Appendix to "Exit, Voice, Loyalty… or Deliberate Obstruction? Non-Collective Everyday Resistance under Oppression"

Stephanie Dornschneider, 22nd December 2020

Field research for the article was conducted in the Occupied Palestinian Territories and Jerusalem from June to August 2017. This appendix provides additional detail on the data collection and analysis, focusing on the recruitment of interviewees, the conduct of interviews, and the analysis of interview transcripts. The final section provides an anonymized list of the interviewees.

Interview Recruitment

Due to the sensitive nature of the research, random sampling was impossible. Time was dedicated to getting to know individuals and building trust. This happened mostly during daily interactions, such as grocery shopping, visits to libraries, copy shops, churches, and cultural centers. The majority of interviewees was recruited based on recurring interactions in the context of such daily activities and knew about my research before I asked them if they would be willing to participate in this study. Occasionally, I recruited individuals I met for the first time.

My research was facilitated tremendously by a connection with the University of Bethlehem. My point of contact was the country representative of an NGO, to whom I was introduced by a colleague. This contact provided me with a work basis in Bethlehem, arranged my accommodation, allowed me to share his office on a daily basis and introduced me to a wide network of people. When I arrived in Bethlehem, he organized a talk for me in a graduate class attended by working Palestinians, and I was able to recruit six interviewees in this way.

Prior to departing on field research, I also contacted my former Arabic teacher, a Palestinian living in California, and he connected me to two more interviewees. Throughout my research, I tried to apply snowball sampling. In most instances, this was unsuccessful, but in one case, a foreign aid worker connected me to an interviewee, who in turn connected me to two additional interviewees.

Interview Conduct

All interviews followed Spradley's guidelines for ethnographic research (1979). At the beginning of the interview, I typically described my research project and the purpose of the interview (explicit purpose). Then I asked the individuals if they had any questions. Sometimes individuals asked questions which developed into conversations about other topics, such as life in Europe, current news, or movies and books. I typically let the individual address anything they wanted to say, and only shifted the conversation back to the topic of the interview after we had discussed what they found interesting.

During the second stage of the interview I asked descriptive questions (ethnographic questions). My typical opening question was: Could you tell me what a typical day in your life looks like? Usually, individuals responded by giving long descriptions. I avoided interrupting these responses and simply nodded or repeated words

when they paused. Because of this procedure, most interviews contain detailed personal descriptions of daily life in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. As part of these descriptions, individuals usually mentioned various experiences of the occupation, as well as their interpretations of these experiences, and non-collective forms of resistance they adopted in response.

In later stages of the interviews, I followed up on particular experiences. For example, one of my interviewees, who was a student at Palestinian university, mentioned a confrontation with an Israeli soldier, and I asked her to tell me more about this experience. She explained that the soldier had entered their house during an evening raid, while she was home alone with her siblings. She described in great detail how she had stood in front of her siblings hiding under the table and asked the soldier to leave. During the final stage of the interview, I asked if my interviewees had anything to add to what was discussed, or any further questions about this research. As in previous stages, I explained my questions or actions (ethnographic explanations).

Each interview was recorded. To protect my interviewees' identity, I asked for demographic information only after the interview had ended, or, occasionally, before it started. I labelled all of my records using numerical identifiers. Before I left Palestine, I uploaded the recordings to a private space online, while deleting them from my cell phone. I stored demographic information in the form of the anonymized table shown at the end of this appendix. A few individuals allowed me to mention their names, but I nevertheless anonymized their information. In addition to the recordings, I took contemporaneous notes of each interview, which I stored in the same manner.

With the exception of six individuals who wanted to speak in English, the interviews were conducted in Modern Standard Arabic as opposed to the local Palestinian dialect. This introduced a context in which the interviewees were always aware of speaking to a foreign researcher, rather than someone from their own cultural context (Hall 1989). While this may have encouraged individuals to withhold certain information that they felt uncomfortable sharing with an outsider, their agreement to participate in the interview in a highly oppressive setting indicates a certain level of trust and willingness to provide information.

Interview Analysis

The interview analysis applied coding procedures developed by grounded theory (Strauss and Corbin 1990). Accordingly, each interview was examined line by line in an iterative process. Drawing on open coding procedures (Ibid., 61-75), interviews were initially broken down into segments (sentences, main-clauses, sub-clauses, and content words) that could be compared with each other for similarities and differences. These segments were then analyzed with a focus on experiences of oppression, the main theme of the research project.[1] Typically, experiences of oppression were identified from content words, including nouns, such as "oppression," "occupation," "checkpoint," "the wall," "Israeli soldiers," as well as verbs and adjectives such as "restricted" or "constraining." Experiences of oppression were also identified from entire sentences, such as "They took my land" or "Protest only gets you killed." Contextual knowledge that was available from

---

[1] Adopting such an *a priori* focus differs from standard procedures of open coding, in which categories are developed bottom-up.

the interview situation facilitated the analysis. An interviewee from Bethlehem said: "I cannot visit my relatives in Jerusalem." Bethlehem is walled off from Jerusalem, and Palestinians need a special permit to visit, which is frequently denied by the Israeli authorities. Given this knowledge, the sentence was coded as an experience of oppression, namely restricted movement.

In the next stage of the analysis, chunks of text that contained particular experiences of oppression were identified and, subsequently, coded for responses to the oppression. To identify chunks, each sentence containing a description of oppression was isolated. The following sentences were examined and added to that sentence until a new description of oppression occurred. Each chunk was then coded with a focus on a response to an experience of oppression, following the described open coding procedure of text segments. Typical content words that indicated responses were verbs, such as "resist," "confront," or "do something against." Additionally, causal connectors following a sentence that contained a description of oppression were considered. For instance, the sentence "So I stay here" followed a description of Israeli efforts to expel Palestinians. In this context, "so" indicates a reaction to Israeli efforts, and the remaining sentence specifies a particular action that is taken (staying in Palestine).

Responses to experiences of oppression were assigned *in vivo* codes that reflect the interviewees' own vocabulary (Strauss and Corbin, 69), for example "writing articles about the occupation" or "paying the occupation tax." Responses were classified as a form of resistance based on these *in vivo* codes together with the interviewees' use of resistance-related vocabulary (see previous paragraph) and existing conceptualizations of resistance as a behavior challenging existing power structures (Sharp 1973).

The analysis moreover applied axial coding, which adds a layer of abstraction by linking categories with sub-categories (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, 97-115), to create sub-classifications of resistance. This analysis revisited the *in vivo* codes and compared their propositional contents, so that different types of resistance efforts became apparent. These efforts showed similarities to well-known concepts from international relations and psychology, and further analysis explored each of these fields of the literature to specify these similarities. In a final step, resistance efforts were assigned names corresponding to the existing literature, namely signaling, persevering, eschewing, and coping.

List of Interviewees

Index	Sex	Age	Place	Job
1	M	23	Bethlehem	Employee in wood factory
2	M	40	Bethlehem	Manager of hair salon
3	M	27	Bethlehem	Employee in launderette
4	F	25	Bethlehem	Employee in bank
5	F	28	Bethlehem	Employee in bank
6	F	64	Jerusalem	Director of NGO
7	F	32	Hebron	Teacher
8	F	41	Bethlehem	Employee in bookshop
9	F	33	Jerusalem	Employee in NGO
10	M	29	Bethlehem	Teacher
11	F	39	Jerusalem	Director of cultural institute
12	M	30	Jerusalem	Owner of bookshop
13	M	50	Bethlehem	Professor
14	M	70	Bethlehem	Director of NGO
15	M	44	Jerusalem	Start-up founder
16	M	35	Bethlehem	Employee in church
17	F	28	Ramallah	Employee at UN
18	F	28	Hebron	PhD student
19	M	23	Bethlehem	Shop owner
20	F	25	Bethlehem	Employee in hotel
21	M	70	Bethlehem	Hotel owner
22	M	22	Bethlehem	Employee in tourist shop
23	F	55	Bethlehem	Employee in tourist shop
24	F	25	Bethlehem	Employee in university
25	M	63	Ramallah	Director of NGO
26	M	36	Ramallah	PhD student
27	M	41	Ramallah	Post-doctoral researcher
28	F	25	Bethlehem	Employee in copy shop
29	M	25	Bethlehem	Employee in copy shop
30	F	25	Ramallah	PhD student
31	M	54	Bethlehem	Priest
32	M	32	Bethlehem	Employee in bank

References

Hall, Edward T. 1989. *Beyond Culture*. New York: Anchor Books.
Sharp, Gene. 1973. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. Boston: P. Sargent Publisher.
Spradley, James P. 1979. *The Ethnographic Interview*. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press.
Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research*. New York: Sage.