



AMERICAN METEOROLOGICAL SOCIETY

Weather, Climate, and Society

EARLY ONLINE RELEASE

This is a preliminary PDF of the author-produced manuscript that has been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. Since it is being posted so soon after acceptance, it has not yet been copyedited, formatted, or processed by AMS Publications. This preliminary version of the manuscript may be downloaded, distributed, and cited, but please be aware that there will be visual differences and possibly some content differences between this version and the final published version.

The DOI for this manuscript is doi: 10.1175/WCAS-D-14-00039.1

The final published version of this manuscript will replace the preliminary version at the above DOI once it is available.

If you would like to cite this EOR in a separate work, please use the following full citation:

Yung, L., N. Phear, A. DuPont, J. Montag, and D. Murphy, 2015: Drought Adaptation and Climate Change Beliefs Amongst Working Ranchers in Montana. *Wea. Climate Soc.* doi:10.1175/WCAS-D-14-00039.1, in press.



1 Drought Adaptation and Climate Change Beliefs Amongst Working Ranchers in

2 Montana

3

4 Laurie Yung, Department of Society and Conservation, University of Montana*

5 Nicky Phear, Department of Society and Conservation, University of Montana

6 Alayna DuPont, McKenzie River Trust

7 Jess Montag, Bureau of Land Management

8 Daniel Murphy, Department of Anthropology, University of Cincinnati

9

10 * College of Forestry and Conservation, University of Montana, Missoula MT 59812,

11 laurie.yung@umontana.edu.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Abstract

Agricultural producers may be particularly vulnerable to climate impacts such as drought. To better understand how ranchers respond to ongoing drought, and the relationship between climate change beliefs and drought adaptation, in-depth interviews with working ranchers were conducted. Ranchers described drought conditions as unprecedented and detailed the interacting impacts of drought and other non-climatic stressors. They viewed adaptation as critical and employed a wide range of responses to drought, but lack of financial resources, risks associated with change, local social norms, and optimism about future moisture created barriers to change. Most ranchers attributed drought to natural cycles and were skeptical about anthropogenic climate change. Many ranchers likened current drought conditions to past droughts, concluding that conditions would return to “normal.” A belief in natural cycles provided a sense hope for some ranchers, but felt immutable to others, reducing their sense of agency and efficacy. Taken together, climate skepticism, optimism about future conditions, lack of financial resources, and a limited sense of agency might be reducing investments in long-term adaptation. However, the relationship between climate change beliefs and adaptation action was not entirely clear, since the handful of ranchers adapting in anticipation of long-term drought were skeptical or uncertain about anthropogenic climate change. Further, most ranchers characterized adaptation as an individual endeavor and resisted government involvement in drought adaptation. In the context of climate skepticism and anti-government sentiment, strategies to scale up adaptation efforts beyond the household will only succeed to the extent that they build on local norms and ideologies.

47

48 **1. Introduction**

49 Agriculture is especially vulnerable and sensitive to climate change (Hall and
50 Wreford 2012, McLeman et al. 2008). Climate change impacts to farming and ranching
51 will likely influence rural futures around the world and potentially compromise global
52 food security (Zhao and Running 2012, Miller et al. 2013). In the Western U.S., climate
53 change has already been linked to declining snowpack, earlier snowmelt, more frequent
54 drought, lower late summer stream flow, and increased inter-annual variability, trends
55 that are expected to continue and worsen throughout the 21st century (Chambers and
56 Pellant 2008, Pederson et al. 2011). Climate change impacts on grazing are particularly
57 important in the U.S. where 27% of the land area is rangeland and grassland pasture used
58 to graze livestock (USDA 2007). Sayre et al. (2012) argue that livestock production on
59 U.S. rangelands is an important and potentially sustainable form of diversified
60 agriculture. In addition to producing food, rangelands provide important wildlife habitat,
61 recreational opportunities, open space, and ecosystem services (Maczko et al. 2011,
62 Huntsinger and Oviedo 2014). Thus, effective adaptation on rangelands is important for
63 social, economic, and ecological reasons.

64 There is a large body of research on the impacts of climate change on agriculture
65 at national or regional scales, but very few studies explore the ways that individual
66 producers or households adapt to specific, localized climate change impacts, such as
67 drought (Head et al. 2011, Miller et al. 2013). To fill this gap, we examined the views and
68 practices of working ranchers in Montana, including how they understand and respond to

ongoing drought, and the relationship between climate change beliefs and adaptation to drought.

2. Literature

On U.S. rangelands, climate change is expected to produce directional shifts in vegetation and increases in invasive plants (CCSP 2008) as well as new conditions and no-analog systems (Morgan et al. 2008). Droughts in the region typically result in decreased forage production both during and for several years after droughts end, due to compromised seedling growth, soil erosion, and lower quality forage (McDougald et al. 2001). In addition to decreased forage production and more invasive weeds, during droughts ranchers struggle with less water for irrigation and cattle in the mid-late summer and altered fire regimes (Chambers and Pellant 2008).

It has long been recognized that changing weather conditions pose both risks and uncertainties for ranchers (see e.g. Whitson 1975). Because they cannot completely eliminate such risks, ranchers manage and mitigate risk over a period of many years with the assumption that variability in profits and productivity is unavoidable (Crane et al. 2010). And, like other agricultural producers, ranchers experience climate-related changes such as drought concurrent to other stressors (McLeman et al. 2008). Drought, in military terminology, acts as a “threat multiplier,” exacerbating existing challenges related to low or fluctuating commodity prices, unmanageable debt, rising land prices, and changing range conditions. According to Leichenko and O’Brien (2002, 2008), these interacting stressors create “double exposures” which deepen vulnerability to climate change.

92 Adaptation has been advanced as a process or means to mitigate the local impacts
93 of climate change. McCarthy et al. (2001, p 21) define adaptation as the “ability of a
94 system to adjust to climate change (including climate variability and extremes) to
95 moderate potential damages, to take advantage of opportunities, or to cope with the
96 consequences.” But adaptation is more than an adjustment to external stimuli.

97 Adaptation is embedded in a social, political, economic, institutional, and biophysical
98 context involving interacting climatic and non-climatic processes that both enable and
99 constrain adaptive actions (i.e. the interacting stressors and double exposures described
100 above) (Adger et al. 2012; Thornton and Manasfi 2010, Moser and Ekstrom 2010).

101 Most adaptation happens at household, local, and regional scales and responds to
102 the specific impacts of climate change, such as drought, that occur in particular places.
103 Agricultural adaptation to climate change will likely occur at multiple scales and involve
104 numerous actors, including state and federal government agencies, NGOs, industry
105 groups, and individual agricultural producers. Range management and extension
106 specialists have documented a range of adaptive actions that ranchers employ in response
107 to drought, including moving cattle to better pastures, developing new water sources,
108 controlling invasive plants, purchasing supplemental feed, culling herds, weaning calves,
109 diversifying income streams, restoring and maintaining forage and soil, developing more
110 efficient grazing systems, improving herd quality, and planning for contingencies
111 (Hamilton 2003, McDougald et al. 2001).

112 Some scholars differentiate between reactive or short-term coping responses and
113 proactive adaptations that restructure or even transform operations for the long-term (e.g.
114 see Smit and Skinner 2002). However, actions that are successful over the short term may

115 be less effective or even maladaptive over the long-term, making it difficult to determine
116 which responses constitute short-term coping that maintains the status quo and which
117 responses effectively anticipate longer-term change and build long-term resilience
118 (Moser and Ekstrom 2010, Nelson et al. 2007). For example, increasing debt could
119 constitute a short-term coping mechanism that might even be maladaptive, if it creates an
120 incentive to overgraze in future drought years in order to make payments. However, a
121 loan to transition to drought tolerant grass or livestock breeds, to diversify an operation,
122 or to purchase additional rangeland to increase the long-term sustainability of a ranch
123 might actually be transformative. A temporary reduction in herd size might constitute
124 short-term coping but a more permanent reduction could restore grasslands and build
125 resilience to drought over the long-term. The efficacy of longer-term herd size reductions
126 hinges on the extent and severity of drought over time as well as market conditions (e.g.
127 the price of beef, the price of hay, and the cost of inputs) that affect ranchers' ability to be
128 financially sustainable with fewer livestock. Thus, specific responses need to be
129 evaluated over long time scales (Thornton and Manasfi 2010).

130 Effective adaptation depends, in part, on adaptive capacity, or access to social,
131 human, institutional, natural, and economic resources and the ability of an individual or
132 group to mobilize those resources to respond to change (Wall and Marzall 2006).

133 Adaptive capacity hinges on a range of assets and endowments, such as social networks,
134 access to relevant knowledge, appropriate policy, available funding, control of natural
135 resources, and mechanisms for collective action. Because these assets and endowments
136 operate at multiple, interacting scales, the resources available to households may differ
137 from those available to social groups, communities, and governments. Further, different

types of adaptation actions require mobilizing different capacities at different scales, meaning that some responses are available to households, while others require collective action.

For agricultural producers, decisions about adaptation are influenced by a range of political, social, and economic factors occurring at multiple scales, including commodity prices, trade policy, government programs, available technology, family finances, risk perception, and social norms (Smit and Skinner 2002, Reid et al. 2007). In an analysis of 1930s drought adaptation in Oklahoma, McLeman et al. (2008) found that adaptation to climate stressors did not occur in isolation of non-climatic stressors; synergies between the two swamped adaptive capacity with overwhelming negative results. They concluded that programs designed to address non-climatic stressors, such as policies to stabilize commodity prices, farm income, and employment, can assist adaptation to drought by building overall adaptive capacity. Thus, the multiple or “double” exposures demonstrated by Leichenko and O’Brien (2002, 2008) may also provide multiple leverage points for improving adaptability.

Interestingly, physical vulnerability to climate impacts does not necessarily increase risk perception, which appears to be mediated by both climate change beliefs and political ideology (Safi et al. 2012). Several studies have found that farmers and ranchers typically attribute local environmental changes, such as drought, to local stresses rather than global climate change (Liu et al. 2013, Milne et al. 2008). In a study in Ontario, Reid et al. (2007) found that most farmers were unaware and/or unconcerned about climate change, and the farmers “who are more concerned and aware of the climate change risks are more likely to make efforts to prepare and to take anticipatory actions to

161 reduce risks than those who are less concerned or skeptical” (p 630). Raymond and
162 Robinson (2013) found that while rural landholders were capable of adjusting to farm
163 risks, they were more likely to respond to short-term risks that had a direct impact on
164 their operation rather than the longer-term risks related to climate change. Thus, ranchers
165 who believe in and are concerned about climate change may be more likely to pursue
166 adaptive actions that anticipate long-term change. Further, natural variability may delay
167 adaptation (Schneider et al. 2000) because the high degree of natural variability in the
168 weather masks climate change trends and thus discourages farmers from engaging in
169 anticipatory adaptation based on climate projections (Hulme et al. 1999).

170 A number of studies have linked perceptions of climate risk with political identity
171 and ideology, concluding that conservative or individualist worldviews correlate with less
172 concern about climate change (Dunlap and McCright 2011, Kahan et al. 2011).
173 According to Maibach (in Cooney 2010 p. 6), “political ideology and some deeply held
174 worldviews related to political identity are currently the biggest factors that determine a
175 person’s view of climate change.” When Americans were recently asked about the
176 causes of warming over the last century, 55% attributed warming to human activities
177 while 41% said that warming was due to natural causes (Gallup 2015). Recent research
178 indicates that individuals attribute local changes, such as warmer winters, to either natural
179 variation or anthropogenic climate change based on their climate change beliefs, beliefs
180 which are heavily influenced by political ideology (McCright et al. 2014). Ascribing
181 specific changes, such as drought, to natural cycles rather than anthropogenic climate
182 change is common amongst climate skeptics (Hobson and Niemeyer 2012). Thus, the

political ideologies and worldviews of ranchers may influence their views on the causes of drought and the need for long-term adaptation.

Most research on climate change and agriculture in the global north examines climate impacts on productivity and yield at regional or national scales with a focus on technical, agronomic, and top-down initiatives (Head et al. 2011, Miller et al. 2013). Very few studies examine the adaptive responses of producers or the processes of autonomous adaptation at the local scale, indicating a need for research on the social, cultural, and political complexities of adaptation at the household scale (Head et al. 2011, Miller et al. 2013, Thornton and Manasfi 2010). To help fill this gap, we examined the ways in which working ranchers in Montana responded to drought, one of the most important climate-driven stressors in the Western U.S. Similar to Head et al. (2011), we used drought as a window into rancher responses to climate change because drought is a local, tangible impact with important consequences for producers. We utilized a qualitative, descriptive case study approach to build knowledge of decision-making in real world situations (Kandlikar and Risbey 2000). More specifically, we investigated the views and practices of the working ranchers in Montana, how they understand and negotiate drought, how they are impacted and how they respond, and how their adaptation decisions relate to their ideas about anthropogenic climate change. Drawing on Adger et al. (2009), we examined the ways that past experience, risk perceptions, social norms, and climate change beliefs enable individual or collective action and/or limit adaptation.

3. Research Methods

We conducted in-depth, semi-structured interviews in three landscapes in Montana, each of which had experienced drought during the last 10-15 years. In total, thirty interviews were conducted with 35 ranchers (five interviews were conducted with couples), including five interviews in the Big Hole Valley, five interviews in the Blackfoot Valley, and 20 interviews on the Rocky Mountain Front (the Rocky Mountain Front was emphasized due to more severe and prolonged drought conditions). Participants were purposively selected from a long list of potential interviewees generated through multiple and diverse contacts in each study site (Brandenburg and Carroll 1995). To access a diversity of views and practices, we selected ranchers from various age groups, with different size ranches, and with different types of operations (e.g. commercial cow/calf operation versus grass fed niche operation). All ranchers who were contacted agreed to an interview. The sample includes approximately 10% of the ranches in these study sites. This small, purposive sample means that research results are not statistically generalizable (i.e. conclusions cannot be drawn regarding the proportion of ranchers who hold the different views described below). Rather, in-depth interviews provide an understanding of the range of views in a particular population and build detailed knowledge of particular case studies, which in turn informs social theory (Burawoy 1998).

Ranchers are defined here as individuals or families who self-identify as working ranchers *and* rely on livestock production for income generation. Most ranchers in these landscapes are cattle producers whose families settled on their property in the late 19th or early 20th century. Ranches range from 2000-50,000 acres and run 100-2000 head of cattle. In this arid environment, 10,000 acres and 500 head of cattle are often necessary to

support a family. The study sites are primarily comprised of undeveloped ranchlands and a handful of small communities (ranging in population from 30 to 1800). Working ranches still dominate these areas, even though some large properties have been sold to amenity owners - newcomers and absentee owners who purchase ranchlands for the wildlife, scenic beauty, recreation opportunities, and privacy. Because of their short tenure and their lack of economic dependence on ranching, amenity owners were not included in this study.

Ranchers were asked questions about their ranch and livestock operations, the nature of recent droughts and local ecological change, the impacts of drought on individual households and the broader community, ranching practices in response to drought, perceptions of risk, future drought planning, local collective action, resources required to adapt, government programs, causes of drought, and anthropogenic climate change. An interview guide ensured comparability between interviews (Patterson and Williams 2002), but participants also had opportunities to bring up topics and ideas that were not covered in the interview guide. While we did not directly measure behaviors, ranchers talked extensively about adaptive practices during interviews, providing details about a range of actions taken in response to drought.

Interviews were recorded, transcribed verbatim, and analyzed using a process of coding that linked concepts to data through reading and rereading of transcripts, interpretations, and social theory (Strauss and Corbin 1990). Forty-three codes emerged from this process, ranging from *natural cycles* to *adaptation practice* to *amenity owners*. Coding of individual interviews was followed by detailed across-interview analyses to reveal patterns and differences. The interview excerpts below provide detail about

rancher views and practices as well as empirical evidence to support the interpretations articulated in this article. Each interview excerpt is numbered to indicate which research participant is quoted.

4. Findings

a. The Local Consequences of Drought

Ranchers described drought conditions as “prolonged” (17) and “continual,” (2) with less snow in the winter, earlier snowmelt, reservoirs not filling, springs drying up, and less rain in the summer. According to this sixth generation rancher “last year was the worst grass year that I had seen since I’ve been ranching...By the first of part of June, everything was brown. It was just fried...By the first week of July, if you drove out across a field, the grass where you drove...would turn to powder” (11). Another rancher reported, “We’ve had springs that dried up that were never dry in my memory” (12). Some ranchers described drought conditions as unprecedented, saying “this year’s different, and in the past 10 years [it’s] gotten worse” (5). Observed impacts on rangelands included the expansion of non-native invasive weeds, the emergence of new weeds, the decline of desirable grasses, and increased competition between cattle and wildlife for forage.

While some ranchers asserted that current conditions were unprecedented in their experience, many viewed current drought conditions as similar to those experienced by family members in the past, saying “they went through the same thing we’re going

through” (10). This kind of “historical knowledge” that “old-timers...passed onto their families” gave ranchers a sense of “how it really gets bad and how there is no grass” (4).

A few ranchers saw drought as a “tremendous opportunity,” (6) saying “we’ve got to be learning all the time” (12) and “you really become creative” (24). And, there were instances where less rain and snow allowed for more outdoor work to be accomplished throughout the year, or where milder winters meant less hay was required. However, there was widespread acknowledgement that ongoing drought conditions were causing severe economic hardship for ranchers, who were forced to reduce their herds, purchase hay at high prices, and lease additional rangelands. As a result, incomes were reduced and debt increased. Economically, drought was compounded by a host of existing pressures, including the rising cost of inputs and the fluctuating and often low price of beef. Because ranchers felt that they were barely scraping by, drought was characterized as able to “break you in just one fell swoop...totally knock you right off the wall” (24).

Drought conditions were widely believed to be causing social and psychological stress, resulting in tensions within families and between neighbors. As this rancher reports:

I see a lot of depressed people...It’s almost like going to a funeral sometimes. It’s kind of like you’re mourning the loss of...if you’ve been on a place that’s been in your family for 80 years, and you’re the one to lose it...That’s kind of a horrible thought. (28)

Another rancher reported that “tensions are really high” and that there’s “more drinking than ever before because they don’t know how to fix the problem” (24).

Increased fighting over water illustrated one of the ways that drought increases conflict between neighbors. During drought years, ranchers often needed to irrigate earlier in the season and for many more weeks as compared with wetter years. At the same time, drought conditions limited the amount of water available for irrigation. Thus, during the drought, already existing tensions over water rights and allocations intensified. As one rancher said, “you’re much more aware of your water rights” (4) during a drought.

b. Responding and Adapting

Ranchers responded to drought in a variety of ways. To keep their operations afloat, many resorted to costly measures, such as purchasing hay, leasing additional rangelands, and hauling water for cows to drink. Ranchers were also investing in longer-term changes to improve water systems, diversify their operations, and bring down costs by reducing inputs, changes that they might pursue even in the absence of drought. In most cases, ranchers did not differentiate between short-term coping behaviors and more strategic long-term adaptations. As discussed above, it is difficult to evaluate the long-term efficacy of particular actions for particular ranching families. Thus, we make only provisional judgments regarding whether specific responses constitute short-term coping or build long-term resilience.

Many of the typical responses to drought increased debt, exacerbating the financial pressure described above and resembling coping more than adaptation. For example, during drought years, hay pastures are far less productive and ranchers often purchase hay at a “ridiculous price” (29). One rancher stated “it’s going to probably take

319 five to six years to pay [last year's] hay bill off" (11). To generate capital to respond to
320 drought or make up for lost income, some ranchers responded by selling portions of their
321 ranch. According to one rancher, 20-30% of the ranchers on the Rocky Mountain Front
322 have sold off bits of land in the last 10 years, rather than "let their cows go" (17).
323 Drought was also seen as a factor in ranch turnover, as entire ranch properties were being
324 sold in part due to drought. In all three study sites, ranch properties were almost always
325 sold to amenity owners for prices that most ranchers could not afford. The transition of
326 ranch properties to amenity owners was widely perceived to compound drought stress
327 through higher land prices that limited ranchers' ability to purchase additional acres, but
328 some ranchers suggested that the availability of land to lease from non-ranching
329 neighbors could help take the pressure off the home ranch during dry years.

330 To earn additional income, some ranchers had diversified their operations. They
331 raised goats, sold horses, bred dogs, and started outfitting businesses. This rancher
332 described how diversification allowed him to weather ongoing drought, saying:

333 Just being a little bit versatile...we market quite a few different types of
334 livestock...selling a few things in the off seasons and having kind of a steady cash
335 flow. And we may last a little longer by doing that. (15)

336 Ranchers discussed innovation and "out-of-the-box" (6) thinking as critical to adaptation,
337 acknowledging that "we've got to get out of this deal where we're just selling calves to
338 the markets" (28). To save money, some ranchers intentionally reduced their inputs. They
339 ran fewer cattle, started raising smaller breeds, and calved later to reduce the amount of
340 hay they fed.

341 Drought was impacting rangelands, making it harder to be a “good steward” (the
342 phrase “steward” or “stewardship” was used by more than half of the interviewees as
343 shorthand for managing ranchlands in ethical and environmental sustainable ways). In
344 some cases, ranchers were overgrazing in order to sustain their herd size and, as a result,
345 some areas were “hammered” (29). One rancher described this situation:

346 We normally try to rest 25% of our land, and we just weren’t able to do that last
347 year, and that really is hard. Because then it usually takes about five or six years
348 of good management to try to get the grass back to where it was. (11)

349 Many ranchers acknowledged that years of high precipitation would be required to
350 restore rangelands. In contrast, some ranchers stated that they had not overgrazed, instead
351 reducing their herd size in order to improve range conditions and better weather future
352 drought:

353 When you live in a semi-arid region, you have to manage for dry years...Take
354 care of your grass...I guess you’re preparing for a drought if you’re preparing for
355 just the next year...our grass is kind of our bank account. If we use it all up,
356 there’s nothing saved for next year. And if you can leave some of it and let it
357 build up, you can get through those kinds of things...We have always strived to
358 take good care of our pastures and we’re still in good shape...we’ve cut numbers.
359 (10)

360 While reducing herd size could build ecological resilience, enabling more sustainable
361 ranching in the face of ongoing drought, some ranchers were concerned about the long-
362 term consequences of this strategy. As one rancher explained, “If it continues to get dry,
363 we’ll continue to sell off cows until we don’t have any cows left, I guess” (16). Another

364 claimed that while he could steward his land better by reducing his stocking rate, then “I
365 couldn’t feed the family” (19). Many ranchers faced tough trade-offs between ecological
366 resilience (reducing herd size to sustain grasslands) and financial resilience (overgrazing
367 to sustain a reasonable family income).

368 While not the norm, a handful of ranchers were transforming their operations in
369 ways that clearly anticipated long-term drought. One rancher described his plan to
370 “helicopter spray portions of the place and then reseed it with a good grass that’s going to
371 do well in drier conditions” (4). Another rancher dug a well far below the water table;
372 rather than stopping at 60 feet, he drilled down to 120 feet so that “as the water table
373 shrinks, we’ve still got plenty of water” (16). One rancher suggested that resting a third
374 of their pastures would no longer work under changing conditions and they might “have
375 to bump that up to half” (7).

376 Interestingly, ranchers suggested that adaptability and the need to respond to
377 changing conditions characterize the entire enterprise of ranching, from everyday
378 decisions to longer-term planning. They described their work in this way: “Improvise,
379 adjust. We got to. If we don’t, we’re sunk,” (8) “it’s just adapt, adapt,” (4) and “it’s
380 always changing” (12). At the same time, most of the ranchers we interviewed were not
381 pursuing dramatic or long-term changes. Ranchers acknowledged that they are typically
382 slow to change and adopt new ideas and practices, saying “one of the biggest things that a
383 lot of ranchers have [a] problem with [is] adapting” (6) and that “most of us can’t change
384 in mid-stride” (30).

385 Some ranchers talked about the ways in which tradition and cultural norms might
386 limit innovation. As this rancher explained:

387 If purple cows were the perfect cow, some people wouldn't have them, because "I
388 ain't going to run purple cows," even if it meant going broke with a black cow. So
389 it's that kind of stuff...goes absolutely hand in hand with the drought. (6)
390 Accordingly, ranchers might hold onto traditional practices that are no longer adapted to
391 current conditions and fail to make necessary changes in the context of drought. In
392 addition to the barriers that some cultural traditions posed, ranchers also focused on the
393 practical risks involved in adopting new practices, as described above. As this rancher
394 reported, "I'm not going to try and guess what's going to happen five years from now and
395 try to run my operation that way because if I make the wrong guess, then I'm in trouble"
396 (16) (interestingly, this was the rancher who dug the deeper well). Another rancher
397 described the risks associated with change, saying "any time you do anything new or
398 different, you're going to make mistakes...some of those mistakes are so costly that it
399 may just sink your boat" (17). In some cases, incremental change was seen as more
400 desirable, "because you can always back out" (4). There was an interesting tension
401 between the widespread acknowledgment of the importance of being able to adapt to
402 changing conditions and both the cultural and practical barriers to adopting new
403 practices.

404

405 *c. Autonomy, Collective Action, and Government Programs*

406 In discussing drought, ranchers readily focused on political-economic forces
407 occurring at multiple scales, from the effects of trade policy on the price of beef to
408 debates over country of origin labeling. However, ranchers clearly saw the individual or
409 family as the appropriate or desirable scale for adaptation. While there were some notable

410 exceptions (described below), ranchers did not draw extensively on local social networks
411 or engage in collective action to formulate responses to drought. Most ranchers said that
412 they did not work with other ranchers to address drought because “they’re independent,
413 and they don’t want to work together,” and “it’s all individual...we’ve never really
414 organized” (13). This rancher went on to describe how rancher independence can inhibit
415 collaboration:

416 It’s real hard to get grouped together to do much, because we love this lifestyle
417 because we can...call our own shots and work when we want... But that
418 independence also makes it very difficult to get together and network and do
419 those kinds of things. (13)

420 Some ranchers saw the lack of communication between ranchers was problematic. As
421 this rancher suggested, “people don’t talk outside the ranches. That’s the
422 problem...People get in trouble, and you don’t know about it” (4). One rancher suggested
423 that the current level of isolation might be relatively new and explained that neighbors
424 used to help one another more, especially with activities such as haying. In contrast, a
425 few ranchers argued that effective communication between ranchers was actually the
426 norm, claiming that ranchers often talk to each other about things that work and have a
427 good support network, despite not being formally organized. They suggested that drought
428 had made people more aware of what other ranchers were doing to adapt to changing
429 conditions. That said, being independent was widely regarded as a very important part of
430 rancher identity and ranchers tended to see adaptation as an individual endeavor. As one
431 rancher stressed, “that’s one thing about a rancher; he has a real tough time having
432 somebody tell him what to do with his place” (25).

Political ideology, more specifically anti-government sentiment, also had an impact on how government programs to address drought were regarded and utilized. Many ranchers did not perceive that there was much available in the way of government programs or support during a drought, despite acknowledging the existence of disaster relief programs (federal disaster relief programs can include emergency loans, grace periods for unpaid insurance premiums, support for moving water to livestock, and access to grazing and haying lands (www.disasterassistance.gov)). Every rancher who spoke about the disaster relief program described it as a failure. Ranchers suggested that payments came too late, funds were inadequate, and programs were inefficient. These ranchers described themselves as “pretty much on their own” (4) and said that the assistance available was a “pittance” (19), “diddly squat...not even a drop in the bucket” (24), and “too little too late” (10). While some argued that the federal government had “saved” ranchers, many suggested the government wanted to control individual ranches through aid, saying that “they want to manage the whole outfit” (14) and that if “all the agencies would leave the rancher alone, he’d be so much better off” (18). However, several ranchers recounted positive experiences with the Natural Resources Conservation Service EQIP program, which provides financial and technical support for improvements to water systems.

Some ranchers disputed that drought is a disaster and resisted the notion that the government should be involved. As this rancher stated:

But that thing right there that says this is a disaster, you’re a victim of disaster, therefore we want to help you. That’s a good enough idea, but it hasn’t been a disaster. It happened to be dry this year. And it’s because you’re unprepared to

456 deal with it, and you [need to] be prepared and need to be flexible so that you can
457 deal with it. It's not the taxpayer's problem. (6)

458 Another rancher made a similar argument, suggesting that unpredictable events like
459 hurricanes, fires, or tornados are disasters requiring federal aid, but that drought in
460 drought-prone landscapes presented a different situation:

461 When you live in an area that has 13, 14 inches of rainfall, and when it drops
462 down to 7 or 8 over a number of years, I don't know that it's a time that you
463 should be really looking for the government to help you...I think people have to
464 help themselves. (10)

465 Even though many ranchers accepted federal funds for improved water systems,
466 government was broadly viewed as making ranching more difficult and there was little
467 faith in or support for government assistance to either help weather the short-term
468 impacts of drought or assist in changing operations to adapt to future drought.

469 While ranchers on the Rocky Mountain Front rarely spoke about collective efforts
470 to address drought, a handful of ranchers from the Blackfoot and Big Hole Valleys told a
471 different story. Both the Blackfoot and Big Hole Valleys had established local
472 collaboratives with programs focused specifically on in-stream flow and drought
473 management. In the Blackfoot, many ranchers participated in a local, voluntary "shared
474 sacrifice" (3, 7) program to leave water in the river for downstream irrigators. In the Big
475 Hole, some of the ranchers worked to ameliorate the impacts of drought on the Arctic
476 grayling, which, if listed under the Endangered Species Act, could result in significant
477 reductions in water available for irrigation. Some ranchers in these two valleys suggested
478 that they benefited from "working together" (14) with federal agencies, which provided

479 them access to grant money for improved irrigation systems, riparian restoration, and
480 support for hauling water and digging deeper wells. One Big Hole rancher was surprised
481 by how many ranchers had signed up for the federal program, saying “I had the opinion
482 that most people were so independent and such rugged individualists in this area that they
483 wouldn’t do this sort of thing” (12). It is important to note that although the Rocky
484 Mountain Front had experienced much worse drought conditions than either the Big Hole
485 or the Blackfoot, ranchers on the Front were less amenable to government programs and
486 less involved in collaborative efforts to address drought. The Rocky Mountain Front is a
487 larger landscape with multiple watersheds, which might make collaboration more
488 challenging.

490 *d. Drought, Natural Cycles, and Climate Change*

491 Most ranchers characterized drought as part of a natural cycle, arguing that it was
492 normal for some years to be wetter and some drier. Ranchers suggested that droughts
493 “would come and go,” (4) that “it’s all a cycle...and we’ll have good years along with
494 bad” (10). As this rancher explained:

495 We’ve noticed in the last few years it seems like it’s been pretty dry. But the other
496 day I was up monitoring our forest allotment...I sat by a tree and I just decided to
497 count the rings when I was eating lunch...and some of them are pretty wide and
498 some of them are small. And so it’s interesting over the years, as you look at that,
499 drought is certainly nothing new to the West. (14)

500 Most ranchers shared the view that drought was simply part of the Western landscape and
501 a necessary hardship for ranchers. Drought was not only natural and cyclical, it was

unpredictable. As this rancher explained “Most ranchers live one day at a time, and you go from there. I mean, for me to predict what’s going to happen, I can’t tell you what it’s going to do tomorrow. So it’s pretty hard” (16). For many of these ranchers, natural variability in precipitation was expected, but conditions would necessarily, eventually return to “normal” (23, 12). Ranchers who believed that drought was “cyclical” argued that it was not going to “every year get worse and worse and worse and worse” (14). At the same time, however, many ranchers argued that current drought conditions were much more severe than in the recent past. The fact that the drought was unprecedented over the last 100 years or so did not necessarily contradict assumptions that it was part of a natural cycle.

Ranchers expressed a range of views about anthropogenic climate change and on whether or not drought conditions would continue. According to many ranchers, “it doesn’t matter whether it’s human-caused” because “the effect is the same” (11). Most ranchers were skeptical, arguing, as detailed above, that climate changes all the time and that the region goes through cycles and periods of drought. The view that drought was a result of natural cycles was often used to contest anthropogenic climate change. Most ranchers suggested that climate science was still uncertain, and some argued that it was “arrogant” (27, 28) to think that humans could influence the earth’s climate. One rancher conveyed this view with much enthusiasm:

Now all [these] educated idiots go on this global warming. Good Lord, that’ll put a wrinkle in their head. For Christ sakes, it’s been going on since Christ was a child...they don’t have a clue how many ice ages we had...It’s a cycle. It’ll change...don’t believe in global warming at all. (18)

525 Interestingly, the handful of ranchers investing in longer-term adaptation were either
526 similarly skeptical of anthropogenic climate change or very uncertain about the causes of
527 drought. One of the ranchers who was committed to cutting herd size to ensure rangeland
528 health was deeply skeptical, saying “It’s just a cycle. We’ve been through it. The world’s
529 been through it so many times before... humans aren’t significant enough to change the
530 climate” (10). The rancher who dug a deeper well was uncertain, saying “I haven’t made
531 a decision as to whether this drought that we’re in right now is man caused or if it’s just
532 Mother Nature doing her thing again.” (16) Similarly, both the rancher who suggested
533 needing to rest half of his pastures in the future instead of just a third and the rancher who
534 planned to reseed his ranch with grass species better adapted to drought were undecided
535 regarding the role of humans and natural cycles in local drought.

536
537 *e. Optimism, Agency, and Planning*

538 A strong belief that drought was caused by natural cycles led to a sense of
539 optimism for many ranchers. In other words, even in the face of ongoing or worsening
540 drought conditions, many ranchers held on to the belief that it would rain and that things
541 would improve, calling this “the old ‘it’ll get better next year’ syndrome” (28). As this
542 rancher explained:

543 You have to be optimistic. I guess you always, even no matter how dry it gets,
544 you kind of seem to know that sooner or later you’re going to get rain and things
545 will get better. At least hope so... You just hold out and you hope it comes. (15)
546 Many ranchers continued to “hope for the best” (17, 23, 26, 29) expressing optimism that
547 they might be “on the uphill swing moisture-wise” (29), that “it’s going to rain next

spring,” (11) and “all it takes is some rain and some snow” (28). As this rancher described, “every time it just gets to the point of being so bleak that you’re about ready to cash it in, you get just enough rain to keep your hopes up” (19). For many ranchers, optimism about future moisture was a coping mechanism justified or framed by the belief in natural cycles.

Despite attempts at optimism, many ranchers expressed a sense of futility, suggesting that they had little control over the situation and very few options. Ranchers said that they had “very little choice” (4) and suggested that there was “no solution” (24) and “nothing we can do about it” (5, 16, 23). They characterized drought as “something you can’t fight” (16). As this rancher put it “why didn’t it rain?...I don’t know and I don’t care...doesn’t matter, I can’t do anything about it.” (6) Many ranchers connected their lack of agency explicitly to the view that drought was caused largely by natural cycles, arguing that no one can control the weather and, as a result there was very little they could do to solve the problem. So, while belief in natural cycles resulted in hope for some ranchers, for others, it engendered a sense of futility and lack of control.

While most ranchers were not engaged in long-term planning for ongoing drought, many acknowledged the importance of having at least a semblance of a plan and the value of looking ahead and planning for different future scenarios. However, the view that drought is unpredictable and not under the rancher’s control meant that most ranchers felt that they could only plan and adapt to a certain extent. In practice, there was a lot of variation in planning. Some ranchers suggested that “You have to do some real drastic things when you’re dealing with drought, you have to plan ahead” (14) and “you need to have a drought plan” (6). The rancher who dug a well 120 feet deep, for example,

planned for the worst, despite acknowledging that he could not predict the future and was uncertain about the existence of anthropogenic climate change. Others said “I don’t have a plan...I don’t really have an answer, I just say trying to get by” (5). In response to a question about planning for drought, this rancher said “As far as a long-term plan, I don’t have enough grass...enough water, I don’t know how you plan for that” (1). The sense of futility and lack of agency colored many responses to questions about planning for future drought. Further, in response to questions about planning, many ranchers argued that they simply lacked the capacity, “the resources, the money,” (4) given the financial hardships caused by drought and other stressors.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

Similar to previous studies (e.g. McLeman et al. 2008), we found that hardships caused by drought were seen by ranchers as inseparable from a broader set of economic, social, and environmental pressures interacting at multiple scales, forces or barriers that create an “adaptation envelope” that shapes future options and trajectories (Wyborn et al. 2014). More specifically, ranchers negotiate a range of cultural, financial, and political barriers as they respond to drought. Cultural barriers include local ranching norms that constrain adaptation options and ideas about rancher independence that limit social networking and collective action. Financial barriers create an overall lack of resources for both short-term coping and long-term change, generated by low beef prices, high input costs, and unmanageable debt. Political barriers include anti-government sentiment which constrains participation in government programs and ideas about anthropogenic climate change that encourage a belief that “normal” or wetter conditions will resume. Ranchers

readily acknowledge that changing their operations in anticipation of future drought involves risk. The barriers described above, in particular a marked lack of financial resources, may discourage risk-taking.

Despite these barriers, ranchers were responding in a variety of ways to drought, pursuing changes consistent with those outlined in the range management and extension literature (e.g. see Hamilton 2003, McDougald et al. 2001). Short-term coping strategies appear to be increasing debt (e.g. through the purchase of expensive hay), decreasing income (e.g. through the reduction of herd size), and otherwise limiting future options (e.g. through overgrazing and selling land). Many ranchers face difficult trade-offs between building ecological resilience by lowering herd sizes and investing in rangeland health, or building financial resilience by maintaining herd sizes and overgrazing to sustain family income. In some cases, ranchers appeared to be making long-term changes by diversifying operations, reducing inputs, and preparing for future drought. However, it is difficult to determine which responses are effective over the short and long-term, and which reinforce the status quo versus transform ranches and communities into more sustainable and resilient systems.

Amenity migration illuminates the interaction of local and non-local forces and the difficulty of determining whether particular changes are coping, adaptive, or transformative. Ranch turnover is influenced by local drought along with numerous non-climatic stressors. Amenity migration is driven by non-local cultural processes including renewed interest in rurality and economic forces such as the availability of disposable income for some socioeconomic groups. When ranches sell to wealthy amenity owners the price of land skyrockets and remaining ranchers are unable to expand their ranches to

617 adapt to lower rangeland productivity. At the same time, more lands are available to lease
618 creating options for ranchers who need to access to additional grass during dry years.
619 Thus, under certain conditions amenity migration may create a “double exposure” that
620 deepens vulnerability by limiting access to land. Under other circumstances, amenity
621 migration may help buffer the impacts of drought on ranchers, decreasing vulnerability
622 and increasing adaptive capacity at the community or landscape scale.

623 Most ranchers in this study attributed drought to natural cycles and were skeptical
624 that anthropogenic climate change was driving local drought conditions. Similar to
625 previous studies (e.g. Lui et al. 2013, Milne et al. 2008), ranchers saw drought as a local
626 change or stressor rather than part of a global process like climate change. These ranchers
627 adhered to a sort of historic range of variability, implying that local conditions cycle or
628 shift around a historic mean, eventually returning to “normal.” Ranchers viewed drought
629 as a risk or threat, but many ranchers envisioned future drought risk as similar to past
630 drought risk. Multiple generations of ranchers and family stories of previous droughts
631 support the belief that conditions will improve, as most ranchers could recall past
632 droughts and the return of wetter years. Local ecological knowledge and family histories
633 are reinforced by beliefs that local changes, such as drought, are driven by natural cycles
634 as opposed to climate change.

635 But do people need to “believe” in anthropogenic climate change to engage in
636 effective adaptation? Adger et al. (2009, p 339) claim that “individual adaptation hinges
637 on whether an impact, anticipated or experienced, is perceived as a risk, and whether it
638 should (and could) be acted upon.” Similarly, Schneider et al. (2000) argue that
639 adaptation decisions depend, in part, on beliefs that the climate is actually changing.

While these assertions make sense, this study raises a number of questions about the complex relationship between climate change beliefs and the efficacy of adaptation to specific climate impacts, such as drought, over different temporal and spatial scales. It's unclear whether or not a belief in anthropogenic climate change actually influences the way that ranchers respond to drought. Do ranchers who believe that drought is driven by climate change invest in longer-term adaptations, while ranchers who see drought as part of a natural cycle focus on short-term changes? In this study, only a handful of ranchers were pursuing adaptations that anticipated long-term drought, indicating that climate skepticism, optimism about future conditions, and a limited sense of agency might be reducing investments in long-term adaptation. However, the ranchers who were investing in longer-term adaptations were either deeply skeptical of anthropogenic climate change or very uncertain about the causes of drought. Additionally, if it's difficult to determine which adaptive actions will be effective over the long-term, how should we evaluate the relationship between climate change beliefs and long-term adaptation?

At the same time, effective adaptation might require a reasonably accurate understanding of the drivers and nature of change. Ranchers might be more willing to invest in long-term adaptations if they anticipate that future drought will be deeper or more prolonged as compared with past drought, and if they recognize that anthropogenic climate change produces directional changes over large time scales. To the extent that the natural cycles argument fundamentally mischaracterizes the system and the nature of future of drought, does a belief that drought is driven by natural cycles somehow constrain adaptation?

The relationship between different perspectives on the causes of drought and ranchers' sense of agency and efficacy is also complicated. For some ranchers, a belief that drought was part of a natural cycle engendered a feeling of hope, because conditions would improve. Other ranchers felt a sense of futility and a lack of control in the face of a cycle they could neither predict nor influence. However, it's unclear if belief in anthropogenic climate change would be empowering, or simply reinforce the sense that forces beyond the control of individual ranchers were driving local drought conditions. This is a particularly important question because, as Hines et al. (1987) point out, if individuals do not perceive that they have power to change and instead exhibit low self-efficacy, they may be unable to act upon threats. Thus, a deep sense of lack of agency in combination with a lack of financial resources may help explain why so few ranchers have been able to pursue long-term adaptations.

A focus on household adaptation also brings scalar processes into focus. Most ranchers in this study characterized adaptation as an individual endeavor, leaving little room for collective action or government involvement. Consistent with the anti-government sentiment widespread in the rural west, ranchers were typically critical of government programs and resisted the idea that government could play a beneficial role in mitigating impacts and facilitating adaptation, aligning their view of adaptation with their political ideologies and identities. But, given such limited financial resources, can ranchers successfully adapt as individuals or families? Some research suggests that the household may be more resilient and adaptive over the long-term as compared with communities or nation states (Netting 1993). At the same time, the adaptation options available to ranching households are enabled and constrained by forces beyond their

control, including national agricultural and climate change policies, global commodity markets and trade agreements, and state-level conservation programs. Joyce et al. (2013) argue that increased coordination between ranchers and federal agencies could reduce the impacts of drought and increase resilience. Access to non-local knowledge, networks, and resources is believed to increase adaptive capacity, but political ideologies that are anti-government and individualistic may limit ranchers' willingness to draw on such resources.

Further, to the extent that ranchers' self-proclaimed independence limits opportunities for local collective action, neighbors may not exchange ideas or pool resources in ways that increase adaptive capacity. Social networks are often cited as a source of adaptive capacity (e.g. see Oliver-Smith 1996, Scheffer et al. 2002, Adger, 2003). However, to the extent that drought increases community tensions and conflict between neighbors, social networks may be strained during prolonged drought, limiting options for collective action. If ranchers find a way to work together, they could become a powerful political force advocating for climate change mitigation and adaptation policies and programs that benefit agricultural producers in meaningful ways (e.g. through improved insurance programs, new irrigation technologies, or funding to transition operations). However, this sort of collective action requires that ranchers envision that drought impacts them as a group, and that responses be scaled up beyond individual ranches.

Since many ranchers do not believe in anthropogenic climate change and are thus unlikely to support climate policy, strategies to mitigate the impacts of drought could instead target the non-climate related factors that make ranchers vulnerable to drought, a

strategy recommended by Lemos (2007). In the case of ranching in the Western U.S., market volatility, low profit margins, invasive plants, the cost of inputs, and debt cycles create the kinds of “double exposures” that amplify risks and deepen vulnerability to climate change. Thus, some approaches to addressing future drought risk could include increasing irrigation efficiency, decreasing debt, lowering the cost of inputs, diversifying operations, and adopting more sustainable grazing practices. These are the types of “no regrets” strategies that yield benefits even in the absence of climate change, function well under a range of possible future conditions, and can be easily adjusted or abandoned in the short term (Hallegatte 2009, Lempert et al. 2006). However, many of these strategies would require government involvement and collective action beyond individual ranches, which could conflict with the independent nature of ranchers. Nascent support for government programs like EQIP and collaborative drought planning in the Big Hole and Blackfoot Valleys suggests a need for future research on how the nature of government programs and the experience of collaboration might influence partnerships across scales and sectors.

A number of scholars advocate for additional research focused on the processes of individual and autonomous local level adaptation (e.g. Head et al. 2011 and Miller et al. 2013). Such studies provide important insights into how adaptation actors in real places negotiate the complex mix of factors that influence adaptation decisions. Future research in this arena should focus on scalar interactions, in particular how local level adaptation is enabled and constrained by forces interacting at multiple scales and which leverage points permit fruitful interventions to spur adaptation. Further, given widespread skepticism about anthropogenic climate change in the U.S., additional research into the

influence of climate change beliefs on the effectiveness of individual-scale adaptation is critical.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all of the ranchers who generously donated their time to participate in interviews.

References

Adger, W., N. Adger, S. Dessai, M. Goulden, M. Hulme, I. Lorenzoni, D. R. Nelson, L. O. Naess, J. Wolf, and A. Wreford, 2009: Are there social limits to adaptation to climate change? *Climatic Change*, **93**, 335–354.

Adger, W.N., J. Barnett, K. Brown, N. Marshall, and K. O'Brien, 2012: Cultural dimensions of climate change impacts and adaptation. *Nature Climate Change*, **3**, 112–117.

Adger, W.N., 2003: Social capital, collective action and adaptation to climate change. *Econ. Geogr.*, **79**, 387–404.

Brandenburg, A.M., and M.S. Carroll, 1995: Your place or mine? The effect of place creation on environmental values and landscape meanings. *Society Nat. Resources*, **8**, 381–398.

Burawoy, M., 1998: The extended case method. *Sociological Theory*, **16**, 4-33.

Chambers, J.C., and M. Pellant, 2008: Climate change impacts on northwestern and intermountain United States rangelands. *Rangelands*, **30**, 29-33.

CCSP, 2008: Preliminary review of adaptation options for climate sensitive ecosystems and resources. *A Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research*. Julius, S.H., J.M. West (eds.), J.S. Baron, B. Griffith, L.A. Joyce, P. Kareiva, B.D. Keller, M.A. Palmer, C.H. Peterson, and J.M. Scott (authors). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, 910 pp.

Cooney, C., 2010: The perception factor: Climate change gets personal. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **118**, A484–A489.

Crane, T., C. Roncoli, J. Paz, N.E. Breuer, K. Broad, C. Fraisse, K. Ingram, D. Zierden and G. Hoogenboom, 2010: Forecast skill and farmers' skills: Seasonal climate forecasts and agricultural risk management in the Southeastern United States. *Wea. Climate Soc.*, **2**, 44-59.

DisasterAssistance.gov (a website describing federal disaster assistance programs)

775 Dunlap, R.E., and A.M. McCright, 2011: The politicization of climate change and
 776 polarization in the American public's view of global warming, 2001-2010. *Sociol Quart.*,
 777 **52**, 155-194.
 778
 779 Gallup 2015: Gallup Poll Social Series: Environment. Gallup News Service.
 780
 781 Hall, C., and A. Wreford, 2012: Adaptation to climate change: the attitudes of
 782 stakeholders in the livestock industry. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **17**, 207–222.
 783
 784 Hallegatte, S., 2009: Strategies to adapt to an uncertain climate change. *Global Environ.*
 785 *Chang.*, **19**, 240-247.
 786
 787 Hamilton, W.T., 2003: Drought: Managing for and during the bad years. *Ranch*
 788 *Management: Integrating Cattle, Wildlife, and Range*, C.A. Forgason, F.C. Bryant and
 789 P.C. Genho, Eds. King Ranch, Kingsville, TX.
 790
 791 Head, L., J. Atchison, A. Gates and P.Muir, 2011: A fine-grained study of the experience
 792 of drought, risk and climate change among Australian wheat farming households. *Annals*
 793 *of the Assoc of American Geographers*, **101**, 1089-1108.
 794
 795 Hines, J.M., H.R. Hungerford, and A.N. Tomera, 1987: Analysis and synthesis of
 796 research on responsible environmental behaviour: A meta-analysis. *J. Environ. Educ.*, **18**,
 797 1-18.

798

799 Hobson K. and S. Niemeyer, 2012; "What sceptics believe": the effects of information
800 and deliberation on climate change scepticism. *Public Understanding of Science*, **22**, 396-
801 412.

802

803 Hulme, M., E.M. Barrow, N.W. Arnell, P.A. Harrison, T.C. Johns, and T.E. Downing,
804 1999: Relative impacts of human-induced climate change and natural climate variability.
805 *Nature*, **397**, 688-691.

806

807 Huntsinger, L. and J.L. Oviedo, 2014: Ecosystem services are social–ecological services
808 in a traditional pastoral system: the case of California’s Mediterranean rangelands.
809 *Ecology and Society*, **19**, 8.

810

811 Joyce, L.A., D.D. Briske, J.R. Brown, H.W. Polley, B.A. McCarl, and D.R. Bailey, 2013:
812 Climate change and North American rangelands: Assessment of mitigation and
813 adaptation strategies. *Rangeland Ecol Manage*, **66**, 512-528.

814

815 Kahan, D.M., M. Wittlin, E. Peters, P. Slovic, L.L. Ouellette, D. Braman and G.N.
816 Mandel, 2011: The tragedy of the risk-perception commons: Culture conflict, rationality
817 conflict, and climate change. *Temple University Legal Studies Research Paper*, No. 2011-
818 26. *Cultural Cognition Project*, Working Paper No. 89; *Yale Law & Economics Research*
819 *Paper No. 435*; *Yale Law School*, Public Law Working Paper No. 230, 31 pp.

820

821 Kandlikar, K., and J. Risbey, 2000: Agricultural impacts of climate change: If adaptation
822 is the answer, what is the Question? *Climatic Change*, **45**, 529 – 539.

823

824 Leichenko, R.M., and K.L. O'Brien, 2002: The dynamics of rural vulnerability to global
825 change: the case of Southern Africa. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global*
826 *Change*, **7**, 1–18.

827

828 Leichenko, R.M., and K.L. O'Brien, 2008: *Global Environmental Change and*
829 *Globalization: Double Exposures*. Oxford University Press, 192 pp.

830

831 Lemos, M.C., 2007: Drought, governance, and adaptive capacity in North East Brazil: A
832 case study of Ceara. UNDP Human Development Report 2007/2008 Occasional Paper.
833 16 pp.

834

835 Lempert, R.J., D.G. Groves, S.W. Popper, and S.C. Bankes, 2006: A general, analytic
836 method for generating robust strategies and narrative scenarios. *Manag. Sci.*, **52**, 514–
837 528.

838

839 Liu, A., W.J. Smith Jr., and A.S. Safi, 2013: Rancher and farmer perceptions of climate
840 change in Nevada, USA. *Climatic Change*, **122**, 313-327.

841

842 Maczko, K., J.A. Tanaka, R. Breckenridge, L. Hiding, H.T. Heintz, W.E. Fox, U.P.
843 Kreuter, C.S. Duke, J.E. Mitchell, and D.W. McCollum, 2011: Rangeland ecosystem
844 goods and services: values and evaluation of opportunities for ranchers and land
845 managers. *Rangelands*, **33**, 30-36.

846

847 McCarthy J.J., O. Canziani, N.A. Leary, D.J. Dokken, and K.S. White (eds.), 2001:
848 Climate change 2001: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. IPCC working group II.
849 Cambridge University Press, pp 19-73.

850

851 McCright A.M., R.E. Dunlap, and C. Xiao, 2014: The impacts of temperature anomalies
852 and political orientation on perceived winter warming. *Nature Climate Change*, **4**, 1077-
853 1081.

854

855 McDougald, N.K., W.E. Frost, and R.L. Phillips, 2001: Livestock management during
856 drought. Rangeland Management Series 8034 University of California Agriculture and
857 Natural Resources, pp 1-6.

858

859 McLeman, R., D. Mayo, E. Strebeck, and B. Smit, 2008: Drought adaptation in rural
860 eastern Oklahoma in the 1930s: Lessons for climate change adaptation research. *Mitig.*
861 *Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **13**, 379-400.

862

863 Miller, M., M. Anderson, C.A. Francis, C. Kruger, C. Barford, J. Park and B. McCown,
864 2013: Critical research needs for successful food systems adaptation to climate change. *J*
865 *of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, **3**, 161–175.
866

867 Milne, M., N. Stenekes, and J. Russell, 2008: Climate risk and industry adaptation.
868 Australian Bureau of Rural Sciences, 108 pp.
869

870 Morgan, J.A., J.D. Derner, D.G. Milchunas, and E. Pendall, 2008: Management
871 implications of global change for Great Plains rangelands. *Rangelands*, **30**, 18-22.
872

873 Moser S.C., and J.A. Ekstrom, 2010: A framework to diagnose barriers to
874 climate change adaptation. *PNAS*, **107**, 22026–22031.
875

876 Nelson, D.R., W.N. Adger, and K. Brown, 2007: Adaptation to environmental change:
877 contributions of a resilience framework. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resources.*, **32**, 395–419.
878

879 Oliver-Smith, A., 1996: Anthropological research on hazards and disasters. *Annu. Rev.*
880 *Anthropol.*, **25**, 303–328.
881

882 Patterson, M.E., and D.R. Williams, 2002: *Collecting and Analyzing Qualitative Data:*
883 *Hermeneutic Principles, Methods, and Case Examples*. Sagamore Publishing.
884

885 Pederson, G.T., S.T. Gray, C.A. Woodhouse, D.B. Fagre, J.S. Littell, E. Watson, B.H.

886 Luckman, and L.J. Graumlich, 2011: The unusual nature of recent snowpack declines in
 887 the North American Cordillera. *Science*, **333**, 332-335.

888

889 Raymond C.M., and G.M. Robinson, 2013: Factors affecting rural landholders’
 890 adaptation to climate change: Insights from formal institutions and communities of
 891 practice. *Global Environmental Change*, **23**, 103–114.

892

893 Reid, S., B. Smit, W. Caldwell, and S. Belliveau, 2007: Vulnerability and adaptation to
 894 climate risks in Ontario agriculture. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **12**, 609–637.

895

896 Risbey, J., M. Kandlikar, H. Dowlatabadi, and D. Graetz, 1999: Scale, context and
 897 decision making in agricultural adaptation to climate variability and change. *Mitig.*
 898 *Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **4**, 137–164.

899

900 Safi, A.S., W.J. Smith Jr., and Z. Liu, 2012: Rural Nevada and climate change:
 901 Vulnerability, beliefs, and risk perception. *Risk Analysis*, **32**, 1041-1059.

902

903 Sayre, N.F., L. Carlisle, L. Huntsinger, G. Fisher, and A. Shattuck, 2012: The role of
 904 rangelands in diversified farming systems: innovations, obstacles, and opportunities in
 905 the USA. *Ecology and Society*, **17**, 43.

906

907 Scheffer, M., F. Westely, W. A. Brock, and M. Holmgren, 2002: Dynamic interaction of
 908 societies and ecosystems—linking theories from ecology, economy and sociology, in: L.

909 H. Gunderson & C. Holling (eds.) *Panarchy: Understanding Transformations in Human*
 910 *and Natural Systems*. Washington, Island Press, 56 pp.
 911
 912 Schneider, S.H., W.E. Easterling, and L.O. Mearns, 2000: Adaptation: Sensitivity to
 913 natural variability, agent assumptions, and dynamic climate changes. *Climatic Change*,
 914 **45**, 203-221.
 915
 916 Smit, B., and M. Skinner, 2002: Adaptation options in agriculture to climate change: a
 917 typology. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **7**, 85–114.
 918
 919 Strauss, A., and J. Corbin, 1990: *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory*
 920 *procedures and techniques*. Sage Publishing.
 921
 922 Thornton T.F., and N. Manasfi, 2010: Adaptation—genuine and spurious:
 923 demystifying adaptation processes in relation to climate change. *Environ Soc: Adv Res*, **1**,
 924 132–155.
 925
 926 USDA, 2007: Major Uses of Land in the United States 2007. Economic Research
 927 Service.
 928
 929 Wall, E. and K. Marzall, 2006: Adaptive capacity for climate change in Canadian rural
 930 communities. *Local Environment: The International Journal of Justice and*
 931 *Sustainability*, **11**, 373 – 397.

932

933 Whitson, R.E., 1975: Ranch decision-making under uncertainty—An illustration. *J.*

934 *Range Manage*, **28**, 267-270.

935

936 Wyborn, C., L. Yung, D. Murphy, and D.R. Williams, 2014: Situating adaptation: how

937 governance challenges and perceptions of uncertainty influence adaptation in the Rocky

938 Mountains. *Reg Environ Change* DOI 10.1007/s10113-014-0663-3.

939

940 Zhao, M. and S. Running, 2012: Drought-induced reduction in global terrestrial net

941 primary production from 2000 through 2009. *Science*. **329**, 940-943.