

In preparation for writing your RP- Malcomb et al (2014) discussion, please consider Tate’s (2013) framework of vulnerability modeling and uncertainty and related debates.

| Modelling Phase   | Common Decisions   | Malcomb et al (2014) |
|---|--|----------------------|
| Model Structure   | <i>Deductive</i> (based on theory)<br><i>Hierarchical</i> (deductive, organized by sub-themes)<br><i>Inductive</i> (based on data)   |                      |
| Indicator Set (Hinkel 2011)   | <i>Deductive</i> (theory-based)<br><i>Normative</i> (value judgements)<br><i>Inductive / statistical</i> (based on data characteristics <i>vis a vis</i> outcomes)<br><i>Non-substantial</i> (based on data characteristics alone)<br><i>Practical</i> (availability and cost) |                      |
| Analysis Scale  | County Polygons<br>Census Tract Polygons   |                      |
| Measurement Error   | Census Undercounts<br>American Community Survey 90% Confidence Interval Margin of Error  |                      |
| Transformation (often called normalization in cartography)                    | Totals or Counts<br>Density<br>Percentage<br>Rate  |                      |
| Normalization   | Inversion<br>$1 / x$ or $\max - x$<br>min-max scaling<br>$(x - \min) / (\max - \min)$<br>Z-score standardization<br>$(x - \text{mean}) / \text{stddev}$  |                      |
| Weighting   | Normative<br>Deductive<br>Equal Weights<br>Inductive / Statistical   |                      |
| Aggregation   | Additive<br>(compensable/substitutable)<br>Multiplicative / Geometric<br>(interactive)<br>Pareto ranking   |                      |
| Uncertainty analysis<br>Sensitivity analysis<br>Validation (Rufat et al 2019) | Monte Carlo simulation<br>Expert opinion<br>Statistical test <i>vis a vis</i> outcomes   |                      |

Recalling our model for thinking about error, uncertainty, and ethics in spatial research...

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1) Real World (Referent)</p>  | <p>Real World</p>   |
| <p>2) Problem Conceptualization &amp; Problem Framing<br/> a) Are you asking the right questions?<br/> Framing them the right way?<br/> b) Are the concepts &amp; theories even appropriate?</p> | <p>--- filter ---</p>                                       |
| <p>3) Construct Validity<br/> a) Referent – Symbol – Concept<br/> b) Applies to data representations and analytical models</p>   | <p>Conception<br/> --- filter ---</p>                       |
| <p>4) Error (Measurement / Representation)<br/> a) Accuracy vs Precision<br/> b) Location vs Attribute</p>   | <p>Measurement &amp; Representation<br/> --- filter ---</p> |
| <p>5) Error in Motion (Analysis)<br/> a) Propagation<br/> b) Uncertainty<br/> c) Sensitivity</p>   | <p>Analysis<br/> --- filter ---</p>                         |
| <p>6) Ethics<br/> a) Should we be doing this research? How should we represent results?<br/> b) Participants, Audience, Responsibility</p>   | <p>Interpretation, validation</p>                           |

Can conducting **reproductions** (using the same data and techniques to attempt to produce the same outputs) help with vulnerability model uncertainty? How?

Can conducting **replications** (using new data & study contexts to test generalizability of the original study findings) help with vulnerability model uncertainty? How?

**References**

Hinkel, J. 2011. "Indicators of vulnerability and adaptive capacity": Towards a clarification of the science-policy interface. *Global Environmental Change* 21 (1):198–208.

Longley, P. A., M. F. Goodchild, D. J. Maguire, and D. W. Rhind. 2008. *Geographical information systems and science* 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley.

Malcomb, D. W., E. A. Weaver, and A. R. Krakowka. 2014. Vulnerability modeling for sub-Saharan Africa: An operationalized approach in Malawi. *Applied Geography* 48:17–30.

Rufat, S., E. Tate, C. T. Emrich, and F. Antolini. 2019. How Valid Are Social Vulnerability Models? *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 109 (4):1131–1153.

Tate, E. 2013. Uncertainty Analysis for a Social Vulnerability Index. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 103 (3):526–543.