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Overview

→ Introduction to key frames for net zero communication
→ What we did during this project
→ The results: climate concern & politics and segment specific insights
→ Recommendations for communicating about net zero and fairness: the do’s and don’ts
Net zero communication - key frames

Waste
Pride
Fairness/Unfairness
Connections/Independence
Wellbeing
What we did
Original Britain Talks Climate research undertaken by More in Common, the European Climate Foundation and YouGov, in partnership with Climate Outreach.
We collaborated with ECF and YouGov in the design and delivery of a mixed-methods research methodology.

1) November 2021: Five stakeholder interviews

2) January 2022: Nationally representative survey with over 4000 participants from all Britain Talks Climate segments

3) February 2022: Four two-hour online focus groups, with the four segments of focus (8 participants in each)

4) February - April 2022: Synthesis and analysis of results (Climate Outreach analysis of YouGov data)
The results
Climate concern is high, but is not seen as a political issue

- Climate impacts including: destruction from extreme weather, harm to nature, and negative impacts on future generations resonate across political and demographic divides.
- Other concerns include: cost of living and suffering for the world’s poorest.
- The majority of segments are not engaging with climate change in terms of politics or policies - climate change is not a priority for people’s vote.

“A lot of it [worry for her children’s future] is to do with the climate as well. Will there be anywhere to live for them, you know, and their children if things go wrong with what’s happening now? So, [I’m] just a bit worried, and, you know, [the] cost of living as well.” - Loyal National
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Backpack Conservative</th>
<th>Disengaged Traditionalist</th>
<th>Loyal National</th>
<th>Established Liberal</th>
<th>Disengaged Battler</th>
<th>Civic Pragmatist</th>
<th>Progressive Activist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (49%)</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (34%)</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (52%)</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (53%)</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (41%)</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (67%)</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (38%)</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (32%)</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (42%)</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (48%)</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (38%)</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (57%)</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Negative impact on children’s future (37%)</td>
<td>[Not worried about climate change] (26%)</td>
<td>Negative impact on children’s future (39%)</td>
<td>Negative impact on children’s future (40%)</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (30%)</td>
<td>Negative impact on children’s future (49%)</td>
<td>Negative impact on children’s future (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (31%)</td>
<td>Negative impact on children’s future (24%)</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (36%)</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (25%)</td>
<td>Negative Impact on children’s future (29%)</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (31%)</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[Not worried about climate change] (21%)</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (20%)</td>
<td>[Not worried about climate change] (16%)</td>
<td>[Not worried about climate change] (15%)</td>
<td>[Not worried about climate change] (18%)</td>
<td>Make some food unavailable (16%)</td>
<td>Make some food unavailable (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>Disengaged Traditionalist</td>
<td>Loyal Nationals</td>
<td>Established Liberal</td>
<td>Disengaged Battler</td>
<td>Civic Pragmatist</td>
<td>Progressive Activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (49%)</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (34%)</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (52%)</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (53%)</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (41%)</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (67%)</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (38%)</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (32%)</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (42%)</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (48%)</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (38%)</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (57%)</td>
<td>Harm nature and wildlife (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Negative impact on children’s future (37%)</td>
<td>[Not worried about climate change] (26%)</td>
<td>Negative impact on children’s future (39%)</td>
<td>Negative impact on children’s future (40%)</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (30%)</td>
<td>Negative impact on children’s future (49%)</td>
<td>Negative impact on children’s future (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (31%)</td>
<td>Negative impact on children’s future (24%)</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (36%)</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (25%)</td>
<td>Negative Impact on children’s future (29%)</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (31%)</td>
<td>Cause bills/costs to rise (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[Not worried about climate change] (21%)</td>
<td>Suffering for the world’s poorest (20%)</td>
<td>[Not worried about climate change] (16%)</td>
<td>[Not worried about climate change] (15%)</td>
<td>[Not worried about climate change] (18%)</td>
<td>Make some food unavailable (16%)</td>
<td>Make some food unavailable (13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Established Liberals

- Most think richer countries should pay to **help poorer countries** (59% support, 21% oppose)
- Fairness: **special rules for special circumstances** over the same rules for all
- **Most willing to change certain aspects of their lifestyles:**
  - Most willing to pay a flight tax (44% on/after 2nd flight)
  - 45% willing to reduce meat consumption
  - 3% very likely and 14% likely to install heat pumps
- Risk: having to choose the economy over the environment
- Opportunity: bold Britain in the world
- **Narrative recommendation:** Net zero policies addressing the destruction of nature and biodiversity, and simultaneously protecting the environment and the economy
Loyal Nationals

- More **pessimistic** about impacts of net zero (23% think net zero will have a very negative impact on inequality between rich and poor)
- Among the **least knowledgeable** of net zero and most likely to **want to have a say**
- **Strong fairness concerns**, their views on what is fair scales by income (**taxing the rich is fair, grants to the rich are unfair**)

“it’s very hard when you look around to see much fairness anywhere. It doesn’t matter. Everyone seems to be either having to pay more taxes, paying more for everything, and getting less.”

- **Risk**: not having a say on net zero
- **Opportunity**: promote clear & simple climate policy symbolising fair outcome
- **Narrative recommendation**: climate change mitigation policies supporting sense of preparedness for localised effects
Disengaged Traditionalists

- **Feel unrepresented**: 51% select “none of the above” for who represents their interests
- Among the **least knowledgeable about net zero**
- **Environmental taxes and benefits** are seen as **generally unfair** - no matter whether they are for the rich or poor
- **Support for environmental policies tends to be lower** than that of other segments:
  - Least likely to support low traffic neighbourhoods (45%),
  - Least likely to want to pay a flight tax (40% unwilling)

→ **Risk**: might be easily swayed on their net zero opinions
→ **Opportunity**: focus on a few policy areas of interest
→ **Narrative recommendation**: Link net zero policies to a range of everyday concerns to bring the issue closer to DTs
Backbone Conservatives

- Most likely to want the same rules for everyone, fairness means same treatment and everyone playing by the same rules
  
  “I think it [fairness] means equality, being treated in the same way. Treating others in the same where you’d expect to be, sort of, treated.”

- Somewhat open to changing lifestyles

- 70% believe environmental and economic outcomes are both achievable

  → Risk: having to choose the economy over the environment
  
  → Opportunity: sound economic and nation-growing arguments
  
  → Narrative recommendation: Policies that protect natural landscapes compatible with pride in British countryside
Recommendations for engagement
Talk about “doing your bit”, but don’t… ignore differences in means and motivations

Invoke fairness, with care and don’t… assume that fairness means the same thing to all

Acknowledge and channel feelings of unfairness towards shared concerns, but don’t underestimate sensitivity to unfairness

Talk about the UK working with other countries, but don’t… overlook the importance of communicating global efforts
Do’s and don’ts

➔ Frame net zero as an opportunity for financial well being, instead of *pitting economic growth against environmental protection*

➔ Build on the co-benefits of net zero, but *don’t* get into technical detail at the expense of values or common sense

➔ Talk about renewables as a way to increase energy independence and self-reliance for Britain, but *don’t* assume that people connect the dots between climate change, net zero and energy

➔ Actively build trust through finding the right messengers, but *don’t* underestimate the critical need to restore and build trust in some communities
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