Climate Change Communications – Dipping A Toe Into Public Motivation

Chris Rose, with Pat Dade, and Nick Gallie and John Scott*

May 2005

Why We Conducted This Study

We are four professional communication, campaign and marketing strategists with decades of experience in public communications. Since before October 2004 we have been very concerned that major plans by campaign groups and the government, to try and mobilise UK public action on climate change, are going to fail.

We want to see such communication exercises succeed. In October 2004 we submitted a report to the officials drawing up the government strategy, and also circulated it to the main non-governmental organisations concerned with climate. It emphasised the need for proper national research on public motivation and on communication 'framing' as a prerequisite to spending time and money effectively. Unfortunately no such research has been done.

To show how such research may help, earlier this year we conducted our own pilot study, and it is reported here.   Our findings demonstrate that many assumptions about what will convince 'the public' of the need to act on climate are seriously misconceived.   Effective research on values and framing is one way to overcome this problem.

Introduction

In February 2005 Campaign Strategy Ltd[1] and Cultural Dynamics[2] (CDSM Cultural Dynamics Strategy and Marketing) commissioned a nationally representative telephone survey of over 1000 adults, who were asked a number of questions about climate change. Some of those results[3] are reported here. The same sample was asked a large number of other questions about environmental issues, and their political identity. They were also asked ten questions about their lives which enable Cultural Dynamics to place them into 12 'Value Modes' groups, within three broad psychological Motivational Groups. This audience segmentation model has been widely used by political parties, by NGOs and by multinational organizations.

The results of the political 'affiliation' part of the study have already been published at www.campaignstrategy.org (Values and Voters Survey) and show how groups of the population with different psychological needs identify differently with the three main political parties.

The methodology of the psychological survey is also described in that report and is not repeated in detail here. In essence it identifies three Motivational Groups:

- Settlers who currently make up 21% of the UK population
- Prospectors, currently making up 44% of the population
- Pioneers, making up 35% of the population

For anyone concerned with effective communication on an issue with climate change, it is essential to understand what 'opinions' or 'attitudes' really mean in terms of what people may actually do when a messenger asks them to take action, or how they will respond when they are told about a problem or solution.

At present, the UK Government is planning[4] to spend £12m on a communications campaign' designed to facilitate public action to help combat the emissions that cause climate change: for example from use of coal, oil and gas, in commerce, homes, transport and industry. The strategy developed by agency Futerra proposes a 'big hairy audacious goal' - "the UK will lead the world in dealing with climate change" – to 'inspire' support for its campaign.

At the same time, the major environmental groups are cooperating in a joint campaign initiative tentatively known as the 'Climate Movement', designed to bring about change through mass public mobilisation. Yet neither the government nor the 'NGOs' (non governmental organisations) have conducted national research into public motivation[5].

Opinion polls and surveys generally test 'opinion' or 'attitudes'. These are interesting but the most superficial forms of research. The next 'level down' concerns behaviours. Understanding behaviour (what people do, how they do it and why) is a better basis for extrapolating the likely effect of a communications proposition than opinions, thus good qualitative research usually sets out to establish and understand why people do what they do before exploring ways of persuading them to consider doing things differently. Qualitative research can uncover motivation but small scale studies for example using focus groups and interviews cannot reliably be used to draw conclusions about much larger groups or the population as a whole.

Decades of research indicate that what drives behaviours, and attitudes, are motivational needs. Seeing as campaigns are intended to bring about behavioural change, otherwise there will be no result, it makes sense to examine the psychological needs that determine behaviours. If communication can be arranged to meet these needs, then it stands the best chance of being effective.

Systems such as MOSAIC and Acorn are based on consumer data (behaviour) and are nationally applicable but motivations cannnot be imputed from such systems.

The Cultural Dynamics system is based on Maslowian psychology and identifies three main sets of needs, matching the three main groups:

- Security or 'sustenance' needs (needs for belonging, identity, security/safety): people for whom with these needs are dominant, are the 'Settlers'
- Esteem or 'outer directed' needs (the need for esteem of others and self-esteem): people for whom with these needs are dominant, are the 'Prospectors'
- Inner-directed needs (needs such as an ethical basis for life, self exploration, finding meaning in life, discovering new truths) – the 'Pioneers'

Faced with a call to action, such as drive your car less or abandon it altogether, or buy this product not that, or help this cause for one reason or another, the different groups will respond according to whether it meets their needs – whether it "makes sense".

Many campaigns fail because they present a proposition in terms that 'work' for one part of the population but not others. To be effective across the population, campaigns need to be put in the three different sets of terms, to meet the different needs.

For example:

- settlers tend to look backwards, to yesterday (which was better) and dislike anything new or different as this threatens identity, belonging, security

- prospectors live in the now, for today, and seek rewards in terms of fashion, status, success, achievement and recognition, and are unconcerned with belonging, security or identity because they have that already

- pioneers look forwards, both in time and to new horizons: they like change, discovery, the unknown so long as it is ethically acceptable but are unworried about status because they have already met those needs

So in the case of 'climate change', if it was a long term global problem, they might think

- settlers: that's not a problem unless it immediately affects my family, my local area, my identity, my traditions

- prospectors: that's not a problem unless it affects my prospects for achievement and success

- pioneers: it's a problem

If they decided it was a problem worthy of action, their responses would tend to be

- settlers: someone should do something about it (leaders of the system, not me, at least not until everyone else is)

- prospectors: we should organise (preferably via well known high status brand, be that political, social or commercial – in the system)

- pioneers: I'll do it myself (hang the consequences, I'll change things if I have to, even the system – ie these are the natural activists)

When offered a 'solution' by others, for example a technology change such as a solar panel, they might react something like this

- settlers: I'd rather not change (but if everyone else is doing it and it's normal and it's done with people like me, ok)

- prospectors: I'm not taking up causes or things that may not work but if it's in fashion, it's for me (if it helps me look successful)

- pioneers: if it's for the good of the planet, or has an ethical imperative, we must do it

Effective 'solar-panel' inducements might include

- settlers: the Queen has them on her roof, Tony Blair has them on his roof, the Council supplies them, my neighbour has one – they're normal

- prospectors: they add value to my home, they're the latest thing, made by a blue chip company, and you can get the model changed in line with the latest trend

- pioneers: I'm in a network of interesting people doing this for a good cause

This picture is a gross simplification of the richer patterns that emerge when you look at the 12 groups within the three main motivational states – see the Values and Voters study.

Nevertheless it is important to note:

- the different groups take action in different ways

- the different groups may elect to do the same thing but for very different 'reasons' because they are meeting different needs

The abiding problem with campaigns by 'cause' groups is that they tend to be founded, like most social initiatives, by the pioneers, who are society's experimenters and activists. They then tend to project "what works" for them, onto the rest of society, often with poor results.

An appeal for living to stay within global limits for instance, has natural resonance with pioneers but is an invitation to "think globally" and is thus an anathema to settlers. Prospectors may dismiss this as "do gooding": an invitation to lose time which is in pursuit of success, by wasting it on benefiting others. Unless there's something significant in it for them, they're probably not going to join a campaign or act.

The small study we report on below, for example, shows that the notion of describing climate change as an 'emergency', which is popular with many campaigners, probably won't have much impact with others, who could be better mobilised in other ways.

Turning again to climate, here are some real examples of campaign-calls which 'work' for settlers or pioneers or prospectors:

- settlers: the American Detroit Project campaign (www.detroitproject.com) against SUVs, which portrays SUVs not as their usual safety and security guarantee but as a threat to individual, local and family safety because they encourage terrorism. How? Because they use a lot of petrol, and in America, most petrol is imported from Arab countries so it's 'putting money into the hands of terrorists'. (Not all 'settler' messages need to be xenophobic – a threat to local identity could equally be the disappearance of much loved local flowers or traditions – no snow at Christmas perhaps).

- prospectors: the emergence of the Toyota Prius, an electric-hybrid car, which went in the US from a 'deep green' niche model (bought by pioneers) to a fashion icon when Cameron Diaz and Leonardo di Caprio started driving them (now there are waiting lists for the Prius in the US)

- pioneers: the majority of campaigns – boycott Esso, ride a bike to work to do your bit for people in remote Pacific islands threatened by sea level rise, buy green electricity to save the climate

You can't argue settlers into seeing things like pioneers or prospectors into seeing things like settlers, and so on. You can't 'sell messages' which make sense to one group, to another.

So is all we need to do to make campaigns about climate effective, to segment them according to needs? Unfortunately not[6]. As well as talking 'talking their language' in psychological terms, we need to make sure we're talking about the same thing, with common assumptions about what is intrinsically good and bad about it, and how, if it's a problem, it will be resolved.   One way to think about this is 'framing'.

Framing

'Framing' is shorthand for the mental processes we use to construct understanding. It's a "aha - it's a one of those" recognition process which is largely unconscious. Once a frame is triggered, we accept what fits with it and discard what doesn't. The 'facts' that don't fit are discarded, not the frame.

Cognitive psychologist George Lakoff, author of *Don't Think of An Elephant*[7], has written several fascinating studies of framing applied to issues ranging from the resonance of images of '9/11' to famous US Presidential debates and the very different ways Americans and Europeans construct international relations in their minds. Lakoff refers to frames as the mental metaphors we unwittingly reach for to understand any new information. "First we see, then we understand".   His work and that of other framers can be found at www.frameworksinstitute.org and www.rockridgeinstitute.org.

A few years ago the Frameworks Institute conducted a study of the frames Americans use to understand 'climate change'. The dominant frames for 'climate' were either that it was made by God or by Nature. In neither case was it plausible that people could change it, so climate-change seemed an implausible proposition to start with. As a consequence many Americans were predisposed to discount any evidence that human-made climate-change was taking place.

If the 'cause' was alleged to be fossil fuels, the proposition became even less resonant. For many Americans 'fossil fuels' were framed as part of 'building America' and 'good for the economy'. A call to cut fossil fuels was inherently unattractive, even unpatriotic, and to do so because of 'climate-change' was a no-no.

In a study on international inter-dependence, Lakoff has also shown that Americans tended to use frames of 'the family' and 'neighbours' as a way to comprehend international relations. Whereas Europeans tended to see parental relationships as continuing into the child's adult life, Americans believed more that as soon as a child could be independent, he or she was on their own. Moreover, the European conception of neighbour relations was more civic, with an expectation that town meetings and so on would be used to resolve common problems. Americans believe more that problems get resolved around the family table, and the role of a neighbour is to keep to his or her side of the fence and only to intervene in times of acute crisis (and get out as soon as possible). Moreover, as the biggest nation, America was like the parent.

Put these frames together and you have a clear picture as to why international cooperation through something like the Kyoto Protocol, to tackle climate change caused by fossil fuels, was a hard sell in the States. (The Institute went on to identify some frames that could be more effective – talking about "carbon dioxide pollution" for example. In the "pollution" frame, less is naturally good. This may be what led George Bush to initially back proposals to introduce legal controls to cut CO2 pollution, only to reverse them later, when, it seems, someone pointed out to him that this was all about 'climate change').

This is not to say that it's plain sailing for climate campaigns in Europe. Clearly it isn't, though the culture is more sympathetic than the American one. Unfortunately, despite the huge efforts and large sums invested by NGOs and governments in trying to 'mobilise' the European publics on the issue, nobody has conducted an equivalent of the Frameworks Institute study in Europe. Each campaign becomes something of a blind experiment in public psychology – very often an uncontrolled and costly stab in the dark.

Campaigners certainly use and trigger frames. They also create them. One example is that climate change is a 'difficult, complex, intractable' problem. Some who sought to raise awareness of the issue did a good job in using this idea to characterise climate change. Presumably they thought that by posing it as hugely significant, they would attract support to tackle it. Perhaps if everyone was an inner-directed globally and ethically minded individual they would have been right but most people are not. Almost half the UK population for example are now esteem driven, and amongst other things, are averse to taking risks (such as trying to tackle an almost insoluble problem), and over a fifth are settlers who shy away from anything 'global'.

The results of this characterisation were all too plain when a year or two ago, a famous climate scientist and an eminent economist demonstrated that the economic costs of tackling climate change were actually rather slight. The public and political response was negligible: the facts did not fit the frame.

Similarly, Tony Blair's repeated characteristaion of climate change as a terribly difficult problem of international relations[8], has the immediate effect of signalling to most of the population that they cannot play any role in this. Yet he, like many others, often follows this with exhortations to individual action. These two frames are incompatible. Unfortunately they are the two main frames used in the proposed UK Government 'strategy' for climate change communications drawn up by agency Futerra, in which the 'big idea' is that Britain should take a 'world-lead' in tackling climate change and the main proposed actions are by communities and individuals.

The short pilot survey we have conducted cannot provide a comprehensive answer to what the most effective communications on climate change would be but it does illustrate how, with a more comprehensive study of framing and of Motivational Groups, one could be drawn up. If work like this is not done, then well-intentioned initiatives such as the NGO 'Climate Movement' and the UK Government's 'Climate Communications Campaign' are likely to fail.

Results Of Our Pilot Study

The full set of data from the nationally representative sample is appended at our website www.campaignstrategy.org. The data are broken down by age, sex, location, socio-economic group and, by the Maslowian value-modes and Motivational Groups.

Question 1

Whose fault is it?

There are many factors that are responsible for climate change.
Out of the following list, who do you think is the most responsible for climate change?

we are all responsible	53%
governments and the laws they pass	21%
oil companies	8%
people who drive big cars	6%
no one, it is just natural change	9%
don't know	2%
none of these	1%

Comment: it is notable in most of these questions that there are very few 'don't knows' or 'none of these'. This suggests that the popular notion that the public is not engaged with climate change is a misconception – this is a mature issue which people have quite clear views about. This question also suggests that effective frames for calls to action are likely to involve individual lifestyles or choices.

Question 2

Which one of the the following do you think that climate change is most like?

a race to develop solutions	9%
an emergency	11%
a problem of international cooperation	48%
another scare story	6%
a judgement on us	4%
unavoidable	15%
don't know	5%
none of these	1%

Comment: these options are designed to put the issue in terms that determine means of resolution or action. Many NGOs spend a lot of time trying to counter propaganda from opponents or the media about climate change being just a scare. This suggests that they don't need to worry – only 6% share this view. The God frame, popular in the USA, has little traction in Britain: hence only 4% see it as a 'judgement'. Yet relatively few also recognize it as an emergency or something driven by, or waiting for solutions – more popular campaign angles. The most popular public option by far is 'international cooperation'.

Question 3

Which of the following do you FIRST think of when you hear about climate change?

weather forecasts   17%

far away places   6%

home, family or my garden   15%

nature and wildlife   13%

God   3%

the future   42%

don't know   2%

none of these   2%

Comment: again, few respondents had difficulty in picking one of these options, and again, God scores lowly. And almost as low comes 'far away places': another example of a common assumption by pundits and campaigners - that people see it as an overseas issue - is wrong. Indeed home, family, garden, the homely weather forecast and nature and wildlife all score strongly. The clear favourite though is the future, suggesting not that it's someone else's problem, but it's ours, only not yet.   Of course this deserves more investigation – does this mean the impacts may not arise at all? Or that they will but are not yet felt? Or what? Qualitative research with groups or interviews could help tease this out.

Question 4

If the UK was to take a world lead in tackling climate change, who do you think would most need to act to make a real difference?

Tony Blair	11%
George Bush	24%
community groups	4%
individuals	22%
environmental organisations	13%
business and industry	23%
don't know	2%
none of these	2%

Comment: here we have the DEFRA/Futerra strategy problem. While we know that many see it as requiring international cooperation, the critical action required for the UK to take an effective role is not to be led by Tony Blair but G W Bush. Community groups – the agents favoured in the DEFRA/Futerra approach – score only 4%.

Question 5

Which of these 2 statements do you most agree with?

We should cut down on our use of imported   31%
oil to make the country less vulnerable to
instability in the Middle East

We should cut down on our use of imported   57%
oil to make the country less vulnerable to
global warming and climate

don't know   6%

none of these   6%

Comment:

This question was asked to test the resonance among the UK population for the American tactic of talking about imported oil as a threat. (figures in the US Administration have done this, perhaps as a way of moving towards a Kyoto-type action without doing it for 'climate' reasons).   Here the 'don't-knows' and 'none of these's jump up. This choice is less familiar than the ideas in the previous questions. From this snapshot though, it appears that for Britons, climate change is more of a threat to security than instability in the Middle East.

Discussion of Results In Terms Of Psychological Groupings

Who is Most Responsible for Climate Change?

Out of a range of seven possible answers, over 53% of respondents chose 'We are all individually responsible'. Only one other choice made it into double figures. Given this pattern, it is possible to assume that the majority of the population (by a slim margin) are willing to change their behaviours based on 'climate change'.

36% of all the respondents who agreed that they were part of the 'all' who were responsible, were Pioneers. This is the leading edge group, who tend to lead new ways of thinking and behaviour. They make up 35% of the population. If the % agreeing with this response is divided by the % of the group within the population as a whole, we get an index of 103.

45% of respondents choosing this option were Prospectors. As they are 44% of the population, they have an index of 102.

Both these indices can be called 'average' – hardly any difference from what would be expected at random. This begins to indicate that the population has accepted the answer 'we are all individually responsible', but for different reasons.

Interestingly Settlers, now just 21% of the population and typically the last to accept new ideas or behaviours, are the people most likely to reject the option 'we are all individually responsible'. Comprising just 19% of the total respondents opting for this answer, they generated a below average index of 91.

Possible Issues:

If there is a significant opposition from one part of society, campaigns sometimes set out to 'change minds' there. However, a programme that is designed to get greater 'buy-in' into acceptance of individual responsibility among Settlers may be perceived as worthy and irrelevant to the two bigger Motivational Groups. So campaigning to try and get the Settlers to change may have the perverse effect of stalling a major drive for people taking more individual responsibility for climate change.

When a culture has this level of acceptance of an issue, planners and decision makers need to create ways in which people can actually change their behaviour, rather than simply continuing to highlight the issue. The nature of change on offer must be geared to the differing needs of the three Motivational Groups.

Important questions to think about/resolve:

Is this a key question, or just 'interesting to know'? It depends on the strategy adopted.

Do Settlers equate 'individual responsibility' with 'their responsibility'?

What do Pioneers really think about individual responsibility?

Do Prospectors feel the same way?

Can NGOs or government campaigns do anything to change the acceptance level of this option?

What happens if more Pioneers start responding in a very different way?

Does anyone believe that no-one is responsible - that it's just natural change?

Well, yes. Over 9% of the population believes this. This makes them uniquely unreceptive to calls for changes to individual behaviours to halt climate change. They are less than one in ten of the population - but do they have the potential to change others' behaviours? If so, who are they likely to influence?

Only 19% of these people are in the leading edge group, the Pioneers. This gives them a significantly low index of 54, ie much lower than 'by chance'.

47% of the people believing this option are Prospectors. As they make up 44% of the population this gives them a slightly above average index of 106.

And 34% of all those seeing climate change as a natural occurrence and 'no one's' fault are Settlers. They index at a very significant 161: much higher than by chance

If NGOs or Government fund programmes that set out to refute arguments put forward by opponents of action on climate change who argue it is a totally natural occurrence and not something we can 'stop' or 'reverse', they may actually increase the numbers of people who will cease some of their current efforts while they undertake a 're-view' of the issue. In other words, the programme becomes counter-productive because it raises a doubt which 91% of the population did not share.

For example, Pioneers have for the most part rejected this option - 95% of them did not select it. But this is the group that is most likely to seek out and listen to new ideas. It is potentially possible that communications could frame the option in such a way that Pioneers would reconsider their options – deliberately in the case of opponents of action (eg some 'contrarians') or accidentally in the case of well-meaning campaigners.

So which groups will affect which other groups? 10% of Prospectors have given this as their answer. This group is unlikely to affect the thoughts and behaviours of Pioneers on this issue.

The 15% of Settlers who believe this option to be true are among those most likely to not believe 'experts' on anything, relying more on personal experience, or experiences of people close to them. They are likely to have some influence in a small and 'bounded' group of people, but little influence outside of this small circle. If it is necessary to influence them, then it may be useful to think about what else these Settlers 'believe in'.

Questions to think about:

Should NGOs or government invest any time or money in refuting this option?

What is the likely outcome if it does?

Will it change the 'dis-believers' beliefs?

Would those new beliefs translate into changed behaviour, or just changed attitudes?

Is there any positive outcome from attempting to change this mindset among Pioneers? Prospectors? Settlers?

Should funds go to programmes that portray climate change as 'an emergency'?

Despite its popularity amongst campaigners, only 11% of respondents believe that climate change can be typified as 'an emergency'.

In other words, about 90% of people exposed to a message that states that climate change is an emergency will experience dissonance, and probably reject the message as not relevant to them. It may well be seen as 'environment for environmentalists'.

Pioneers are the most likely to believe that climate change is an emergency. 39% of all those who believe this are Pioneers. This gives them an index of an above average 114. These people are disproportionately represented among activist campaign groups. There is a risk of only preaching to the converted if messages on 'emergencies' are addressed to a wide audience via public media. It would be possible to restrict messaging to channels only likely to be used by the 'converted', which will be fine if the object is to mobilise them. However, Pioneers are unlikely to need overt clues or messages to take immediate actions once they perceive a need for changed behaviours. DIY is their action-mode when convinced about a new problem. Communications based around an emergency are unnecessary for them – they will decide for themselves whether an emergency exists.

39% of people who believe climate change can be typified as an emergency are Prospectors, the same percentage as for Pioneers. Because Prospectors are a larger group they have a lower index - in fact they score a low index of only 89. Prospectors are influenced by Pioneers in terms of new concepts, so it is likely that this figure could change to a higher index.

Settlers have an index of 100 and seem to just be following the trend, as is usual at this point.

Overall, a programme of public communications that portrays climate change as an emergency may have a long-term counter-productive effect if people's experiences in the future do not match the expectations they had when taking 'emergency actions'.

Prospectors will react quite quickly if messages are framed in a way that tells them that they need to act NOW! This is their kind of message.

Settlers on the other hand are always slightly wary of anyone or anything that asks them to change any form of behaviour. Creating 'emergencies' that have long periods of payback (like most climate change issues) are almost certain to result in little to no change in behaviour. The key to Settler behaviour change is to have short periods between behaviour change and observable/measurable changes in the environment.

Questions to think about:

How can campaigns inject some urgency into behaviour change? What measures of 'noticeable result' could be instituted and promoted?

Is typifying climate change as 'an emergency' capable of shifting opinions and behaviours?

Who is most likely to change if climate change is not seen as an emergency?

Do communicators need to understand Prospectors better? Or Pioneers? Or even the Settlers?

Conclusion

As can be seen from this very cursory examination of the data, it is possible to get a very different and detailed picture of people and their motivations in relation to possible campaign calls, through looking at psychological segments of the population rather than across the population as a whole. Value-based targeting at the more detailed level of the twelve Values Modes should be used to test specific campaign propositions.

****

* Who we are:

Chris Rose is a communications and campaigns consultant and director of Campaign Strategy Ltd working for public bodies (eg Home Office, English Nature), NGOs (eg Greenpeace, Amnesty, WWF) and private sector companies. Formerly Deputy Executive Director of Greenpeace, founder and Director of media agency and charity Media Natura, and campaigner with WWF International and Friends of the Earth. Recently published a book *How To Win Campaigns*, published by Earthscan, and runs a free campaign planning website www.campaignstrategy.org. Helps his partner run the Fairyland Trust www.fairylandtrust.org, an innovative conservation organisation.

Pat Dade is recognised as one of Britain's leading experts on psycho-social cultural change. He is a founding Director of Cultural Dynamics Strategy and Marketing Ltd. Cultural Dynamics runs an on-going cultural survey which measures the changing values, beliefs and motivations of the British population. Using this deep and extensive data base established over 30 years Patrick advises major corporations and government bodies on the implications of micro and macro cultural changes for their programmes, policies and procedures, from corporate strategy and long range planning to market segmentation and creative brand development. He has worked closely with over 400 major organizations around the world. He lectures extensively in universities, business schools and on management development programmes for multinationals. His deep awareness of, and experience with the use of, psycho-social trends provides him with a unique and valuable insight into the dynamics of the futureGroups utilising such Value Modes research include BT, Shell, Unilever, BBC, Arsenal Football Club and the US Marines.

Nick Gallie is a freelance communications consultant currently focussed on producing internal communications and communications training programmes for major corporations (utilizing the IllustraReseach training model). Clients include Hewlett Packard and Canon. Nick was formerly Creative Director of Greenpeace UK where he was responsible for the group's award winning communications campaigns for many years. Nick is also a former Director of the media agency Media Natura. He was responsible for the successful launch of the renewable energy supplier Unit[e] (now Good Energy) into the UK and for the creation of the on-line lobbying community Rural Futures**.**

John Scott is a founding partner at KSBR Brand Futures (www.ksbr.co.uk), a Full Member of the Market Research Society, an Honorary Research Fellow at Lancaster University and a Member of the Marketing Society. John has designed and led projects for a wide variety of clients including commercial organisations, pressure groups, the BBC and the Central Office of Information.

[1] Chris Rose chris@campaignstrategy.co.uk

[2] Pat Dade thegurupat@aol.com

[3] The questions concerned were paid for by the JMG Foundation. Other climate-related questions were asked for a national environmental organisation and will be released should that group decide to do so.

[4] http://www.defra.gov.uk/news/2005/050216d.htm CHANGING PUBLIC ATTITUDES TO CLIMATE CHANGE DEFRA press release. The Futerra report and evidence base is at http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/climatechange/02.htm

[5] For the DEFRA strategy a large number of qualitative and quantitative studies were reviewed by Andrew Darnton but none of these looks systematically at values or motivations and none do so nationally. Most are small interview or focus group studies designed to look at specific propositions or issues such as uptake of energy efficiency. See the 92 page report at http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/climatechange/pdf/ccc-app1.pdf

[6] For instance, while cliamte campoaigns will already be appealing disproportionately to pioneers, they clearly haven't recruited the 35% of the population that are pioneers

[7] Pub Chelsea Green, 2004

[8] for example '*no one nation alone can resolve it. It has no definable boundaries. Short of international action commonly agreed and commonly followed through, it is hard even for a large country to make a difference on its own.'* Speech by Prime Minister Tony Blair on the 10th anniversary of the Prince of Wales' Business and Environment Programme.

contact:

Chris Rose 01328 711526
chris@campaignstrategy.co.uk
see also www.campaignstrategy.org