

Concerned #2

Robert Coleman, Jason Garver, Marxa Marnia, Andrea Martin, Brian Spang

Introduction

- Interviewees all fell into the "Concerned #2" category
- Wide range of interview locations, time-lengths, and discussion topics
 - 13 minute interview and a 1 hour interview, though same set of questions
 - interviewed in offices, public spaces, etc.

Refined Keywords and Themes:

- **Keywords:** corporate (x19), alarming (x8), grandchildren/future generations/time/too late (x11), science (x30+), education (x14), data (x5), media (x50+)
- **Themes:** extreme/severe weather words, importance of scientific competency or education, future generations and family members, future impacts, “us vs. them” separation from nature, economics/money, change as a solution, fear of change as a barrier, climate science is indubitable,

Refined Wordle of Keywords

science
media
corporate
education
future.
data
alarming

Matrix 1: Information Sources

Information Sources	<i>Trusted</i>	<i>Not Trusted</i>
<i>Least mentioned</i>	press releases, newspapers, magazines, BBC, Al Gore, John Stewart,	"opposing views," ABC, NBC, CBS, Fox News
<i>Most mentioned</i>	scientific data documentation (2), NPR, internet, talk radio	Mass media, Fox News (2)

Matrix 2: Government Action

Government Action	<i>Trusted</i>	<i>Not Trusted</i>
<i>Least mentioned</i>	advertisements, changes to “social climate”	emissions related, carbon trading for corporations, Kyoto
<i>Most mentioned</i>	pollution control, recycling, community government (2), mandates on corporate behavior, regulations on manufactured vehicle emissions and efficiency, end of carbon trading	politicians in general, federal government, monetary investment

Matrix 3: Climate Change: Participant's Understanding

Climate Change: Participant's Understanding	<i>Shallow Understanding</i>	<i>Deep Understanding</i>	<i>Background Beliefs (Opinion)</i>	<i>Peripheral Beliefs (Reasons Why)</i>
<i>media</i>		X	Not objective.	Bias or inaccurate info.
<i>time</i>		X	What about those that come after us?	Future generations will deal with our mistakes, while bureaucracy gets in the way.
<i>corporate</i>	X		The "bad" guys.	Corporate waste and emissions far outweigh cumulative impact of individuals.
<i>alarming</i>		X	A good thing, but their aren't enough people drawing attention to the problem.	Want to and may not be able to because of other concerns (i.e., economic pressures/no jobs) or not have the education level to understand how to change.
<i>data</i>	X		The data is indubitable.	Science is fact.scien
<i>science</i>		X	Stressed the importance of science in determining the role of climate change.	People do not have enough scientific knowledge.
<i>education</i>		X	Stressed the importance of education on interrelationships between science, climate, media, and policy.	People will not otherwise seek-out information detailing the interconnections of science, climate, media, and policy.

Surprising Outcomes

- Difficulty in drawing parallels between quantitative and qualitative data, maybe it is best to analyze them independently of one another?
 - Maybe the hallmark of good qualitative data is when it is supported by quantitative? and/or vice versa?
- Different conclusions from interviews than from survey:
 - “I would have thought they would be...”
 - There seems to be agreement that we interviewers expected our individual participants to be ‘alarmed’ Americans, we were surprised that they did not.
- When the interview became a conversation, things got a whole lot easier.
- Mitigation strategies
 - Top-down strategies, like carbon trading (cap and trade), not trusted (“a sham”)
 - Corporations are self-serving

Conclusions

- “Canned” or “auto” responses may skew some data.
- Maybe the hallmark of good qualitative data is when it is supported by quantitative? and/or vice-versa?
- Maybe the difference between “Concerned” and “Alarmed” is self-perception?
 - “Concerned” individuals may view their stewardship as doing “enough.”

Potential Future Work

- We could revise the questions to omit the keywords we have identified. Thus providing a truer representation of the participants opinion/vocabulary.
- A more random survey would obviously provide more representative results of the Olympia population.
- Future work might entail investigating the methods used by other groups conducting the 'Six Americas' survey and then applying those methods to a new survey of Olympia, comparing the Olympia study to other cities.
- It might also be interesting to investigate how to use this data to create more research questions on how to address educating the general public about climate change/make them more able to understand the scientific data.