

Section	Purpose
A	Collect background information related to avalanche training and competence, e.g. association with NAWS, if any, level of avalanche competence and training, activity level in terms of travelling in avalanche terrain, and level of comprehension of avalanche terrain.
B	Understand how respondents evaluate the available elements in the warning and how these are communicated (which elements are most important, least important, difficult to assess and manage, poorly communicated or easily misunderstood, and which elements are missing).
C	Test how users perceive three different ways of presenting the avalanche danger: text, symbols, and pictures.
D	<p>Test the comprehension of two scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – danger level 2 (wind slab problem), based on the warning for Troms region on 18 April 2017, and – danger level 4 (wet slab problem), based on the warning for Troms region on 4 April 2017. <p>For each scenario, the participant was first randomly presented with one out of four alternative ways of communicating the danger:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avalanche danger level with explanation (general advice associated with the danger level), 2. Avalanche problem with technical details (avalanche rose, probability, distribution, expected size and type of avalanches) and advice (advice on how to manage the problem including travel advice), 3. Avalanche problem with technical details only, and 4. Avalanche problem with advice only. <p>We thereafter asked the respondent to interpret and evaluate the warning in terms of (1) behavioural implications (based on a pre-defined set of options), (2) how well the avalanche warning was presented, and (3) how the respondent would describe the warning to others, and what travel advice s/he would give to them.</p>
E	Collect background information related to demographics, and back-country recreation, e.g. gender, age, home region, terrain activities, and use of avalanche gear and forecast.