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Abstract

Emergency response agencies commonly focus on how hard infrastructure will interact with extreme climatic and geologic events: bridges during an earthquake and buildings following a tornado, for example. Peoples’ actual experience of these extreme events vary, however, based on socially constructed consequences of natural hazard events and their interaction with a depleted or robust social safety net.

Previous research shows people living with depleted social safety nets and who experience a natural hazard event are likely to help where they see disaster. Individuals consistently form groups, called emergent groups, to organize their efforts. This research explored emergent groups that formed in Portland, Oregon, to address food insecurity in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Twenty-two emergent groups were identified. Nine organizers participated in structured interviews about the groups they helped form. Six of those groups remain active after two years; three of which are now codified as tax-exempt 501(c)3 organizations. Those groups now have paid staff, contracts with social service agencies to provide regular meals, and plan to provide additional services in the future. This research found emergent groups were disproportionately led by people of color with lived experience of poverty who struggled to finance their efforts. Anticipating the formation of emergent groups could mitigate disasters following hazard events. Creating streamlined financial support pathways for emergent groups could lead to more equitable and flexible resource distribution for the communities most impacted by hazard events.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Geologic and climatic hazard events like hurricanes, tornadoes, and earthquakes are often characterized by a short duration of disruption followed by a long recovery period. In sudden-onset hazard events like earthquakes and tornadoes, it is widely known that those most geographically proximal to the disaster, such as family members and neighbors, are the first on the scene and most likely to rescue survivors. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the National Guard are usually the first large organizations on disaster scenes (in the U.S.), providing support such as food, clean water, and mass shelter – usually a few days or weeks following a disaster (Gardner, 2008). Established aid organizations such as the Red Cross and the Salvation Army are experienced in disaster response and are often the next to respond, followed by local established groups like churches, citizen groups, and volunteer organizations (Gardner, 2008). The large organizations move in choreographed and replicable steps in their disaster responses. Often, however, they are not adept at shifting to meet the unique needs of each place or people affected (Tierney, Lindell, & Perry, 2001). Small grassroots volunteer groups, first identified and coined as “emergent groups” by Stallings and Quarantelli (1985), inevitably form to provide relief to perceived unmet needs, regardless of the location or type of disaster (Strandh & Eklund, 2018; Twigg & Mosel, 2017). A well-known example of this phenomena is The Cajun Army, formed after the Great Flood of 2016 in Louisiana, whose all-volunteer members ferried people to safety and supplied food in the absence of swift government response (Markowitz, 2017). A more recent example
is the work of Chef Jose Andres and the flexible, responsive, grassroots style efforts of World Central Kitchen (Andrés, 2017).

This research aims to record and discuss the phenomenon of emergent groups in an understudied type of disaster and setting; the prolonged global pandemic in an urban setting. This study will contribute to emergent group, disaster response, COVID-19 response, and food justice literature by elevating the understudied emergent volunteer groups that formed to address food insecurity in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Although volunteer response groups emerged globally to address social service gaps in education, childcare, and housing, due to a limited scope this research will focus on groups in Portland, Oregon, that formed after March 8th, 2020. This research aims to survey a sample in one city in the U.S. that could be an example of other places and emergent efforts.

Despite repeated calls from researchers to incorporate social resiliency into municipal disaster planning (Roque, Pijawka, & Wutich, 2020; Twigg & Mosel, 2017; Aldrich & Meyer, 2014; Gardener, 2008), citizen engagement and social capital is largely overlooked in disaster resiliency planning in favor of hard infrastructure, such as earthquake-proofing bridges and levees or retrofitting buildings. This research challenges the contemporary construct of the white, male, able-bodied, middle-aged, middle-class, and Anglo emergency manager (Enarson & Phillips, 2000) to include emergent groups as an important aspect of municipal emergency response (Twigg & Mosel, 2017). By recording new volunteer efforts that were not state-sponsored, affiliated with a larger non-profit, or already in existence, this research explores the role of emergent group response where emergent groups literature is sparse: the prolonged global pandemic.
The COVID-19 pandemic was, and at the time of writing (2022) continues to be, experienced as a disaster by many. Disasters disrupt the “fabric of community life and stress social systems” (Fritz, 1961). President Trump (pursuant to Sec. 501(b) of Stafford Act) declared COVID-19 a federal disaster on March 13, 2020 (COVID-19 Disaster Declarations, 2020). An important distinction that will be illuminated in greater detail to follow: although COVID-19 was declared a “Natural Disaster” by tax judges (Nussbaum & Mason, 2020) and at least one state Supreme Court ruled it a “Force Majeure Event” (Adler Pollock & Sheehan P.C., 2021), this research will conceptualize the COVID-19 pandemic as a disaster, but not a natural disaster. It is widely accepted among disaster scholars that there is no such thing as a natural disaster (O'Keefe, Westgate, & Wisner, 1976). Disasters are seen as the intersection of hazard events and a vulnerable human population (O'Keefe, Westgate, & Wisner, 1976) and “in every phase and aspect of a disaster – causes, vulnerability, preparedness, results and response and reconstruction – the contours of disaster and the difference between who lives and who dies is… a social calculus” (Smith, 2006). Regardless of the natural origins of the SARS CoV-2 virus mutation that caused the COVID-19 pandemic, the outcomes – deaths, economic disruptions, and impacts on mental health - of the pandemic were in no way a natural unfolding of events.

The COVID-19 pandemic and the state’s (at the national, state, county, and city levels) uncoordinated response “laid bare global structural inequalities and injustices, including those involving food,” (Lloro, 2021). Food insecurity increased globally (Fernando, 2020), nationally (Feeding America, 2021), and in Oregon (Edwards, 2020) during the COVID-
The pandemic also exacerbated the existing extra burdens and structural inequities for women, people of color, and especially women of color (Cox, 2020; Sawn, 2020; Sultana, 2021).

Unlike an earthquake, in which those closest to the geographic epicenter are most acutely affected by the immediate effects of the natural hazard event, the effects of the COVID-19 disaster resulted in unequal negative effects based on employment, race, class, and gender (Alkon et al, 2020; Cox, 2020; McLaren et al, 2020; Swan, 2020). For example, an early study in February of 2020 from the Pew Research Center found workers’ education level was the key determinant of opportunities to work from home (Rakesh Kochhar, 2020). According to that study, white workers were likely to transition to working from home (44%) while Latinx workers were the least likely to work from home (26%) followed by Black workers (34%). Essential workers who were required to continue to work in person and not allowed flexible schedules were more likely to be exposed to COVID-19. These workers are more likely to be Black, Latinx and female (Alkon et al, 2020; McLaren et al, 2020). Food justice scholars have long argued that Black, Latinx, and Native Americans are more likely to experience food insecurity and exploitation in the labor market because of structural racism and economic inequalities (Alkon et al, 2020). Alkon, Bowen, Kato, and Young note that the “underlying medical conditions” often cited as the cause of death in COVID-19 patients by the NIAID Director Dr. Anthony Fauci, are more likely to affect Black, Latinx and Native American people as a direct result of racial capitalism (Alkon et al, 2020).
The pandemic affected access to reproductive healthcare unequally. The effects of COVID-19 resulted in service disruptions in sexual & reproductive healthcare centers mainly used by people with low or no incomes (Human Rights Watch, 2021). Decreased access to abortion services, contraceptives, and HIV/STI testing occasioned changes in sexual behaviors, menstruation, and pregnancy control and intentions (Mukherjee et al., 2021). McLaren and co-authors (2020) apply Caroline Moser (1993)’s triple-burden concept of the undue work for women in their vignettes of women’s experiences during COVID-19 in Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Vietnam, and Australia. The authors describe how women in these places experienced increased work and stress in productive (paid employment), reproductive (unpaid caretaking for children in the home due to school closures and for the sick), and community support (volunteering in the community). The “third burden” of providing community support during a disaster is the focus of this research.

Community support, as defined by Caroline Moser (1993, p. 35), are activities people undertake in their free time in the community, rather than in the home or workplace, to ensure “the provision and maintenance of scarce resources of collective consumption” including providing water, healthcare, and education. Moser defines the unpaid work as “community management”, meaning the work carried out at the community level around the allocation, provisioning, and managing of items of collective consumption” (ibid). These activities are most often performed by women when unpaid but by men when paid or may result in an increase of status or paid work (ibid). Although Moser describes community management mainly in relation to women-led protest movements in the Global South to ensure basic services provisioning in opposition to the government; I follow
McLaren and co-authors in their application of the triple-burden framework to all geographies (2020) and apply the triple-burden framework to emergent groups in Portland, Oregon.

Moser’s discussion of community management work corresponds to disaster sociologists Stallings & Quarantelli’s (1985) definition of emergent groups: “groups of citizens…that emerge around perceived needs or problems associated with both natural and technological disaster situations” (p.94) with one notable omission: gender. While Moser explicitly brings attention to community management work as gendered, and mainly performed by low-income women as an extension of their household provisioning, Stallings & Quarantelli (1985) do not mention gender in their article aside from the introductory vignette, which is as follows: “Mrs. B” hears a rumor about the need for volunteers during a chaotic disaster situation. Her husband, “Mr. B”, accompanies her to the evacuation site and manages to create order from chaos by jumping on a table and asking for evacuees to line up, and then “from then on, Mr. B was consulted for directions and decisions” (ibid, p. 93). We do not hear from Mrs. B again, although it was her impetus to volunteer. Stallings & Quarantelli provide evidence that emergent groups inevitably arise in disaster situations and argue that they are a useful service to both emergency management plans and more codified organizations. In 1985 Stallings & Quarantelli argued these groups should be anticipated and supported by local government emergency responses, but did not address how to identify emergent groups. Gender and race are also absent in subsequent literature reviews of emergent groups in nine disasters (Strandh & Eklund, 2018) and explorations of emergent groups in urban contexts (Twigg & Mosel, 2017).
Intersectional feminist disaster sociologists Enarson and Phillips (2000) and others draw attention to the conspicuous absence of feminist theory in disaster sociology even as gender, race and class shapes disaster vulnerability and response. I argue that by not explicitly noting the expected role of race, class, and gender in anticipated emergent groups, local emergency management agencies may be providing support to groups comprised of the proverbial Mr. Bs when in practice the majority of the work in need of support is undertaken by Mrs. Y, Ms. X, and Miss Z, who are most likely not white.

Templeton et. al. (2020) take this a step further and argue state support of groups, especially emergent groups, based on identity, either pre-existing or formed as a response to a disaster, is a lifesaving measure in disaster response. The authors postulate ignoring those preexisting identities could increase aversion to safety responses from vulnerable populations and increase morbidity.

Popular media and grey literature described a few volunteer-led groups that emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic. Volunteer activities included creating new gardening spaces, buying meals for health care workers, cooking meals for anyone who wanted them, and new mutual aid groups that formed to address a variety of needs. I did not find an existing database or commentary on emergent groups in response to COVID-19, nor emergent groups in Portland, nor inclusion of the role of race, class, and gender in creating and sustaining emergent groups. Due to scope, this research aims to examine emergent groups in Portland, Oregon, during the COVID-19 pandemic to contribute to emergent group, disaster response, COVID-19 response, and food justice literature. A discussion of emergence and the intersections of race, class, and gender of these volunteers is absolutely
critical to understanding this phenomenon, but it is outside the scope of this limited research.

The motivation behind this research is to add to disaster literature that discusses this new type of disaster and one that is increasingly frequent (Quarantelli et. al., 2017) - the prolonged, uneven, transboundary catastrophe, and to elevate community food work efforts during disasters. This research may help food system activists and emergency managers better prepare for future disasters of this type by identifying the types of emergent groups, who starts them, and the perceived gap they aimed to address. Current climate and public health research indicate global disasters, both climactic and human, may be the new normal (McMahon, 2021). U.S. Government-sponsored National Academy of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine is shifting from examining natural disasters to the “complex interactions among the psychical climate system, earth’s ecosystems, and the human systems whose dynamics are governed by human actions” (National Academies of Sciences, 2021). This research aims to share lessons learned from emergent food security group responses to the COVID-19 pandemic to encourage a more adaptive response in preparation for the next hazard event.

This research aims to answer these questions: What are the characteristics of emergent groups in Portland, Oregon that formed to address food insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic? What are the similarities the volunteers shared with those they aimed to serve, and what are the differences? Is prior experience volunteering mandatory to volunteering during a disaster?
To answer these questions and in the gap of peer-reviewed literature on the topic, I conducted a search on popular print and web-based media sites and social media to find emergent groups that seemed to address food insecurity that started after March 8th, 2020. I asked people who volunteered with these groups for a brief, 30-minute Zoom call that was recorded and transcribed. Interview questions asked about characteristics of the emergent groups, including the service area, services provided, fundraising strategy, and the current status of the group. I also asked the volunteers about previous volunteering experience and their commonalities and differences with those they aimed to serve, among other data points detailed in the Methods chapter. I then created comparative tables and conducted a thematic analysis of the short interviews, drew conclusions in the Results chapter and discussed the findings in context of existing literature in the Discussion chapter.

*Why this research now?*

My interest in this research is motivated in part by my direct experience during the COVID-19 pandemic. In line with previous activist-researchers (Lloro, 2020; Sbicca, 2018, others), I use my experience to bridge praxis and theory. In April of 2020, two other women and I created a volunteer emergent group and crowdfunded money from the community, bought restaurant meals from locally owned food businesses, and gave them away to anyone who showed up to get meals. That work continues at the time of writing, and my experience as a volunteer during the COVID-19 pandemic drives my deep interest in this research.
Positionality statement

I approach this research intending to leverage my immutable characteristics to uplift the work of others who, because of racial capitalism and patriarchy, are not given a fair treatment. Racism is a form of oppression that categorizes people in hierarchies based on their race or perceived race. Patriarchy is a system of governance in which men hold an undue level of power and where women are largely excluded from power. Structural racism and patriarchy refer to the macro-level conditions through which societies maintain racism and patriarchy in mutually reinforcing systems (housing, education, healthcare, employment, eldercare, etc). These forces are universal in our current social and economic structures and impact every aspect of life, including life prior to and during a disaster. By identifying the existence and impacts of structural racism and patriarchy on emergent groups, I aim to move towards approaching this research with an anti-racist and feminist lens.

To start building this lens, I will first identify my own characteristics that may be influenced and affected by structural racism and patriarchy: I am white-presenting, cis-gender, able-bodied, and credentialed. I am a female Jewish researcher and community member in Corvallis, Oregon with a middle-class worldview. My experiences in higher education informed the specific research questions, gives me access resources to conduct this research, and trained me in social cues needed to gain access to academic and government spaces. My access to education allows me to ask these questions of community volunteers and potentially publish written research, and my history and background will influence
how I interpret data I collect. My attitudes and experience volunteering drive my interest in this specific topic.

Emergent groups form to address a perceived gap in services, but for volunteers whose normalized experience is that of purposeful and systemic disinvestment, this experience of being ignored by the state is not new. Previous attempts to engage with the government or the media may have gone unanswered for some of the respondents to this study. Some may not trust the government due to state-sanctioned or structural violence, and other groups formed or pivoted in direct response to the violent murder of George Floyd, a Black man, by a white police officer on May 25, 2020. Those experiences could impact willingness to engage with this research and with academia in general. My identities and personal experience helped me build a certain level of comfort in academic, organizational, and government spaces. In high school I lobbied for political issues in Washington DC. In my undergraduate experience I engaged with public leaders at the local and national level and as a master’s student I interned at the City of Portland, collaborating with government employees. I aim to approach volunteers with sensitivity around our different experiences and comfort level engaging in state institutions, and especially when working with Black, Indigenous and other people in communities affected by systemic racism.

I also expect the simultaneous crisis of the COVID-19 pandemic and the murder of George Floyd impacted volunteers differently. As a white-presenting woman who was not in the streets fighting for my communities’ survival and legitimacy, I expect some volunteers will share what they are comfortable sharing with me, and will withhold details if they perceive that I am not of their group, or had a different experience. I intend to approach this topic
by acknowledging my position and experience, and allowing research participants to share to the level of detail they are comfortable. Because I am not approaching this research as a member of the communities most affected by the simultaneous disasters I do expect some potential respondents may not engage with this research. I respect and understand that decision, and will do my best to uplift research of and from those communities.

I am interested in food security because of my lived experience in very different types of food sheds. I grew up in the Midwest where we either drove for over an hour to the grocery store or ate what we grew and raised. Then my family moved to Oregon, where I learned about kale and chard and a panoply of diverse foods. I have also experienced the frustrations of working 60 hours a week in food service and being unable to pay my rent, bills, and buy enough of the food I wanted, going to food pantries and picking through the wiltly kale and dried beans. My undergraduate experience taught me that food insecurity is a more approachable way to talk about poverty, without scaring people away by saying “poverty” and “capitalism”. So, I hope you follow me through this thesis knowing that when I write Food Insecurity, I’m really writing about poverty. I hope this research will elevate the voices of community food activists and contribute to the legitimization of community support and emergent groups during disasters.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

This thesis aims to understand the phenomenon of emergent volunteer efforts that formed in response to the COVID-19 pandemic in Portland; therefore, I will start by discussing relevant literature on disasters and the phenomena of emergent volunteer groups during disasters. Literature that centers race & gender in emergent groups will be discussed to frame the attention given to race and gender in this research, and I will close with a brief review of community food work literature to illustrate food insecurity as one digestible aspect of larger social inequalities.

What just happened? Was COVID-19 a disaster?

In short, yes. COVID-19 was a disaster. A robust debate in various fields of literature including geography (Harriss, Hohenemser, and Kates, 1978), anthropology (Trivedi & Koons, 2021; Henry, 2005; Oliver-Smith, 1999), and sociology (Quarantelli, “What is a disaster?”, 1998; Tiereny et. al., 2001) among others tangle with the question of defining exactly what constitutes a disaster. Geographers generally understand disasters as the interaction of a hazard event on a society, in a limited time and geographic area. Disaster anthropologists view disasters as making the more complex processes of existence visible (Trivedi & Koons, 2021). For this research I will use one of the early disaster scholars, Charles E. Fritz’s, definition of a disaster to differentiate it from the ongoing household and societal disaster of living with income inequality, poverty, and the effects of racism. Fritz defines disasters as an external force that “disrupts the fabric of community life and stresses social systems”. Although the COVID-19 pandemic was not a geologic or climatic
hazard event such as a hurricane, earthquake, or wildfire, the pandemic unequivocally disrupted the fabric of community life and stressed social systems.

President Trump declared COVID-19 a federal disaster (pursuant to Sec. 501(b) of Stafford Act) on March 13th, 2020. On March 28, 2020, President Trump granted Oregon a Major Disaster Declaration (4499DR-OR) in response to the COVID-19 Pandemic. This declaration allows for the filing of certain insurance claims, the activation of FEMA’s public assistance program, and other money-moving bureaucratic processes. Although the State and Federal government declared a disaster, understanding why COVID-19 pandemic was a disaster and situating COVID-19 in previous disaster literature is useful in understanding the societal precursors that created the disasters.

Disaster studies as a discipline is largely understood to start with Samuel Henry Prince’s 1920 dissertation titled, “Catastrophe and Social Change”, written in response to a shockingly deadly and destructive harbor explosion in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Prince’s meandering dissertation spans theology, philosophy, sociology, and opinion and asserts disasters create social and political change. The slew of disaster writers and philosophers following Prince can be grouped into two theoretical groups: (1) social Darwinists and those aligned with mass chaos theory who think in the absence of structure (such as a functioning government, capitalism-based market system, religious order, and other class-based rules of society), the true nature of humans is to descend into chaos and war and; (2) anarchist philosophers (Kropotkin, 1902), sociologists, and disaster researchers (Fritz, Quarantelli, and Tierney) who theorize that cooperation and altruism are driving forces of humanity and in the absence of structure, such as during a disaster, an opportunity to create
a better and more just society may emerge (Solnit, 2009). I will not endeavor to review the entire body of disaster response literature here, in part because it rapidly devolves into a heady philosophical debate on the nature of humans and the role of the state, which is a tangled Pandora’s Box of a discussion to appropriately tackle in this thesis, and also because Rebecca Solnit eloquently does so in her 2009 book: *A Paradise Built in Hell*. 

Solnit argues disasters bring change to not only the political and social structure, as previously noted by Prince and others, but a more latent change at the individual level when people experience disasters as a euphoric outpouring of generosity and community and may emerge more altruistic and socially-minded (Solnit, 2009).

When disasters strike the underlying unmet political, social, and individual needs are brought to the surface and into the public sphere. In an individualistic society a low bank account balance is often suffered in silence, behind walls and a closed door. If an earthquake topples the walls and opens the door, the food insecurity and hunger is now public. Visible suffering engenders a human caretaking response (Poppendieck, 1998). Disasters also expose and make “visible and important” (Solnit, 2008) the underlying non-market social systems, relationships, and informal activities that comprise Moser’s community management work and upon which, according to J.K. Gibson-Graham’s economic iceberg analogy, are functioning in non-disaster times. These community management work networks may provide the basis for emergent groups in times of disaster.

Disaster response literature in general tends to be gender-blind (Fothergill, 1996) but does acknowledge effects of disasters are unequal due to “social vulnerability” which is code for race, gender, age, and other social strata (Morrow, 2008). Emergent group literature
attuned to gender is sparse. Enarson (2008) argues that gender and social stratification influence every aspect of the disaster experience. Moser draws attention to the power differential in community management work, noting this work is most often undertaken by women when unpaid but by men when paid. This patriarchal structure is mirrored in the professionalization, high salaries, and mainly male-dominated field of state-hired emergency managers while volunteer (unpaid) disaster response work is most often performed by women (Enarson & Phillips, 2000). Enarson and Morrow (1997) describe various women-led emergent groups helping to recover from Hurricane Andrew in the shadow of an ineffective and slow government response. A short review of volunteerism literature, following, provides additional intersectional understanding of the forces that affect emergent groups in the gap of emergence and social vulnerabilities.

Volunteering

Community management work is often, but not always, performed on a volunteer basis. Volunteerism is a fairly new topic in academia; its own multidisciplinary area of study coalesced around 1975 with Smith’s study on “voluntary participation” (Smith, 1975, as described in Wilson, 2012). The act of volunteering itself is not new (Wilson, 2012), but the study of volunteering and volunteerism spanning across many fields (Musick & Wilson, 2007) while also understood as its own field of research is a fairly new concept.

This research will focus on the phenomenon of groups formed by people volunteering their time during a disaster to accomplish a common goal. Volunteering is ubiquitous in most non-communist cultures (Musick & Wilson, 2007) although the form varies from neighborhood groups to small mutual aid groups to larger organizations with state ties.
Volunteering can be attached to formal organizations or can be informal unpaid help on an individual-to-individual basis (Wilson, 2012). In the U.S., Snyder and Omoto (2008, pp.3-5)’s definition encompasses most types of volunteering relevant to this context: “freely chosen and deliberate helping activities that extend over time, are engaged in without expectation of reward or other compensation and often through formal organizations, and that are performed on behalf of causes or individuals who desire assistance”.

Reasons People may Choose to Volunteer

Musick & Wilson discuss psychological, sociological, and economic reasons one may choose to volunteer (Wilson, 2007). Psychological theories are individual personality traits and motivations, inherent or learned, that may increase the penchant of volunteering. Extroversion has a positive influence on volunteering (Okun, Pugliese, & Rook, 2007), for
example. Sociological theories of volunteering extend these individual traits to both immutable and changeable characteristics of groups of people, including race, gender, access to social networks, and belonging to specific social groups. Being a member in a group of volunteers increases the likelihood of future volunteerism (Atkins, Hart & Donnelly, 2005), as does being white (Wilson & Hughes, 2010), being a woman (Bureau of Labor Statistics U.S. Department of Labor, 2016); (AmeriCorps, n.d.) and belonging to a religious group during adolescence (Perks & Haan, 2011; Caputo, 2009). Economic theories view volunteerism as simply unpaid labor and seek to understand the societal conditions that motivate individuals to make the choice to volunteer. Volunteerism is, by definition, unpaid labor. Because each volunteer is a composite of their psychology, sociology, and current economic situation, understanding how these three aspects of identity and experience influence volunteering will be essential in contextualizing information provided during an interview within the structures of our current society.

The Role of Social Capital in Volunteer Disaster Response

Bourdieu’s (1983) expands the definition of capital to include non-economic capital forms: symbolic, cultural, and social capital. Social capital describes the “actual or potential resources” available based on membership to groups, institutionalized relationships, and mutual acquaintance and recognition (Bourdieu, 1983). It also describes the existing community management work (Moser) performed on a daily basis during non-disaster times and the submerged part of the economic iceberg illustrated by J.K. Gibson-Graham. Access to existing social capital before a disaster may influence group volunteerism as a disaster response.
Emergent group as disaster response studies often draw on social network theory to understand the how and why of volunteerism in this particular form (Roque, Pijawka, & Wutich, 2020; Aldrich & Meyer, 2014; Gardner, 2008). Coleman expanded on access to social capital theories posited by Bourdieu to equate access and barriers to social capital with access and barriers to concrete resources (Coleman, 1988) and Putnam (1995) extends this from the individual to the community. These theories create a lens in which the relationships, volunteer networks, and friendships formed prior to a disaster provide access to or create barriers to concrete means for survival, either individually or as an emergent organization, during a disaster. This is the role of social capital in volunteer disaster response.

Musick & Wilson’s understanding of volunteers’ psychological and sociological traits in conjunction with Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam’s social capital theories explain why some people may perceive a social gap during a disaster but may not have the resources to volunteer to address them. Simultaneously, these theories explain why some volunteers may have the resources to perform unpaid labor during a disaster, but may not be working to meet an actual social gap. Solnit (2008) provides countless examples of people with perhaps the most resources to volunteer often respond in ways that preserve and protect their resources, while those who are most affected by disasters and in need respond with generosity of resources and time.

Gardner argues that existing relationships influence a citizen’s opportunity to volunteer while Putnam (2000), described existing organizational and interpersonal networks as “essential for volunteers’ coordinated mobilization”. Gardner and Putnam argue prior
social ties, organizational involvement, or interpersonal networks are causal to volunteering, but disaster response theories offered by Stalling & Quarantelli (1985) and examples of historical events (Solnit, 2009) observed the formation of emergent citizen groups following disasters regardless of existing social ties. Stalling & Quarantelli were the first to argue the disaster causes the volunteering, and volunteers will create social ties, organizational structures, and networks following a disaster - regardless of their previous networks. Solnit, J.K. Gibson-Graham, and Moser argue people (Moser focuses on women) are always engaged in these activities and they underpin normal activities. Interview questions will directly seek to understand how social ties impacted volunteers during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Volunteering during Disasters

Contrary to media reports, most people engage in helping activities when faced with disaster and there is very little looting, chaos, or malice (Tierney, 1994; Auf der Heide, 1989; Quarantelli, 1986; Quarantelli & Dynes, 1968). This is consistent throughout disaster response literature. When people engage consistently in helping behaviors following a disaster they become disaster volunteers. People may decide to volunteer as individuals or by joining existing groups. Strandh and Eklund (2017) clearly illustrate Dynes & Quarantelli (1968)’s four types of volunteer groups, including emergent groups, in the disaster response context. A reproduced table is included below:
Table I: Types of Disaster Response Volunteer Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Volunteerism</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Established</td>
<td>Sometimes (rural fire departments, e.g.)</td>
<td>The organization is designed to respond to disasters. The tasks and structures do not change when responding to a disaster.</td>
<td>Police Fire Ambulance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Expanding</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The organization typically used for disaster responses and has trained staff and structures, which tends to include an expanding component of volunteers.</td>
<td>Red Cross Salvation Army FEMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Extending</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>The organization does not usually respond to disasters. Staff and volunteers may work within the existing structure but take on additional or new tasks.</td>
<td>Construction companies (clean-up after a natural event) Meal providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Emergent</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>These organizations did not exist prior to an event and are new in every way – structure, tasks, and response experience.</td>
<td>Search &amp; rescue groups formed directly following an event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study is focused on understanding the phenomenon of the “emergent group”, as first defined by Quarantelli & Dynes in their 1968 review of disaster responses. Emergent groups arise to address a perceived gap in social services during or after a disaster and are comprised of “private citizens who work together in pursuit of collective goals relevant to actual or potential disasters but whose organization has not yet become institutionalized” (Stalling & Quarantelli, 1985, p.94). Table II, below, is based off of Strandh and Eklund’s table describing the tasks and structures of the four types of volunteer disaster response groups identified by Quarantelli & Dynes.

Table II: Tasks and Structures of the types of Volunteer Disaster Response Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Old Structure</th>
<th>New Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>I. Established</td>
<td>II. Expanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonroutine</td>
<td>III. Extending</td>
<td>IV. Emergent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These groups form to provide relief from gaps in social services usually organized or provided by the market, agencies, and the government during times of non-disaster. During and especially following a disaster, social service provision including food, clean water, education, and childcare may be disrupted. During the COVID-19 pandemic, media articles and social media posts documented the emergent groups and volunteers that formed to address the education gap ("Why Learning Pods Might Outlast the Pandemic", The New Yorker, 2021), and childcare ("This Entrepreneur's Covid-safe Mini Daycare Pods Meet the Moment", Forbes, 2021) as childcare centers closed without another option. Food, like education and childcare, is both subsidized by the government and available for purchase, and inexorably tied into gender, class, and race inequalities (Swan, 2020). And, like education and childcare, the United States government’s slow response to the COVID-19 pandemic decreased individuals’ ability to get food, which created an “embodied crisis” that disproportionately affected women, women of color, and migrant women (Burns, 2020). This is because women were expected to maintain paid labor duties in addition to additional duties to care for children, the sick, and the elderly, and manage the social service gaps to provide childcare, education, and food. This research will focus on the social service gap of food provisioning during the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Food as a social service gap**

In February, 2020, about five million Americans were unemployed (Bureau of Labor Statistics). By April, or two months following the disaster declaration in the U.S., that number rose to 21 million Americans (about 11.2% of the population). The three counties that comprise the City of Portland experienced an unemployment rate similar or higher
than the national average (13.4% in Multnomah County; 10.7% in Clackamas County, and 9.9% in Washington County) (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020). Feeding America, the nation’s largest food bank, estimated food insecurity increased by 29% from pre-pandemic levels to during the pandemic (Feeding America, 2021); from 35 million Americans to 45 million. Children, women, people who were food insecure before the pandemic, and Black people are disproportionately affected (Feeding America, 2021).

In Oregon, food insecurity rates more than doubled from pre-pandemic levels to about 25% of Oregonians experiencing food insecurity in 2020 (Edwards, 2020). It is well documented that food insecurity is a symptom of poverty and low wages, and that women and people of color are more likely to experience poverty, low wages, and systemic underemployment (Edwards, 2020). Predictably, the pandemic affected individual households based on pre-existing socioeconomic factors (Feeding America, 2020; Valley et al, 2020).

The Logic Model

If the emergent citizen groups as a disaster response theory holds true in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, those directly impacted by the disaster are theorized to form emergent groups. Communities of color and women were disproportionately impacted, so I expect a large proportion of emergent groups to be led by women and people of color. Stallings & Quarantelli theorize that volunteers belonging to the groups most affected by the social service gap form emergent groups; in this case we would expect to see people with low wages, women, and people of color to be overrepresented in emergent groups to provide food for themselves and their communities. This would move community food work towards what food activist LaDonna Redmond calls “Food Justice 2.0”, meaning
people who have faced food inequalities lead the food movement. However, I expect to record a disproportionate number of groups led by white volunteers, especially white women, who were relatively unaffected economically by the COVID-19 pandemic, explained by social capital theories and volunteerism literature. Interview questions will aim to collect data around race, gender, class, social ties, and other traits of volunteerism to understand who is most likely to volunteer to address food insecurity during prolonged disasters like COVID-19.
Hazard Event

Race, Class, Gender

I’m Fine

Help!

Traits of Volunteerism (psychological, sociological, economic)

I’ll start a group

Access to social capital
Access to networks

Emergent Group
Chapter 3: Methods

This research is designed to answer the following questions:

1. What types of emergent citizen groups formed as a disaster response?
2. Which communities do volunteers in the citizen emergent group belong to? Are the volunteers from the same group most affected by the pandemic?
3. How do prior social ties, organizational involvement, or interpersonal networks impact volunteering during a disaster, or does a disaster cause volunteering and create social ties, organizational structures, and networks where there were none previously?

The following table matches research questions and anticipated findings to literature reviewed in the previous chapter.
Table III: Theory, Anticipated Findings, and Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory &amp; Anticipated Findings</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergent groups form to address social service gaps (Stallings &amp; Quarantelli, 1985)</td>
<td>What types of emergent citizen groups formed as a disaster response?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Finding: Yes, emergent groups formed specifically to respond to this disaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers belonging to the groups most affected by the social service gap form emergent groups (Stallings &amp; Quarantelli, 1985).</td>
<td>What communities do volunteers belong to, and are they the same groups as those most affected by the disaster?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Finding: social capital theories and volunteerism literature suggest most volunteers will be white, women, and those who relatively unaffected economically by the COVID-19 pandemic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner &amp; Putnam (2000): Prior social ties, organizational involvement, or interpersonal networks are causal to volunteering.</td>
<td>How do prior social ties, organizational involvement, or interpersonal networks impact volunteering during a disaster, or does a disaster cause volunteering and create social ties, organizational structures, and networks where there were none previously?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalling &amp; Quarantelli (1985): the disaster causes the volunteering, and volunteers will create social ties, organizational structures, and networks following a disaster regardless of their previous networks. Anticipated Finding: both are true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I conducted semi-structured interviews to answer the above research questions (restated below). Each interview question directly corresponds to a research question, as described in Table IV, below.
Table IV: Research & Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What types of emergent citizen groups formed as a disaster response?                | 1. What is the name of the group you volunteered with during COVID-19?  
2. Did this group start on or after March 8th, 2020?  
3. If so, around when did this group start?  
4. How do you describe what you did during the pandemic?  
5. What words would you use to categorize the group you volunteered with during the pandemic? |
| What communities do volunteers belong to, and are they the same groups as those most affected by the disaster? | 6. Who does your group aim to serve?  
7. What do you have in common with those your group aims to serve?  
8. What are some ways you are different from those your group aims to serve? |
| Are prior social ties, organizational involvement, or interpersonal networks required precursors to volunteering or does a disaster cause volunteering and create social ties, organizational structures, and networks where there were none previously? | 9. How did you meet the people you currently volunteer with?  
10. In what ways did you volunteer before your involvement with this group? if yes, please describe how and where you volunteered (groups, tasks) |

**Study Area**

Although volunteer emergency food responses emerged globally, due to the constraints of a master’s thesis, this project is limited in scope to Portland, Oregon. This research used the Portland City Boundaries, with the understanding that the City of Portland sits within the Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro metropolitan statistical area. The exclusion of parts of the statistical area is due to the limits of the study. I chose Portland because I live near and
work in Portland and have relationships, connections, and local knowledge that deepened my understanding of this research. Portland is the largest and most diverse city in Oregon, although it is still one of the least diverse of its size nationally. I chose not to study the city where I live, Corvallis, because the data sample would not be large enough and I am involved in two of the three emergent groups in Corvallis.

Defining Emergent Groups in this Study

For this research, an emergent volunteer food aid effort was defined as an effort involving at least two people volunteering to bring food to people in their geographically local community. Efforts included in this study started after March 8, 2020, the date of the first Oregon state-wide stay home order (Executive Order 20-03). Efforts affiliated with an existing non-profit, a pivot from an existing non-profit, and groups that started before March 8th, 2020 were excluded because they don’t meet the definition of emergent group that responded to the COVID-19 pandemic. Organizations that raised money for other communities were excluded, as will organizations with mostly paid organizers and efforts that are simply a fundraiser with no food-aid component. This definition of emergence is in line with Strandh & Eklund’s (2017) Group Type IV (nonroutine tasks, new structure) which is based off of the typology from Dynes & Quarantelli, 1968.

Participant Selection & Recruitment

Participants were first recruited and identified from my personal contacts. I followed various community food work groups on social media during 2020 - 2021. I started recruitment for this study by social media messaging, email, or through their ‘contact us” page on their website, if available. Then I conducted a peer-reviewed and grey literature
search to identify additional groups and contacted these groups in the same way. After each interview I asked participants to name other groups they knew or suggest groups that fit the inclusion criteria (snowball sampling). I reached saturation when no new groups were mentioned and after three contact attempts to groups I was able to identify. One organizer reached out to me after the data collection period had ended; I included the group in the emergent group count but did not interview them.

I expect additional groups formed during the Pandemic that I was not able to learn about or contact. I attempted to learn about some of these groups through a key informant interview with the Young Woman’s Christian Association, which served as a fiscal sponsor to many smaller organizations, but they did not return my request for an interview during the study period. I also expect my limitations as a monolingual researcher narrowed my learning about some groups. I heard a mention of groups that worked to provision migrant farmworkers with food but I wasn’t able to connect with anyone who knew details about that group. This difficulty is mirrored in previous researchers’ experience attempting to study emergent groups.

Ethics & Protection of Participants

This research aimed to elevate the contributions of women and community workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. I aimed to stay true to feminist values by sharing the work back with the communities who participated in the research and by submitting excerpts of this thesis to peer-reviewed journals for publication. I also intend to hold space for community feedback and conversation following the academic defense of this thesis. The outcomes of
that community conversation will determine the direction and scope of sharing the findings from the thesis.

The interview questions were intentionally created to be concise and respectful of participants’ time. The questions were approved by the Human Subjects Board at PSU and were determined to minimize risk to participants. The research was voluntary. Participants were fully consented before the interview and could stop their participation at any time.

Data process and analysis

Each interview was recorded using Zoom video conferencing software. Then, each interview was transcribed using an AI transcription software (Otter.ai) and imported into Atlas.ti for thematic coding. The first level of codes directly related to the research questions. After reading through the interviews, I created a second round of emergent themes and coded for those in all interviews.
Emergent efforts arose during the COVID-19 pandemic in Portland, Oregon, to address food insecurity. This research identified 50 groups active in Portland to address food insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic. Of those 50, exactly half were initially thought to meet inclusion criteria and outreach was conducted with all 25 groups. After conducting an interview with organizers, three groups did not in fact meet the inclusion criteria and were excluded. Twenty-two groups satisfied all aspects of the inclusion criteria, as outlined in Chapter 3, although not all twenty-two groups participated in research interviews. Reasons for exclusion are provided in Table V, below.

The specific type of group, size, logistics, target group, and volunteer structure varied greatly between groups and is discussed below. A variety of mutual aid groups emerged in response to protests against police violence against the Black community in Portland in the summer of 2020. Of those groups, eight were included in the initial list because they seemed to focus on food insecurity and started after March 8, 2020. The remaining groups identified not included in this study because I couldn’t verify if they met the additional inclusion criteria or not. Two other groups were excluded because I was unable to find the group name, a contact person, or details about their activities to verify their inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Groups Identified</th>
<th>Address food insecurity</th>
<th>Started after March 8, 2020</th>
<th>At least 2 volunteers</th>
<th>Met inclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Three groups were excluded after participating in a interview because they did not meet the inclusion criteria*
Each of the 22 groups that fit the inclusion criteria seemed distinct. The number of volunteers, logistics of food distribution or fundraising activities, or group they aimed to serve seemed different for each group. I invited the initially identified 25 groups to participate in the research project using a variety of outreach methods, based on the contact information provided on websites or social media. Outreach methods included email, phone call, text, and social media direct message. Two groups were referred to me via snowball sampling after the data collection period had ended for this project; they are included in the 25 identified groups but were not invited to participate in data collection.

Recruitment for the structured interviews started in February of 2022. Of the 25 groups invited to participate, 13 consented to participate. One interview was not completed and no interview was rescheduled. As stated above, three groups that seemed to meet the inclusion criteria were determined to not meet it during the course of their interview: one group was only a fundraising effort and did not have a meal distribution component; two groups started prior to March 8, 2020 and were pivots from existing organizations. The total number of interviews completed and included for this research is nine.

Table VI: Emergent Groups Identified and Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Groups Identified</th>
<th>Initial Outreach</th>
<th>Interviewed</th>
<th>Included in data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of emergent groups that formed as a disaster response

Details of each of these groups varied widely. Six of the nine groups (67%) started in the month and a half following the stay-home order in Oregon (March 8, 2020). Two additional
groups started during the first six months (June & July, 2020), one in response to COVID-19 and the other in response to COVID-19 and the protests in Portland following the murder of George Floyd. The final group started one year after the first stay-home order, in March 2021, as a response to the first wave of the pandemic receding and the second wave starting. Although many more groups emerged to address food insecurity in Portland, the groups in this sample overwhelmingly started rapidly following the stay home order (within the first few months, all but one within the first year). Figure 3 shows the duration of emergent groups, using a small circle to represent a start or stop date and an arrow if the group has not yet stopped.

*Figure 3: Duration of Emergent Groups*

Three of the nine groups stopped their operations before data collection for this study started. Of those three, one group paid locally owned restaurants to make meals for
frontline healthcare workers (stopped after two months), another group purchased food from local farms and partnered with an existing nonprofit to distribute Community Supported Agriculture boxes (stopped after six months, and the third group, comprised of teachers at a local school, delivered food boxes to families with students who attended their school (stopped when children returned to in-classroom instruction, September 2021, about a year and a half after the group started).

The majority (67%) of the groups are still operating in some capacity, as illustrated in Figure 3. The details of each groups’ operations is described in Table VI.
Table VII: Emergent Group Start Date, End Date, Target Population & Main Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date*</th>
<th>End Date*</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 13, 2020</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Restaurant owners</td>
<td>Information hub, local policymakers, lobbyists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14, 2020</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Restaurant workers/friends, then anyone who wants food, delivered</td>
<td>Cooked meals from purchased &amp; donated foods and delivered them to anyone who requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Frontline healthcare workers, then the homeless community</td>
<td>Cooked meals from purchased &amp; donated foods, now contracts with homeless shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29, 2020</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Frontline healthcare workers</td>
<td>Purchased meals from locally owned restaurants and delivered them to hospitals &amp; care facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 2020</td>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>Restaurant workers, then farmworkers and food industry workers</td>
<td>Purchased CSAs of farm produce and partnered with an existing org to distribute it to farm workers &amp; other POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>September 2021</td>
<td>Spanish-speaking families of school children experiencing food insecurity</td>
<td>Created &amp; delivered food boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 2020</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Meals to houseless people in the park blocks (site of 2020 racial protests)</td>
<td>Cooks meals for homeless services shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 3, 2020</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Anyone who wants food</td>
<td>Partners with local landowners to host refrigerators or pantries stocked with fresh &amp; non-perishable foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2021</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>People camping</td>
<td>Redistributes meals leftover from other large-scale meal cooking efforts; cooks meals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*if specific dates were unknown, the first/last Instagram post was used as a proxy for start/end date

**Categorizing groups in volunteers’ own words**

One interview question asked each respondent to describe the emergent group in their own words. The question did not specifically mention tax-exempt status but each participant discussed their tax status. Two of the three groups that stopped their operations did not file or desire a 501(c)3 tax exempt status as a charitable organization, and both described their efforts as “mutual aid”. One organization intended their effort to be a short-term intervention at the inception of the effort. An organizer of that group said, “...because we were mutual aid, we weren't a full-blown nonprofit. We were trying to keep things sort of
brief. We’re going to raise this amount of money. Once we reach our goal, we’re going to spend it. And that's it, then we're going to wash our hands of this.” Another group that stopped framed their work as “an educator-driven mutual aid effort”. The third group that stopped activities before the start of data collection for this research did obtain a 501(c)3 tax-exempt status by partnering with another international organization that already had that designation. Then, international organization stopped their localized operations which resulted in the local chapter ending their operations.

Notably, five of the six groups that continue to operate in some capacity at the time of writing filed for and were awarded a tax-exempt status as a charitable organization. Two of those groups specifically also described their work as mutual aid. None of the groups described their work as charity work.

Five of the nine groups described their emergent group using the word community, for example: community-based, community providing nutritious & delicious [meals], community-based free food distribution network. Organizers described their groups using a wide variety of words, such as “collaborative”, “necessary”, “love”, “understanding”, “empathy”, and “humbling”.

They described their actions as “storytellers”, “advocating”, “feeding people in need” and two groups described their actions as “focused on people who want to be heard” and “providing a voice for people”.

Details and Logistics of Meal and Money Recipients
Seven of the nine groups aimed to serve one group of people. Two groups described a dual mission; both people in need of meals and the food system as a whole, including restaurants and farms. The two groups with dual missions paid full cost for the price of food, either from farms (one group) or from restaurants (one group). The groups that aimed to serve individuals who needed food, without the dual mission of supporting restaurants or farms, purchased food to make meals at discount stores, repurposed food waste, and accepted and distributed donated foods.

Each group described their intended target group to receive meals. These target groups can be grouped into four main types:

1. Restaurants and food service workers (three groups, one still ongoing)

2. Frontline healthcare workers (two groups, one pivoted to serving homeless individuals)

3. Homeless individuals, people who are camping, or students experiencing food insecurity (four groups, one of which pivoted to this after serving frontline healthcare workers)

4. “anyone who wants them” (three groups, one still serving this population and the other two now have contracts to serve at social service agencies & homeless shelters).

The two groups that started by providing meals for frontline healthcare workers both now do not. One group has stopped and the other group pivoted to fulfilling contracts with social service agencies.
The emergent groups can also be typed by the details of the logistics of providing meals. Two groups mainly raised funds to support the food industry to minimize disruption. Of those groups, one paid for restaurants to continue to make meals; volunteers coordinated the logistics of deliveries at healthcare agencies and created systems for direct payment to restaurants, fundraised, and generated social media. The other group purchased food grown by local farmers. Their volunteer time was also dedicated to aggregation, distribution, raising funds, and social media.

Another type are the groups that cooked meals for distribution (four of the nine groups). All of the groups in this type started by cooking meals in the organizers’ home kitchen. Two of the four groups in this type continue to cook meals and those three are now 501(c)3 tax-exempt, pay at least one employee, rent a commercial kitchen space, and have contracts with social service agencies to cook meals for local homeless shelters.

Seven of the nine groups in total delivered meals or food to people, either to their address (three groups), to their campsite or tent (three groups), or to their workplace (one group). Of the two groups that did not deliver food, one established reliable food pick-up sites dispersed in neighborhoods and the other created a communication hub for people to go to restaurants to pick up free or purchased food.

*Commonalities and Differences Between Volunteers and Recipients*

All volunteers named at least one aspect they shared with those who received their meals or support. One organizer worked as a teacher in the school where families experiencing food insecurity sent their children, two organizers who provided meals for frontline healthcare workers had personal connections to the healthcare system (one’s spouse is a
nurse and the other was a chef in the hospital system), and another two organizers worked to provide fresh farmed foods or meals to restaurant workers because they were a chef in Portland prior to the pandemic and their friends were suddenly unemployed.

Volunteers seemed to have created their emergent group to provide meals for people similar to themselves but not exactly within their close community. Except for one group, volunteers didn’t seem to aim to serve people drastically different than themselves – they seemed to have at least something in common with the group they aimed to serve. The group that aimed to serve a community very different than the one they belonged to explained their thought processes as the “white bro question”:

“And so then we were kind of back to the white bro question. So how do we get food to people who actually really need it? We are locked into the algorithm our networks on Instagram are people in our age group, who are mostly white, who are have a little bit of privilege and a little bit of leverage already. We just were having a really hard time accessing the kinds of populations that actually needed our work. So [the partnership with an existing organization that serves immigrants and people of color] made that possible.”

Six of the nine organizers who participated in this research specifically mentioned their lived experience with poverty, experiencing homelessness, or living with a low income. One organizer was a combat veteran with lived experience of homelessness; their group aims to serve people camping and currently experiencing homelessness. The organizers’ lived experience with homelessness drove them to provide meals for the houseless community: “I just take it personally, because I know what it's like to go without a meal.”

Two organizers who didn’t mention lived experience of poverty stopped their operations after a few months. Both of those groups delivered meals or food; neither of them cooked
meals. The other organizer without lived experience of poverty no longer volunteers with the group although the group continues their activities in some way.

Six of the nine organizers spoke about their experience in the food service industry in some capacity. Four organizers were chefs before the pandemic. Three of them volunteered as chefs during the pandemic, and all of them used their connections in food industry and food sourcing in their volunteering. One described the beginning of the group as a mixture of nervous energy, wanting to help, utilizing existing connections and knowledge of the food industry and feeling helpful: “And so all this energy and confusion about what was going on, I felt like I need to do something. My grandma always told me that if you don’t know what to do, do what you know. I know how to cook.”

Shared humanity was the most commonly mentioned similarity between volunteers and food recipients. Multiple organizers named their unique lived experience and what differentiated themselves from those they aimed to serve, and then instantly explained a commonality with those who were receiving their meals. For example, one organizer said: “I’m a combat veteran. I’ve been houseless twice in my life as an adult. I grew up very young on welfare, growing up in the projects, and, more importantly than all those labels, I’m another human being, made up of the same thing that you and I are both made up of.” Most of the organizers seemed uncomfortable naming specific aspects of their identify, access to resources, and differences from those they aimed to serve.

Organizers also described the common experience of the pandemic, and how the economic effects of the pandemic put everyone on the same “playing field”. This concept is explained by one organizer who spoke about seeing themselves in their food line:
“I honestly thought, truly believed in my heart, that... If you were a doctor, an attorney, an engineer, a chef, a cook, Madonna, it didn't matter what you did, or who you were, we're now on the same playing field, because 95% of America...is not working. And that the people that were in my line [for food] were me. ...Because ...we are those people in a different time. Because I have been that.”

Two organizers spoke about the lack of social safety net and societal economic precarity, describing one event as transformational and shifting their role from serving the meals to receiving the meals: “it's easy to lose your job and next thing you know, you lose your apartment, you lose your house, you get divorced, you break up with your partner, you know. Our society is just not willing to see it that way.” The other organizer who spoke about the precarity of employment and income worked a two-week on, two-week off schedule during the pandemic. They volunteered their time during their off-weeks and reflected on their commonalities with those who accepted the food they distributed: “But most of us that are working class people... are not very far away from being on the street.”

In general, those who created emergent groups were not employed at the time they started the group. Two volunteers who participated in the research were employed; one is described above and worked their job for two weeks and would volunteer the other two weeks each month, and the other worked a flexible schedule and was able to fit volunteering in as their job waned during the first few months of the pandemic. At the time of publication of this research, the three organizers who no longer volunteer with their respective emergent groups are now employed either in their same job, a different job, or as a paid employee of the emergent group. Two organizers continue to volunteer with their group. One group does not have regular meals and exists mostly as a sporadic distribution network, and the
other group cooks and distributes meals each week. The addition of volunteers allowed that person to decrease their volunteer commitment from “about 60 hours a week to 15”.

Of the three emergent groups that have stopped operations at the time of this research, all of the organizers are again employed. The organizers of those three groups said they stopped volunteering because their job restarted. One organizer stopped volunteering with the group although the group continues because they needed to reprioritize: “… after two years of doing advocacy work, and not getting paid and not having any structure, … and I’m a mom, and my husband is a chef. And so, we have had to sort of reprioritize.” In general, after about two years of volunteering with emergent groups, none of the volunteers are consistently engaged at the same level of volunteerism as they were at the beginning of the pandemic.

The impact of previous volunteer experience and existing social ties and networks

A key concept this research aims to examine is the prevalence of previous volunteering experience for those who start emergent groups during a time of disaster. This research found 100% of those who volunteered or started a group during COVID-19 had previous volunteer experience. The general sentiment was, as one volunteer said, “I’ve volunteered my whole life”.

The nature and setting of organizers’ previous volunteer experience seemed to impact the group the volunteers aimed to serve. For example, one organizer participated in a volunteer group in college that exposed them to food justice work. During that experience they met the executive director of the established non-profit group they partnered with during the pandemic to distribute CSA boxes to people outside their social group. During their
emergent group response, that connection allowed this group to pivot from serving restaurant workers to undocumented people and people in the farming community. It also utilized an existing food distribution network that they would otherwise not be able to access.

Another organizer with experience volunteering with Special Olympics and the student farm at their university was already involved with a restorative justice group at their workplace (a local middle school), led by a coworker. The leader of that group shifted to providing food boxes to food insecure families with students at the school. The volunteer who participated in this research said, “I did a lot of volunteer work in high school and college..., and I’ve really liked volunteer work personally.”. They went on to describe their volunteer work during the pandemic was their only time to connect with the community they serve because of the shift to remote learning.

Although faith-based communities are the most common place for people in the U.S. to volunteer and 63.2% of established food pantries are faith-based (Natalie D. Riediger, 2022), none of these emergent groups mentioned faith, affiliation with a religious institution, or using their faith community for social or financial connections.

Most organizers had previous volunteering experience in food work. One organizer started a food recovery network at their college, another volunteered at the student farm at their college, and others volunteered at the Oregon Food Bank or other food pantries & banks. The organizers without food-specific volunteer experience worked previously with kids, in bike repair clinics, and in the military. The organizers of emergent groups who were also chefs volunteered in the past as chefs and continued to do so in the group they helped to
create during the pandemic. One organizer described their previous experience and connections, “And so when I started the nonprofit I went back to my thought of, I used to do this once a month. I know people who work at some of the shelters. I know people that work at some of these hospitals. I already had an in as to how I can get the meals to people and how to implement a program.”. In general, organizers utilized their previous experience volunteer, their social ties, and their networks during their involvement with the emergent group.

Most organizers also knew those they volunteered with during the pandemic but in two cases groups were formed because of a connection made during the pandemic. Two organizers met through a Facebook post in a neighborhood group and created an emergent group. Another group was formed because a volunteer followed on Instagram a chef who was cooking meals for the community by themselves and decided to offer help. Their offer of help shifted that group from cooking meals in a personal kitchen to renting a commercial kitchen, scaling up operations, and paying employees. The origins of another group is unknown because I was only able to speak with a volunteer, not an organizer, but that volunteer started their involvement because of an Instagram post soliciting help. Excluding those three examples, the remaining groups were formed using existing relationships, coworking ties, friendships, and, in one case, a spousal relationship.

Existing networks provided volunteers with access to a variety of resources. The two groups that purchased food at full price for redistribution used their personal networks to fundraise first, then expanded to the broader community to continue to raise money. One organizer described initial fundraising through a GoFundMe and their Instagram and
another organizer said, “I sent out an original initial email to my own network, put up a very basic website...”. Both groups were able to raise enough financial support to stand up the group from their own networks. Notably, both of those organizers did not have lived experience with poverty, and both groups no longer are operational.

The groups that solicited donations of food directly or sought to decrease food waste during the initial shut-down phase for restaurants used their connections with food distributors and did not ask for money. One organizer said, “And so I knew that my purveyors at the restaurant that I worked at, had extra food just sitting in their stores that they couldn't sell because all the restaurants were closed. And so I reached out and I was like, What do you have? And they're like, We have like 50 pounds of ground beef right now, when I sell it to you for 49 cents on the dollar.” All of the organizers who started groups that cooked meals for the homeless population or anyone who wanted them had lived experience of poverty and focused on providing meals to that group rather than paying restaurants or farms for their product.
Chapter 5: Discussion

This research found some interesting additions to and exceptions from existing emergent group literature. This long-term perspective on emergent groups is different than the typical emergent group study, that is, emergence as ephemeral and groups form to fill a gap in service and then dissolve. This study shows these groups mostly did not dissolve or stop, they defied expected race and gender assumptions based on volunteerism literature, and they used technology to expand social networks and organize.

Emergence and Gender and Race

Emergent groups are a type of community support (Moser, 1993, p.35) that respond to disaster scenarios. Additionally, at the inception of emergent group research, Stallings & Quarantelli (1985) theorize most emergent group volunteers are white, women, and those not affected economically by the disaster (in this case, the pandemic). White three of the nine emergent groups that formed do fit this description, in general this did not hold for this sample. Of those three groups, one organizer described themselves as a “rich white lady” and another said, “I was furloughed, so I was fine”, and the third is a Spanish teacher who returned to full-time, in person work in the Fall of 2021. Those three groups are no longer operational and their volunteers have returned to pre-pandemic employment.

This research did not specifically ask about gender, but the interview questions, “what do you have in common with those your group aims to serve”, and “what are some ways you are different from those your group aims to serve” elicited responses that identified gender. As stated above, six of the nine groups continue their activities. Of those six groups, four are started or led by men (the other two are led by a group of people and I was not able to
speak with the lead organizers and so their gender identities were not identified). Of the four led by men, two are now paid by the emergent group which is now a 501(c)3, pay other staff people, and have contracts with social service agencies to provide meals. None of the groups started by women continue, and none of the women who helped start a group are now paid. This research corroborates Moser’s theory that community support activities are most often carried out by women when unpaid, but by men when paid or may result in an increase of status or paid work.

This pattern of men receiving pay for work they started as volunteer while the women were not paid deserves more attention than this thesis can provide. Further research is needed into why this is the case. Research questions include if women would accept payment if it was offered, how turning volunteer labor into a paid position aligns with the female volunteers’ values, and if female volunteers were financially compensated at the beginning of the emergent effort, if those efforts would have continued. Further research is also needed to understand if additional emergent groups formed at a scale or duration too small for this research.

The interviews did not directly ask about race but all interviewees disclosed some aspect of their racial identity in the course of the interview. A unique finding of this study is that People of Color are disproportionally represented in emergent volunteer groups compared to the population in Portland. According to the most recent American Community Survey (2021 ACS), Black people comprise 5.8% of Portland and white people 77.4%. Of the nine organizers interviewed for this study, three (33.3%) said they were a person of color or Black and six (66.6%) said they were white. It should be known in the same statement,
however, that this same size is too small to generalize this statement. Further research including a larger or representative sample is needed.

The overrepresentation of People of Color in this research may be because emergent groups formed to fill perceived gaps in service provisioning and non-white communities experienced greater impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Organizers mostly created emergent groups that served people similar to themselves. An exploration into the social capital of these organizers is important to understand if groups were formed utilizing the social capital available to these organizers or despite the lack of social capital. What is known from this dataset is that all of these groups struggled to fundraise. Templeton et. al. (2020) argue state support of groups, especially emergent groups based on identity, either pre-existing or formed as a response to a disaster, is a lifesaving measure in disaster response and ignoring those preexisting identities could increase aversion to safety responses from vulnerable populations.

*Emergence and the Shift to Structured Organizations*

Emergent groups form to fill perceived gaps in service provisioning. Existing food pantries, soup kitchens, and the statewide food bank pivoted to meet the additional need for food and increased their activities. Volunteers perceived a gap in established, structured organizations that existed prior to the pandemic to provide food and created emergent groups to fill this need. Volunteers could have directed their volunteer hours to existing social service agencies, but chose instead to start new emergent groups. Further research is needed to fully explore this choice, but we can conclude groups emerged to address a
perceived need for food provisioning at some level and volunteers perceived a lack of service provisioning by the existing structured organizations.

One aspect that differentiates these emergent groups from existing groups is their flexibility in logistics. The seven emergent groups that provided food directly did it by delivering food directly to households, workplaces, or campsites. Another emergent group created a dispersed network of 49 refrigerators stocked with a variety of foods and another group delivered fresh produce to homes. Pre-pandemic, most food pantries were only open for a limited number of hours or days per week and did not offer delivery (Martin, 2020). These pantries may not meet the needs of most people experiencing food insecurity because they may have unreliable transportation and may be working during the pantry’s open hours (ibid). Providing food delivery directly to workplaces and places of residence decreases the logistical labor of food provisioning for families already experiencing increased logistical labor of poverty, but increases the logistic workload for food providers.

Notably, two groups continue to deliver meals to homes and campsites (one weekly and the other sporadically). The remaining five groups that, at the beginning of their activities did deliver food, no longer do. Three of those groups are no longer active. Two of the five groups that used to deliver meals and no longer do have contracts with social service agencies and deliver meals to service sites, including shelters and established warm meal sites, but no longer deliver to homes or campsites. This trajectory of simplification of logistic for service providers continues to put an extra burden of food provisioning on people who are already experience increased burdens to provide food for their households.
Another aspect that separates these emergent groups from existing groups is their lack of affiliation with faith organizations. The majority of food pantries (63.2%) are faith-based and are mostly run by volunteers (Riediger, 2022), but membership and activism in faith-based groups is declining (The Pew Research Center, 2018). Long-term, committed volunteerism is also declining nationally (McLennan et al., 2016). The presence of these emergent groups could support McLennan’s conclusions that more “diverse and spontaneous” styles of volunteering may remain. Emergent groups may provide a second layer of long-term, grassroots, volunteer-based food security programming as membership and volunteerism in faith-based communities declines.

A majority of the emergent groups continue their activities at the time of writing this thesis. Notably, four of the six groups that continue to operate in some capacity at the time of writing this thesis filed for and were awarded a tax-exempt status as a charitable organization, effectively shifting from an emergent group (Type IV) to an established disaster response group (Type I). Although the groups are now a “charitable” organization, none of them describe their work as charity work. Further research is needed to understand how these groups define charity and why they don’t use congruent language with the tax status, why these groups chose to create a structure, if that structure will inhibit the growth and flexibility of the group, and will eventually dwindle due to the national trend of declining volunteerism in structured groups.

These groups may also decline due to lack of funding. One organizer described their view on money and continual fundraising: “So when I started the nonprofit, I was getting zero money from it. We started as a mutual aid. We just wanted to feed folks.” None of the
groups that remain operational started with the intention of becoming a charitable organization, nor continuing their operations. Most of them described their inception as a near-accident, or started doing one activity, found pleasure or satisfaction, and continued. Now, 18 to 24 months later, these groups seem to be more stable and lasting because of their tax status, paid staff, and organizational structure.

Of the three newly registered 501(c)3 charitable organizations, all have consistent contracts to cook and deliver meals to social service agencies. Some deliver thousands of meals each week and utilize multiple commercial kitchen spaces, others deliver a few hundred meals each week. All three of the organizations talk about their future expansively, and in the same breath as their accidental beginnings. For example, one organizer tells the story of the past 18 months succinctly:

“*We went from a group of friends to a company who was handling close to a million dollars in contracts. And so it’s definitely been very humbling, and just eye opening to where we were able to put the money back into the community. And just actually, like, put jobs in which everyone was getting what they need. And also grow our programs at the same time.*”

**Emergence and the Role of Social Capital**

Another main theory this research aimed to discuss is the role of social ties, organizational involvement, and interpersonal networks. The research found previous volunteering experience was consistent for all volunteers engaged in creating or participating in an emergent group during the pandemic. Most organizers already knew their co-organizers, but two groups coalesced through social media and three others used Slack, a messaging web-based application, to organize.
In general, the role of technology seemed to be critical to sharing information, raising funds, and accessing services. Two groups delivered meals to encampments and shelters without the use of technology to reserve the meals, one group delivered meals to families involved at their school, and another group coordinated meals with hospitals and other frontline healthcare workplaces. One group published a sign-up sheet to reserve meals only through Instagram. Volunteers with all but one of the groups (the group involved with school families) spoke in-depth about their utilization of Instagram to fundraise, publicize, solicit donations of food and supplies, and recruit volunteers. Technology may also extend the relationship network that Putnam (2000) argues is essential for volunteers, coordinating, and mobilizing. Most of these groups used social media to distribute food and fundraise and two groups formed because of a connection through social media. In this case, it seems we can expand Putnam’s relationship network to include social media following. This could mean a much larger and more integrated network of relationships. Further research is needed to understand if this network is stratified by race, class, or geography and contribute to or minimize segregation.

**Challenges & Limitations**

This was a voluntary research study and the study participants were volunteers as required by the inclusion criteria. In general, those who consented to participate in the research study seemed enthusiastic to share their experiences. 12 of the 25 groups I invited to participate in the research consented to be interviewed (48% response rate). As expected, many of the volunteers seemed to be interested in sharing resources, ideas, and networking with other, similar volunteers.
Some volunteer food security efforts may have been true mutual aid efforts, conducted at the neighborhood scale or small social network scale. This study may have missed these groups due to the short timeline for data collection, lack of participant incentives, and abridged snowball sampling follow-up. I identified many of the groups through social media networking. Due to my own limited network, I may have missed some groups because they did not show up in my algorithm. Other groups could be limited not only in geography, but also language and recipient population to the extent that I may not have identified them in this study. These omissions are regrettable and require a more in-depth research study. Additionally, due to the limited scope and timeline of this research, the inclusion criteria will potentially limit some efforts that deserve recording because of their effectiveness in disaster response. For example, Meals for Heels is a well-known mutual aid group in Portland that distributes food and other supplies for people working in the sex industry. Because this group existed before the pandemic, it does not meet the inclusion criteria for this study, but provided a disaster response during COVID-19. The same is true for Fed, a pivot program created by an established non-profit, Feed the Mass. Both programs were omitted from this study because they did not meet the inclusion criteria, but both provided disaster response. More research is needed to understand the full scope of community disaster response work in food security. Research is underway at Portland State University in partnership with the Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization and the City of Portland’s Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (expected Fall 2022).
Although this research focuses on volunteers and organizers, the effects on food security of participants of the programs is critical in understanding the effects of the programs themselves. Due to the ongoing nature of some of the programs and to reduce the research burden on people experiencing food insecurity, this study does not focus on that population. Further research is needed to understand how volunteer run emergency food programs affected those experiencing food insecurity and other symptoms of poverty during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Finally, as acknowledged in the above positionality statement, I expect some groups may be uncomfortable or unwilling to participate based on my position. The omission of these groups is also regrettable; more funded research is needed from the communities those groups represent and serve.

Conclusions & Contributions

This research, most importantly, contributes to disaster response literature by confirming the emergent groups formed to address food insecurity in response to the COVID-19 pandemic in Portland, Oregon. This responds to Twigg & Mosel’s call to study “the nature and forms of urban disaster emergency in long-running crisis” (2017, p.454). While the phenomena of emergent groups following a disaster is known, this research records and discusses the efforts of emergent groups during a prolonged disaster and the activities of these groups 18 – 24 months after their inception and initial disaster response.
This study found emergent groups that respond to prolonged disasters are not as ephemeral as previously studied staccato emergent groups which form and quickly fade with the resolution of the disaster. Although these groups started by delivering food, most of them have since streamlined and ceased that aspect. This means that without explicit attention on food equity and food justice, these groups may repeat the patterns of established food organizations: streamlining operations for the group and displacing labor onto households receiving food help.

All of these groups struggled to fundraise. Templeton et. al. (2020) argue state support of groups, especially emergent groups based on identity, either pre-existing or formed as a response to a disaster, is a lifesaving measure in disaster response and ignoring those preexisting identities could increase aversion to safety responses from vulnerable populations. This research concludes that emergent groups are disproportionately started by people of color and those groups could lead to established organizations that increase employment for those communities and provide services to communities most affected by the disaster. A streamlined pathway for financial and organizational support for those organizations may have decreased the impact of COVID-19 on Portland’s communities of color. I recommend emergency management plans include a funding pathway that is accessible to people of color, communities most impacted by hazard events, and that allows for flexible food provisioning activities.

Technology may also extend the relationship network that Putnam (2000) argues is essential for volunteers, coordinating, and mobilizing. In this case, it seems we can expand Putnam’s relationship network to include social media following and social media
networking using hashtags and post shares. This could mean a much larger and more integrated network of relationships, and access to a much larger and less stratified community of potential supporters, volunteers, and donors.

Next Research Steps

Emergent groups are still an understudied but widely accepted phenomenon. As hazard events continue to increase in frequency and severity, the role of emergent groups is critical to incorporate into disaster response. There are still many aspects about the long-term effects of these groups that are unknown. To start, the pattern of men receiving pay for work they started as volunteer while women continued their unpaid labor deserves more attention than this thesis can provide. Research questions include if women would accept payment if it was offered, how turning volunteer labor into a paid position aligns with the female volunteers’ values, and if female volunteers were paid at the beginning of the emergent effort, if those efforts would have continued.

Further research is also needed to explore social capital and networks of these organizers to understand if groups were formed utilizing the social capital available or despite the lack of social capital. Technology may have played a role in accessing capital beyond the community of the organizers and for much cheaper than previous awareness campaigns. For example, an Instagram post asking for donations can be shared widely outside of an organizers’ neighborhood while flyers asking for donations have a high cost in materials and volunteer time. Research is needed to explore the role of technology in fundraising for emergent groups with a specific attention on fundraising across race and class stratifications.
The efficacy of existing social service agencies is crucial to understand to predict what aspects emergent groups may form to address. Volunteers could have directed their volunteer hours to existing social service agencies, but chose instead to start new emergent groups. Further research is needed to fully explore this choice, but we can conclude groups emerged to address a perceived need for food provisioning at some level and volunteers perceived a lack of service provisioning by the existing structured organizations. Finally, this study only sought to interview organizers in Portland, Oregon. Previous literature on emergence shows we can expect that groups formed across the globe in response to the global pandemic. A cross-section of emergence globally would provide a more holistic understanding of this phenomena. Understanding the conditions in which emergence occurred and did not occur and could help create disaster mitigation plans in the event of the next hazard event.
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Appendix A. Data Collection Instrument

**Semi Structured Interview Questions**

**Emergent Groups in Portland, Oregon, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic**

Introduction [read aloud to participants]

Thank you for your time participating in this interview. It is 9 questions and should take us no more than 30 minutes.

The goal of this interview is to record and understand *new volunteer groups* that formed during the COVID-19 pandemic to provide meals or help give people food.

A volunteer group is a group of people who are not paid for their work. A new group is any group of people who started to volunteer after March 8th, 2020. Groups of people who were already serving food before the pandemic, or volunteering in another way before the pandemic, or groups that mostly volunteer for other things during the pandemic (not just food) are outside these research goals.

This interview is entirely voluntary. You can stop at any time. This research is part of a masters’ thesis from a student in the college of Urban & Public Affairs at Portland State University.

Do you have any questions for me before we begin?

1. What is the name of the group you volunteered with during COVID-19?

   [short answer]

2. Did this group start on or after March 8th, 2020?

   [Yes / No]

   a. If so, around when did this group start?

   [short answer]

3. How do you describe what you did during the pandemic?

4. What words would you use to categorize the group you volunteered with during the pandemic?
5. Who does your group aim to serve? *For example, healthcare workers, food insecure people, BIPOC, or anybody?*

[short answer]

6. What do you have in common with those your group aims to serve?

[long answer]

7. What are some ways you are different from those your group aims to serve?

[long answer]

8. One of the goals of this study is to understand if previous volunteering experience or previous connections matter when people decide to volunteer during a disaster. Or, if the disaster happened and then people who have never volunteered before come together to create something new with new people.

   a. How did you meet the people you currently volunteer with?

      [long answer]

   b. Did you volunteer before your involvement with this group?

   c. [Yes / No]

      i. If yes, please describe how and where you volunteered *(what groups or organizations and your volunteer work tasks)*

9. What other groups do you know of that started during the pandemic to address food insecurity?

   [long answer] – name of group, contact information if known

**Thank you for your time completing this interview.**

End of interview
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