information Sheet** and copy of *Informed Consent Form* to Key Informant / Potential Participant / Respondent
3. **Record Respondents personal information** (e.g. name, contact details) in Participant Key
4. **Schedule interview** date, time, and location with confirmed Respondent
5. **Confirm interview** with Respondent **24 hours prior** to scheduled appointment
6. **Conduct interview** with Respondent

#### The Gatekeeper's Recruitment Email to Leaders and Core Members of LEAF :

A young woman named Lyndsay Dawson, a U.T. grad student in Sociology, attended LEAF's Creation Care Gathering as a representative of Clear Springs Baptist Church. Immediately after the Gathering, she petitioned her department to be allowed to write her M.A. thesis on faith-based environmentalism, using LEAF as her case study. The department has given her the greenlight.

I met with Lyndsay yesterday and she is delightful --- bright, easy to talk to, and genuinely enthusiastic about the topic. I've agreed to be interviewed for her research and I'm hoping the five of you will as well. Because it is a sociological study, you will be referred to by pseudonym in the thesis, so you needn't worry about privacy issues. Lyndsay would like to interview a half dozen subjects. She would need one to two hours of your time, preferably sometime between Thanksgiving and New Year's.

May I send Lyndsay your contact information? Don't feel obligated, but if you're willing to participate, please let me know as soon as possible; Lyndsay needs to get started immediately in order to finish her thesis before her wedding next April, at which time she and her new husband plan to spend the following six months hiking the entire Pacific trail. Oh to be young again!

### **The Gatekeeper's Recruitment Email to LEAF Members in the Outer Tier:**

LEAF has become the focus of a Master's thesis currently underway by a U.T. grad student, Lyndsay Dawson. Lyndsay is in the sociology department and is collecting data on faith and environmental activism. She has asked for permission to contact a dozen LEAF supporters for her research. All subjects will be identified by pseudonym, rather than name, to ensure privacy.

LEAF does not share our e-mail list with anyone, no matter how good the "cause." But I did agree to contact a handful of LEAF supporters to see if they'd be willing to be included in Lyndsay's study. Please don't feel pressured to participate. If you'd rather not, then don't respond to this e-mail and that will be the end of it. If you don't mind answering a few questions, then e-mail me back and let me know that you're o.k. with my giving Lyndsay your e-mail address. She's a delightful young lady and not at all pushy, so you don't have to worry about being pestered or put on the spot.

Think about it and let me ASAP --- Lyndsay's deadlines are pretty tight.

## *Appendix C*

### Study Information Sheet

Dear Study Participant,

My name is Lyndsay Dawson and I am a M.A. candidate at the University of Tennessee. As part of my degree requirements, I am interviewing members of the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship in order to learn more about the organization. With the emerging popularity of the interaction of religion and the environment, I am interested in recording the motivations, ambitions, and successes behind one particular group, LEAF.

I invite you to participate in this study and help me to complete my thesis research. This is an opportunity for members of LEAF to express why they are apart of the organization and their effects on the campaign against mountain top removal.

All information that you provide will be kept confidential. No reference that could link you to the study will be made in verbal or written reports. A pseudonym or number will replace your name. Our conversation will be digitally voice-recorded; you do not need to say anything that you do not want recorded. Various measures also protect your personal information. Written, audio, and electronic files are stored in locked file cabinets or password-protected. There is no known risk from participating in this study.

Most important to this study are your personal responses to the questions. Specialized knowledge or strong opinions are not required for this study. During our conversation, I will be asking specific questions about environmental values in order to gauge how members of LEAF operate individually as well as holistically.

One benefit of this research is that it gives LEAF a voice through its various members. The outcome of the research can help to clarify the misconception of the relationships that Christians have with the environment. Your contribution to the study will help to show the importance of Christian activism on environmental issues.

Please contact me at ldawson3@utk.edu or on my personal cell (423-620-2147) to schedule an interview or if you have any questions. If you would like to speak with my colleague, Dr. Sherry Cable at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I will gladly put you in touch with her.

Thank you for the willingness to consider this request. I hope that you will take this opportunity to further develop the understanding of the intersection of religion and the environment. I look forward to hearing from you.

## Appendix D

### Informed Consent Form

It is my understanding that by agreeing to participate in the *Case Study of the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship*, my rights, welfare, and privacy will be maintained in the following ways:

- ☐ I have had the details of the research project explained to me by the project investigator.
- ☐ I understand the procedures to be used in this study and have been made aware of any possible risk involved.
- ☐ All responses that I give to questions will be confidential and made accessible only to the project investigator and faculty advisor.
- ☐ Upon publication, I will be referred to only by a research pseudonym assigned by the project investigator.
- ☐ In signing this consent form, I have not waived any of my legal rights nor have I released this institution/agency from liability for negligence.

I have been informed of this information in the following forms by the project investigator or an approved representative:

(a) written form \_\_\_\_\_ [Respondent's initials] AND/OR

(b) verbal form \_\_\_\_\_ [Respondent's initials]

By signing this form I acknowledge that all of my questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

If I have further questions or concerns about this study, I may contact the project investigator, Lyndsay Dawson, by email (ldawson3@utk.edu) or by phone (423-620-2147). I may also contact the faculty advisor of this research, Dr. Sherry Cable, at (865) 974-6021 (University of Tennessee office).

I freely and voluntarily agree to participate in this research.

---

Signature of Volunteer

---

Date

---

Signature of Witness

---

Date

## *Appendix E*

### Interview Schedule

#### **OPENING**

Thank you for your participation in this study including your willingness to be interviewed. [INFORMANT] thought you would be a good contact to better understand the functions of LEAF as a Christian Evangelical activist group in the Environmental Movement.

I will be asking you questions about your individual role in LEAF, the organization in itself, personal religious and environmental concern, behaviors, and values, as well as the collective values and beliefs of the organization. I'm interested in what you think about these things. Please share the first thing that comes to your mind, whatever it may be. If a question is unclear, you are more than welcome to ask me to repeat and briefly explain the question.

Our conversation should take about an hour. I will be taking notes, but will be unable to document the entire interview by hand. Would you be opposed to the use of a digital audio device to record our conversations?

[**Transition:** Okay, let's start by talking about your role in LEAF]

#### **BODY**

##### **I. LEAF**

I. A            To begin with, can you give a brief summary of LEAF?

##### **Individual's Role in LEAF**

I.B            How long have you been active in the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship?

I.C            Is this your first experience as an activist? (If no, what else? If yes, how does this make you feel?)

I.D            What are your responsibilities within the group?

I.E            What were the motivational factors that initially caused you to join?

I.F            Why do you remain a member?

- I.G In your opinion, what causes others to join?
- I. H What is your motivation to fight against MTR? Do you (or your family) live close to mining areas?

### **LEAF as a Grassroots Environmental Organization**

- I.I What is the main concern organization?
- I.J Where do the resources come from? (people-class base: age, gender, education, income; monetary: within/outside of group)
- I.K Specifically, how has LEAF been active?  
Institutionally/Noninstitutionally?
- I.L What are the accomplishments of LEAF on the anti-MTR campaign?
- I.M Has LEAF been interested in other environmental issues?
- I.N Do you feel that the emergence of LEAF has contributed to the Environmental Movement?
- I.O What are the goals of LEAF? (Environmental stewardship versus Justice)
- I.P What is the future of LEAF?

[Transition: Alright, now let's move onto the topic of religious behaviors, concern, and value]

## **II. RELIGIOUSITY, RELIGIOUS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN, AND VALUES**

### **Religiosity**

- II.A What church do you attend and how often?
- II.B How would you describe your religious beliefs?
- II.C Do you refer to yourself as a Christian?
- II.D How do you interpret the Bible (literal/inerrant)?

### **Religious Concern**

II.E As a Christian, do you feel that you have a personal responsibility toward the environment?

II.F What are some pro-environmental behaviors that you engage in? (recycling, reducing consumption, walking/biking/commuting instead of driving, composting, etc)

### **Environmental Concern**

II. G Why do you care about the environment?

II. H Out of the following, which best describes your reason for concern about the environment: the welfare of others, personal interest and enjoyment, the right of nonhuman species and the biosphere, or a conviction for environmental stewardship?

### **Values**

II.I How would you define “environmental stewardship?”

[Now for our final topic, I will be asking your questions pertaining to the overlap of religion and the environment.]

## **III. RELIGIOUS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN OVERLAP**

### **Values of LEAF**

III.A Based on what you said, how does LEAF exemplify environmental stewardship?

III.B Does LEAF differ from other evangelical organizations? How?

### **Difference Between Values of LEAF than secular organizations**

III.C How do you think that secular groups also fighting against MTR perceive LEAF?

III.D Do you view a difference between the motivations behind LEAF than other secular groups?

III. E What do you think motivates secular organizations?

[**Transition:** Thank you for your participation. To close I would like to ask a couple of questions regarding the interview.]

#### **IV. FINAL COMMENT**

##### **Closing**

IV.A           What are the overall reactions to the things that we have discussed today?

IV. B           Is there anything else that would be helpful for me to know?

**[STOP RECORDING]**

**[GIVE INFORMANT BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SHEET TO COMPLETE]**

**[Final transition:** Again, thank you for your participation in this study. It was a pleasure talking with you and I appreciate your time for the interview.]

I should have all the information I need. Would it be all right to contact you if further questions are to arise?

*Appendix F*

Respondent Biographical Sheet

Informant #: \_\_\_\_\_

Pseudonym (first name only): \_\_\_\_\_ (leave blank if you wish to have one assigned)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer the following questions by either filling in the blank or marking the response that best corresponds with your answer.

1. What year were you born: \_\_\_\_\_?
2. How would you describe your race or ethnicity: \_\_\_\_\_?
3. In which county and area do you live: \_\_\_\_\_?
4. What is the proximity of your neighborhood to a MTR site (in miles) \_\_\_\_\_?
5. How much time do you spend in nature \_\_\_\_\_?
6. Please identify your current or most recent occupation? What do you do in your job?
7. What is your most recently completed level of education: \_\_\_\_\_?
8. How many children do you have: \_\_\_\_\_? (If you have children, please indicate the age of the oldest: \_\_\_\_ and youngest: \_\_\_\_ )
9. Have you ever done one of the following:
  - a. Donated money to an environmental organization?  
\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Yes → IF YES, please identify: \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Signed a petition related to an environmental problem or concern?  
\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Yes
  - c. Helped or joined an environmental organization aside from LEAF?  
\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Yes → IF YES, please identify: \_\_\_\_\_
10. What religious denomination is your church affiliated with \_\_\_\_\_?
11. Please rank your religious views using the following scale: \_\_\_\_\_  
(1) extremely liberal, to (4) moderate, to (7) extremely conservative

12. Who did you vote for in the last two Presidential elections?  
a. In 2000: \_\_\_ Bush \_\_\_ Gore      b. In 2004: \_\_\_ Bush \_\_\_ Kerry
13. Please rank your political views using the following scale : \_\_\_\_\_  
(1) extremely liberal, to (4) moderate, to (7) extremely conservative
14. In which group did your total family income, from all sources, fall last year before taxes?

\_\_\_ UNDER \$10000

\_\_\_ \$10000 TO 14999

\_\_\_ \$15000 TO 19999

\_\_\_ \$20000 TO 24999

\_\_\_ \$25000 TO 29999

\_\_\_ \$30000 TO 34999

\_\_\_ \$35000 TO 39999

\_\_\_ \$40000 TO 49999

\_\_\_ \$50000 TO 59999

\_\_\_ \$60000 TO 74999

\_\_\_ \$75000 TO \$89999

\_\_\_ \$90000 - \$109999

\_\_\_ \$110000 OR OVER

## Vita

Lyndsay Hughes Dawson was born in Kingsport, Tennessee on February 19, 1985. She attended Sullivan Elementary and Middle School and graduated first in her class at Sullivan South High School in 2003 in Kingsport, Tennessee. In May of 2007, she was honored as magna cum laude, outstanding graduate in Sociology, and received her Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology and French with a minor in International Economics from Carson-Newman College in Jefferson City, Tennessee.

The following fall semester, Ms. Dawson began the Master's program in Sociology at the University of Tennessee. While in the program, she presented a paper titled, "The Shift of Electronic Waste from China to Africa," in the spring of 2008 at the Southern Sociological Society Conference in Richmond, Virginia. During the summer of 2008 she worked on a project with the Institute for a Secure and Sustainable Environment (ISSE) to develop a habitat restoration and conservation prioritization tool for the United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS).

Ms. Dawson completed her thesis "Stewards of the Mountains: A Case Study of the Lindquist Environmental Appalachian Fellowship, A Faith-Based Environmental Organization" in April of 2009. Following the completion of the Master's degree in Sociology, she became Mrs. Lyndsay Dawson Mynatt and immediately began a thru hike of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail.