

Supporting research & resources for...

2. Finding trusted spokespeople to deliver your messages:

Bubula, T., M. Nisbet, R. Borchelt, et al. (2009). Commentary: Science communication reconsidered. *Nature Biotechnology*. Vol: 27 (6) pp: 514-519.

- Due to a prevailing assumption that public opposition to controversies in science is rooted in ignorance and scientific illiteracy, simply presenting all of the facts has been the default response in science communication. This "deficit approach" ignores the possibility that facts may not be the most important driver of individual decision making.

Stugis, P. and N Allum. (2004) Science in society: re-evaluating the deficit model of public attitudes. *Public Understanding of Science*, 13: 55-74.

- Ideology, social identity and trust have much greater influence on how people make sense of controversial issues than facts. As such, acceptance of facts is incumbent upon the acceptance of the source.

Powell, M. and D.L. Kleinman. (2008). Building citizen capacities for participation in techno-scientific decision making. *Public Understanding of Science*, 17: 329-348.

- Efforts that involve stakeholders in dialogue surrounding controversial science are more likely to result in positive perception of scientists. However, it is important that the dialogue occurs early in the planning process, not at the 11th hour when key decisions have already been made.

Leiserowitz, A., Maibach, E., Roser-Renouf, C., Feinberg, G., & Rosenthal, S. (2015). *Climate change in the American mind: March, 2015*. Yale University and George Mason University. New Haven, CT: Yale Project on Climate Change Communication.

- The most trusted source for information about climate change is "Climate scientists", followed closely by "Family and friends". However, while most Americans trust climate scientists and believe they should have a role in shaping policy, there is a strong partisan divide. Trust of climate scientists is lower among people who associate with Republican ideologies.

Leombruni, L.V. (2015). How you talk about climate change matters: A communication network perspective on epistemic skepticism and belief strength. *Global Environmental Change* 35:148-16.

- Given the high priority that Americans place on trust of their family and friends when discussing climate change information, Leombruni suggests placing a priority on in-person influencer campaigns to promote acceptance of climate change within their networks.

Wolso et al. (2016) *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 65: 7-19.

- The way that individuals interpret information about climate change, and how they choose to act (or not) in response, is a function of what they deem as important, moral, and identity affirming. Because such social motivations are so profoundly influential in human psychology, it is immensely important to promote inclusivity and tolerance across moral and ideological frameworks, and from multiple perspectives.