

Assessment of the Status and Potential for Growing the Moral Movement on Climate Disruption

A Project of the National Climate Ethics Campaign

April 2013

Authors: Bob Doppelt, Katie Huber, Sarah Mazze, Jean Stockard

Contact: Bob Doppelt, Executive Director
The Resource Innovation Group
bob@trig-cli.org



The **Resource**
Innovation
Group



**National
Climate
Ethics
Campaign**

Assessment of the Status and Potential for Growing The Moral Movement on Climate Disruption

Executive Summary

Climate disruption is a profoundly moral issue. The consequences of uncontrolled climate disruption wreak socio-economic and ecological devastation and the decisions about how to respond to the crisis will ultimately be based on moral and ethical values, whether or not they are acknowledged as such. Organizations that help Americans grasp the moral implications of the emergency can therefore make a major contribution to shifting the nation's mindset about climate disruption and to implementing solutions. Yet to date, little has been known about the strengths, limitations, needs, and opportunities for improved effectiveness of organizations that are making a moral call to action on climate disruption. This report provides an assessment of many of these organizations and offers recommendations to increase their effectiveness and grow the size and impact of the movement.

The assessment is a project of the [National Climate Ethics Campaign](#), which is coordinated by [The Resource Innovation Group \(TRIG\)](#), in partnership with a 15-person national advisory committee and a five-person social-science committee.

For the purposes of this survey, a moral call to action on climate disruption is defined as a values-based message that proclaims that individually and collectively we have a moral obligation to prevent unjustifiable human suffering and death, grave social inequities, and degradation to the earth's ecosystems and climate that are the source of all life. The results are based on the analysis of data collected through an online survey of 135 representatives of organizations that use a moral frame for their call to action on climate change and on several follow-up interviews with select respondents.

The findings paint a portrait of a movement that includes a wide variety of small and large, faith and secular organizations located across the nation that are making a moral call to action on climate. There were many commonalities amongst the organizations. However, they tend to have different goals and use different strategies and tactics that could be broken down into two different groupings, which we call clusters.

The first cluster, made up largely of lower budget, religious organizations with smaller membership, emphasizes personal awareness and engagement, with a moral imperative for action being the primary frame they use. The second cluster, which mainly includes larger budget, non-religious organizations, measures their success based primarily on new policies enacted or implemented and employs a moral call to action as merely one of a number of communications frames.

The membership and constituencies of most organizations within both clusters on average include more people with liberal perspectives, yet the first cluster had a lower percentage of politically liberal members than the second cluster.

Organizations within both clusters attributed their effectiveness to clarity of purpose, effective framing and messaging, partnerships with like-minded organizations, effective leadership, and touching people on an emotional level.

The most common reasons for difficulties or failures were lack of funding, ineffective messaging, and lack of clear purpose and goals.

The vast majority of respondents have only informal or anecdotal measurement tools that they rated as moderate or poor in quality, providing them with limited insight into the effectiveness of their strategies. They also have limited or no professional development training programs for staff.

The most important factors needed to increase their organizations' effectiveness include additional staffing and funding, followed by assistance with framing and messaging, goal and strategy development, and evaluation and measurement.

The report concludes with a series of recommendations for organizations making a moral call to action on climate disruption. Recommendations are also offered for funders wanting to help increase the effectiveness of the organizations. These include the need to increase the ability of groups to develop clear goals, strategies and tactics, improve staff education and training, broaden their focus to include people with moderate and conservative political views, and employ better measurement and evaluation mechanisms. In addition, organizations within each of the identified clusters might improve their effectiveness by developing stronger linkages and partnerships with organizations found within the other cluster or by considering the use of some of the strategies and tactics of the other cluster.

Introduction

Two issues have dominated the public debate about climate disruption: science and economics. Opponents of action claim that the science is uncertain and that emission reductions will harm the economy and destroy jobs; proponents of engagement assert that the science is clear and that addressing climate disruption will be good for the economy and create jobs. Missing from these frames is the moral dimensions of the issue.¹ Even if the science includes some uncertainties, the risks of appalling levels of human suffering and death, extreme social inequalities, and irreversible disruption to the earth's climate that supports all life are far too great to delay action. Even if the upfront costs are high, we have a moral obligation to do whatever is necessary to prevent runaway climate disruption. These points underscore the fact that climate disruption is a deeply moral issue; when this point is included, the public dialogue on climate disruption takes on a very different perspective.²

This report provides an assessment of organizations across the nation making a moral call to action on climate disruption. Its purpose is to provide a platform for dialogue about how to best increase the effectiveness of that call and how to expand the moral movement on climate disruption. Data for this assessment was gathered through a survey that was completed by 135 representatives of organizations across the nation that use a moral or values-based call to action to address climate disruption. The number of organizations is unknown, as many respondents chose to remain anonymous. The surveys were followed up with interviews with individuals from select organizations. The study is a project of the [National Climate Ethics Campaign](#), which is coordinated by [The Resource Innovation Group \(TRIG\)](#), in partnership with a 15-person national advisory committee and a five-person social-science committee. To our knowledge an assessment of the moral movement on climate disruption in the United States had not been completed prior to this study.

Based on results from the survey and interviews, this report identifies the different ways in which organizations are making a moral call to action on climate disruption, along with their related strengths, limitations, opportunities, and needs. This information forms the basis of a suite of recommendations found at the end of this document for increasing the size and effectiveness of the moral movement on climate disruption.

What is a Moral Call to Action on Climate Disruption?

Morality addresses questions related to what our duties and responsibilities are to other people, what is fair and unfair, and what is just and unjust in human relationships and our relationship with other species and the environment. For the purposes of this survey, a moral call to action on climate disruption was therefore defined as a values-based message that

¹ Markowitz, E.M. (2012). Is climate change an ethical issue? Examining young adults' beliefs about climate and morality. *Climatic Change*. Advanced online publication. doi: 0.1007/s10584-012-0422-8

² Shwom R, Bidwell D, Dan A, Dietz T (2010) Understanding U.S. public support for domestic climate change policies. *Glob Environ Change* 20:472–482

proclaims that individually and collectively we have a moral obligation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to protect the climate in order to:

1. Prevent unjustifiable human suffering and death due to the impacts of climate disruption and/or
2. Generate and/or ensure fairness and justice for all people now and in the future globally and/or
3. Sustain the Earth's natural systems for its own sake and/or because it is the source of all life.

The call to action can be based on religious values, such as a requirement to be good stewards of God's Creation. The call to action can also be based on non-theistic spiritual values such as love and compassion for all living beings, equity, justice for all, etc. Finally, the call to action can be based on personal ethical values such as living with integrity, good moral character, and so forth.

It is important to note that the moral call to action addresses both the consequences and the solutions to climate disruption. As noted, the impacts of climate disruption have profound moral implications. Equally important, although science and economics can help inform our decisions, the choices that must be made to respond to the problem will ultimately be based on the moral and ethical values we hold dearest regarding our duties and obligations to other people and the natural environment. Thus, a moral call to action asks people to surface and clarify the moral and ethical values that will guide their response to the climate crisis.

Survey Objectives

This assessment is intended to provide a platform to help both secular and faith-based organizations, as well as funders, understand the potential of a moral movement to generate significant individual, organizational, and social change on climate disruption. It also offers recommendations for how the movement can significantly improve and expand, better target its energies and resources, and better measure success.

Specific objectives of the research include:

1. Understand the commonalities and variations among organizations currently engaged in making a moral call for action on climate disruption.
2. Identify the strategies and tactics that organizations use to make a moral call to action on climate disruption.
3. Discuss the successes and failures of the movement, and explore their causal factors.
4. Recognize opportunities for enhancing the effectiveness and impacts of existing organizations and for expanding the size and diversity of groups involved in the movement.
5. Provide guidance on where funders can make investments to increase the effectiveness of organizations engaged in the movement.

Methods

To begin the project, The Resource Innovation Group (TRIG) established a 12-person steering committee composed of people representing faith and secular organizations from across the nation. TRIG also organized a social science advisory committee composed of 4 academic scholars as well as climate ethicists to help design the survey and evaluate results. See Appendix B for a list of steering committee and advisory committee members.

Data for this report was collected through an online survey, developed by TRIG with input from the social science advisory team. Some respondents were identified through a snowball sampling method, with steering committee members and known survey participants offering suggestions for additional organizations to include. Other respondents were identified through Internet research on organizations making a moral call to action on climate disruption. As the word spread about the survey, still other organizations asked to participate. Thus, the results do not represent a random sample, but rather an attempt to capture results from all relevant organizations using a morals or values-based call to action. (The questionnaire is available upon request from The Resource Innovation Group.)

After potential organizational respondents were identified, an email was sent explaining the purpose of the survey and asking people to complete it. Most people responded to the survey between late November 2012 and January 2013.

A team from TRIG that includes social science advisory committee member and TRIG Research Director, Dr. Jean Stockard, Professor Emeritus at the University of Oregon, analyzed the survey responses and developed a draft set of findings. Representatives from four organizations participated in follow up interviews (see results below). The TRIG team selected the organizations from those respondents that provided their contact information and that represented the variability apparent in the preliminary findings. The TRIG team designed interview questions that would confirm or deny the preliminary conclusions and provide deeper insight than obtainable through the survey. Information obtained during the interviews was compared to the draft findings and refinements were made.

Results

The survey asked about the strategic focus of the organizations, the ways in which they measured and evaluated their programs, and respondents' perceptions of their organizations' or programs' successes and failures as well as strengths, limitations, and needs. Results for each of these areas are summarized below and complete details are given in Appendix A. We begin by describing the organizations' characteristics and dimensions that appear to differentiate the groups.

Characteristics of Organizations

- **Size, Budget, and Focus Suggest Two Dominant Clusters:** Almost three-fourths of the respondents indicated that their organization was affiliated with the religious sector. About half had annual budgets of less than \$100,000, and a little more than half had been established for at least five years. One fourth of these groups said that a “moral or values-based call” was the only way their organization or program urged action, and over half said it was their primary, but not only approach. The remainder (a fifth) said that it was one of many approaches that they used equally. Organizations in the religious sector tended to have smaller budgets, use a moral or values based call as their primary or sole focus, and to have been established longer than non-religious organizations. In contrast, secular organizations tended to have larger budgets, use a moral or values-based call as only one of many approaches, and to be more recently established. The distinction between these two clusters of organizations is highlighted throughout the remainder of this discussion. Although similar in many respects, there appear to be important and statistically significant differences between the two clusters including different sizes and budgets, as well as primary focuses, strategies and tactics.
- **Staffing and Skill Development:** Two-thirds of the respondents representing both clusters indicated they were paid staff, while the others were volunteers. Four-fifths of the respondents were program directors rather than staff. When asked how the people who direct the daily operations of their organization or program expand their skills, the vast majority (84%), cutting across both cluster types, replied that it was “through voluntary education and training programs.” Only five percent said that they had required education and training and all of these were in the second cluster of larger, higher budget, non-religious organizations. Organizations in the first cluster of smaller, lower budget, single-focused, religious groups were significantly more likely to depend upon volunteers and to report that their staff had no formal training.
- **Funding:** The most commonly mentioned source of funding was small donations, followed by foundation grants. Corporate donations and earned income were least often mentioned. Organizations in the smaller, lower budget, single focused religious group cluster were significantly more likely to receive funding from religious organizations. Organizations within the larger, higher budget, multi-focused, secular group cluster were significantly more likely to receive large private donor funding.

- **Membership:** The organizations varied substantially in size. Almost a third had fewer than 100 members (defined as people who pay dues or regularly participate in activities), and a quarter had more than 1000 members. Organizations within the larger, higher budget, multi-focused, secular group cluster had significantly more members. On average the respondents reported that their members were politically liberal, but this was significantly more likely to occur with the organizations in the larger, higher budget, multi-focused, secular group cluster.

Strategic Focus

To understand the strategic focus of the groups we asked them to describe the frames of reference that they used, their goals, target audiences, strategies, and tactics. Note again that although we have found some statistically significant differences between the two clusters there is a good deal of overlap with, as described below, a number of organizations using similar frames and strategies.

“Our youth spokespersons, particularly founder Alec Loorz, has been able to bridge partisan politics by speaking with authentic moral authority about the issue that impacts his generation the most. Youth inherently resonate and are able to tell their own stories in equally compelling and authentic ways, with minimal “training”. We had a global march in 2011 that engaged 50,000+ youth in 200 cities and 43 countries.”

-Victoria Loorz, Kids vs. Global Warming

- **Communications Frames:** The respondents reported using a wide variety of communications frames when making their moral or values-based call to action. Most common was a “future generation” frame (e.g. protect future options for our children), noted by over three-fourths, followed by climate justice (e.g. treat all people equally and fairly in new policies and projects), ecological health (e.g. protect ecosystems and biodiversity from climate impacts), social equity (e.g. prevent climate impacts on those who emitted the least), and religious (e.g. we are stewards of God’s creation) frames, all of which were cited by two-thirds or more. All the other frames, except jobs and economic growth were cited by over half of respondents. Organizations within the smaller, lower budget, single focused, religious group cluster were significantly more likely to report using a religious frame and a personal responsibility frame (e.g. each individual must do their part to address the

problem) that those in the larger, multi-focused secular group cluster.

- **Goals and Hopes:** When asked what they hoped to achieve through their moral or values-based call to action, the respondents gave multiple responses, with almost all of the items listed marked by at least three-fifths of the sample. The most commonly endorsed items were reframing the public discourse about climate disruption, encouraging elected officials to introduce and/or support climate protection policies, and motivating the actively engaged public to adopt more sustainable behaviors. Least often mentioned were expanding membership and generating greater financial, time, or other commitments from members and constituents. Organizations in the smaller, lower-budget, single-focused, religious group cluster were more likely to report goals regarding motivating the public and their members to adopt more sustainable behaviors.

- Target Audiences:** The respondents reported a wide variety of target audiences. The most common targets, mentioned by about three fifths of the respondents, were religious leaders, organizational members, and lay leaders in faith communities (which is expected given the higher percentage of religious organizations that completed the survey), as well as individuals who accept the reality of climate disruption. Least commonly mentioned were likely voters, business executives, think tanks and academics, mentioned by a quarter or less. Organizations within the smaller, lower budget, single focused, religious group cluster were more likely to report targeting religious leaders, the U.S. Congress, and state elected officials or agencies. This seems contradictory, given that this cluster of organizations focuses primarily on increasing personal awareness and responsibility rather than policy change. A possible explanation could be that this cluster of groups listed a larger suite of target audiences, while the organizations within the more secular cluster tend to be more selective in their target audiences. Organizations within the larger, higher budget, multi-focused, secular group cluster more often reported targeting other climate action groups, think tanks and research organizations, academics and climate scientists, and the mass media.
- “The faith community was the first to focus on the human impacts of climate change, and the need for a justice-based approach to both adaptation and mitigation efforts. Today there is a much broader coalition of groups and interests talking about these issues. In my own denomination, there is a strong and growing movement to reduce energy use in our congregations. I have funded an effort to help congregations track their usage and work towards Energy Star certification that has seen some great results in only a year and a half.”

- Mary Minette, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
- Strategies:** The most commonly mentioned strategies were providing information on why impacts of climate disruption are morally wrong, collaborating with other organizations, providing information on morally right and just solutions, educating people about the science of climate disruption, mobilizing grassroots engagement, and encouraging people to alter behavior by emphasizing moral obligations to the natural environment. About two-thirds or more of the organizations mentioned all of these. Least common was use of the arts or other cultural activities. Organizations within the smaller, lower budget, single focused religious group cluster were more likely to report motivating senior leadership to influence others, using moral and ethical precepts to motivate behavioral changes, hands-on projects, and encouraging reduced consumption of energy and material goods.
 - Tactics:** The most frequently used tactics were educational in nature, including conferences and workshops (used by about three-fourths of the respondents), newsletters and posters, social media campaigns, and opinion editorials and news coverage (reported by half or more of the organizations). Rarely used tactics (reported by 10% or fewer) were more activist in nature, including civil disobedience, boycotts, “get out the vote” events, canvassing, and strikes or walkouts. Organizations within the smaller, religious group cluster were significantly more likely to report using religious or spiritual vigils as well as newsletters and posters, while the organizations within the larger, secular group cluster more often reported using policy reports.

- **Changes in Strategic Focus:** Almost two-thirds of the respondents reported that their organization or program had changed its target audiences, strategy, or tactics within the last three years. The most common reason given for these actions was greater clarity or change in their strategy or tactics, followed by changing political circumstances and greater clarity or change in mission and goals. Organizations within the larger, multi-focused secular group cluster were more likely to cite changing political circumstances as a reason for their alterations. About two-fifths of the respondents indicated that they had changed their communications framing in response to the frames used by opponents. The most common reason given for these changes were changing political circumstances followed by greater clarity in strategy and tactics. There were no differences between the two clusters in the incidence of changes in communications framing or reasons for such changes.

Measurement and Evaluation

To understand the organizations' methods of measurement and evaluation we asked about how they define success, the ways in which they measure success, and the effectiveness of these methods.

- **Defining Success:** When asked how they define success, the most common response was a greater understanding of the issue by their target audience, cited by three-fourths of the respondents. This was followed by positive feedback from members, cited by sixty-three percent of respondents, growth in membership base, behavioral changes, new policies and changes in the way climate disruption is publicly described by their target audiences, all noted by about half of the respondents. The least common responses were changes in the publicly stated views of elected officials. Organizations within the smaller, lower budget, single focused religious group cluster were significantly more likely to define success as receiving positive feedback from members and visible personal behavioral changes to reduce energy use or emissions by their members. Those in the larger, higher budget, multi-focused secular group cluster were significantly more likely to define success by the number of additional elected officials who support climate protection policies and the number of new climate protection policies adopted.

“In testifying for stronger regulations on permits at San Juan Power Plant in the Four Corners Region, PNM officials met with us later to ask for clarification on our moral statement, because they sincerely were questioning how their actions were perceived within the context of morality.”

-Joan Brown, New Mexico Interfaith Power and Light
- **Measuring Success:** Three fourths of the respondents said that they measured the success of their moral or values-based call to action informally, such as through anecdotes. Substantially fewer (about one third) reported also using qualitative measures, such as through interviews or case studies, and/or quantitative techniques. Almost a fifth reported having no measurement tools. When rating the effectiveness of their organization's measurement and evaluation criteria and methods, very few respondents answered “excellent,” while about two-thirds gave the rating as “medium” and one-third rated the

area “poor.” Responses were similar for representatives of the two clusters of organizations.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Obstacles, and Needs:

To understand the respondents’ perceptions of their organizations’ or programs’ strengths, weaknesses, obstacles and needs we asked for stories of their success, factors that they thought contributed to their success, as well as about factors that may have contributed to difficulties and failures, and factors that could increase their effectiveness in the future.

- **Examples of Success:** The survey respondents described many successes, and the list below is just a small sample of their achievements. A full listing of open-ended responses to this and other questions is available upon request from TRIG.

- ❖ Voices for Earth Justice helped local congregations establish "Green Teams."
- ❖ Colorado Interfaith Power and Light held 96 energy saver workshops with over 1400 attendees, who then reduced their CO2 use by 8.8 tons.
- ❖ Kids vs. Global Warming organized a global march in 2011 that engaged more than 50,000 youth in 200 cities and 43 countries, with youth leaders presenting the unified message that their future matters.
- ❖ Tompkins County Climate Protection Initiative in New York spurred their county legislature to approve a target of 80% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050.
- ❖ Faith in Place helped a congregation to convert a field from conventional corn production to a Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) that provides shares to the local food bank.
- ❖ Greater Washington Interfaith Power & Light organized a “Green Your Congregation” workshop attended by over 100 people from local congregations.
- ❖ Pennsylvania Interfaith Power & Light raised funds through an awareness generating bike ride.
- ❖ In California, the Fremont Congregational Church, United Church of Christ, held a Vacation Bible School with a “Green” theme.
- ❖ West Harlem Environmental Action (WE ACT) hosted the first national conference on Climate Justice, bringing the environmental justice movement together with mainstream environmentalists to share perspectives.
- ❖ GreenFaith launched a certification program for houses of worship, which has led to comprehensive behavior change and advocacy within faith-based groups.

“We played a major role in the campaign to shut down Washington State's only coal fired power plant... We focused on common values of clean air, healthy families, strong communities, and a good economy while using a moral and ethical frame for messaging.”
- LeeAnne Beres, Earth Ministry/Washington Interfaith Power & Light

- **Reasons for Effectiveness:** When asked to rate a variety of factors on their importance to their organization’s or program’s successes, the highest rated factors were clarity of purpose, carefully designed strategy and tactics, effective framing and messaging, ability to touch people at the emotional level, effective leadership, and partnerships with like-

minded organizations. Organizations in the larger, higher budget, multi-focused, secular group cluster were significantly more likely than the organizations in the other cluster to cite effective framing and messaging, partnerships with like-minded organizations, and taking a partisan approach as important to their success.

- **Reasons for Difficulties/Failures:** About two-thirds of respondents said that their organization has experienced some difficulties or failures in the past 1-3 years. The factor rated most important for their difficulties or failures was lack of funding followed by ineffective messaging, and lack of clear purpose and goals. Discomfort with talking about morality and ethics and taking too partisan an approach were much less common responses, although both were noted more often by organizations in the larger, higher budget, multi-focused, secular group cluster than by those in the religious group cluster.
- **Ways to Increase Effectiveness:** Respondents rated a variety of factors on their importance to increasing the effectiveness of their organization or program's moral call to action on climate disruption. Most important were additional staffing and funding, followed by assistance with areas such as communications framing and messaging, strategy development, and evaluation and measurement. Assistance with partnership development was rated significantly more highly by organizations in the larger, higher budget, multi-focused secular group cluster.

Summary of Key Findings

1. A wide variety of small and large faith and secular organizations located across the nation are making a moral call to action on climate. For some the moral call to action is their primary focus and for others it is one of a number of approaches used to achieve their goals.
2. There were many commonalities amongst the organizations, including use of a “future generations” frame and a focus on educational strategies and tactics like conferences and workshops and social media campaigns, with many also engaging in policy-change focused activities like letter-writing campaigns. Table 1 in Appendix A shows the distribution for questions that illustrate key characteristics of the respondents’ organizations, while Table 16 lists characteristics and responses given by at least two-thirds of the organizational representatives.
3. However, the organizations displayed statistically significant differences in areas that could lead to characterizations of two somewhat different clusters. One cluster of groups, mostly religious organizations, operates predominantly with volunteer staff and uses a moral or values-based approach as their sole or primary frame, emphasizing personal awareness and engagement in solutions to the problem. The other cluster of groups, mostly larger budget, non-religious organizations, measure their success based on policy enactment and implementation. See Tables 2 and 17 in Appendix A for a summary of the ways in which the organizations differed.
4. Within both clusters, individuals attribute their organizations’ effectiveness to clarity of purpose, effective framing and messaging, partnerships with like-minded organizations, effective leadership, and touching people on an emotional level.
5. Within both clusters the most common reasons for difficulties or failures were lack of funding, ineffective messaging, and lack of clear purpose and goals.
6. Organizations within both clusters appear to lack requirements for or methods for staff training, although those in the religious group cluster have the least focus on professional development.
7. Organizations within both clusters tend to include members or constituents considered to be politically ‘liberal’ and seem to place less emphasis on conservatives or people who might be considered skeptical of the reality of climate disruption. However, the cluster of smaller, religious groups is more focused on motivating the unengaged public to adopt more sustainable behaviors.
8. Within both clusters the most important factors needed to increase their organizations’ effectiveness include additional staffing and funding, followed by assistance with framing and messaging, strategy development, and evaluation and measurement.
9. It is difficult for most organizations in both clusters to determine the effectiveness of their strategies because three quarters of the respondents said they employ only informal and anecdotal measures of success, one fifth had no measurement procedures, two thirds said their measurement tools were mediocre, and one third said they were poor.
10. As indicated by the number of respondents that filled out the survey, there seems to be clear desire to increase the effectiveness of organizations making a moral call to action on climate change. There is also appears to be a desire for the movement to grow and expand, as illustrated by the fact that of the 22 respondents that said they were *not* currently making a moral call to action, 8 stated that they wanted to learn how to do so.

Discussion

Responses Paint A Portrait Of A Diverse Movement

Survey data and follow-up interviews combine to paint a portrait of the moral movement on climate disruption that is characterized by a diverse group of organizations from a range of sectors and locations, religious and non-religious, of varied sizes, all approaching the moral call to action in different ways. On the whole, these organizations have experienced many successes, but they also indicated that they need specific forms of assistance to continue to grow the movement. Many respondents said they have been successful in meeting narrow programmatic goals, but many also expressed limitations in their ability to clarify their goals and strategies and to measure their success. These limitations could compromise their ability to improve over time as individual organizations and as a movement.

There were many similarities among the organizations. For instance, in terms of framing, the vast majority reported using the “future generations” frame, highlighting the importance of protecting future options for our children. Yet, as previously described, we also found statistically significant variation among the organizations, with two relatively distinct clusters of groups emerging. One tended to include smaller, religiously oriented groups more often staffed by volunteers, and reported being in existence for five years or more. Organizations in this cluster are more likely to be focused on personal awareness and engagement and promoting behavioral change to combat climate disruption, choosing to emphasize different frames, strategies, tactics, goals and measures of success that were oriented toward this aim. The other cluster of organizations have larger budgets, more members, professional staff, represented organizations primarily outside the religious sector, and had been using a moral or values-based call to action for less than five years. Organizations in this cluster were more likely to report strategies, tactics, goals, and measures of success that related to the enactment or implementation of policies regarding climate disruption. Perhaps reflecting their more recent use of a moral or values-based approach, organizations in this cluster were also to report that being more uncomfortable in talking about values and moral issues, contributed to some of the difficulties and failures they had experienced.

Most of the religious groups appear to be primarily focused on personal awareness and responsibility for climate solutions and, although it is a goal, may struggle to translate this focus into engagement in policy activity. Conversely, the secular groups tend to be more policy focused, but may struggle with developing a member base that is personally engaged in a meaningful way.

These observations raise the question of whether organizations that choose to pursue just one objective (either increasing personal responsibility or supporting policy change) could be more effective at addressing climate disruption if they were simultaneously working on the other objective, or at least had a strategy to easily transfer their primary focus into the other focus. For example, would a group focused on personal responsibility be more effective if they had a way to convert the concern of their members generated by this focus into more engagement in policy debates or advocacy? Conversely, do the groups focused on policy

change have a large enough and sufficiently engaged member-base to demonstrate strong public support for the policy for which they are advocating?

This point leads to a second question related to whether the organizations making a moral call to action on climate disruption have the knowledge and skills needed to achieve the other objective, or whether there is an opportunity to share skills or cross-pollinate in some way. In other words, do these organizations intentionally choose one objective to the exclusion of the other because they lack skills and know-how in the other, or would they like to do both and need help to do so? We surmise that there may be an opportunity for organizations within both clusters to increase their effectiveness by developing stronger linkages with and methods for learning from those in the other cluster.

However, it is important to note that both increasing personal responsibility and supporting policy change are not the only way to measure success. Thus, we also raise the question, are organizations actually interested in pursuing the other objective? It is possible that both clusters of organizations could increase their success simply by becoming more effective within their own niche, rather than by stretching into another arena. In this case, improved strategic planning and evaluation processes might be the primary ways in which organizations can increase their effectiveness, especially if the knowledge gained were shared across the entire population of organizations.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Organizations Interested in Growing their Effectiveness

The following recommendations are offered to organizations that wish to improve the effectiveness of their moral call to action on climate disruption. They are based on the needs of the organizations identified by the survey respondents, as well as the follow-up interviews.

- **Develop Greater Clarity On The Goals, Strategies And Tactics Employed To Make A Moral Call To Action:** Clearly defining the purpose of the organization's moral call to action is essential. Is it to build awareness of the problem, motivate people to personally engage in solutions, shame people for inaction, call out elected officials for their failure to engage, or other? Also, is the call to action focused on highlighting the impacts of climate disruption or on clarifying the moral values that should be used to guide decision-making? The goals an organization adopts should shape its strategies and tactics. Thus, organizations in both clusters might benefit from spending time developing greater clarity on the purpose of their moral call to action, and on formulating more refined strategies and tactics for achieving those goals.
- **Develop Better Methods of Staff Training and Professional Development:** The large number of organizations in both clusters that said they had only informal approaches to staff development, or no method at all, suggests that more rigorous education and training programs might be very beneficial. Rather than creating whole new training programs, one approach might be to link with organizations that provide training for non-profit staff. Education, networking, and problem solving with others in the field via webinars, teleconferences and other methods would also help. An education and training program specifically for organizations striving to make a moral call to action on climate disruption might be an additional and powerful way to increase staff skills and capacities.
- **Develop More Refined Set of Target Audiences:** Organizations within each cluster stated that they strive to reach a wide variety of target audiences. Organizations within the secular group cluster seemed to be somewhat better in selecting fewer primary audiences. However, when asked to identify their targets, organizations in both clusters checked a long list of audiences. This suggests that organizations might be spreading their efforts too thinly and that more selective targeting might lead to better results.
- **Reach Out Beyond Liberals:** Even as organizations more carefully select their target audiences, they might consider shifting or expanding to include more conservatives and people that are skeptical of the reality of climate disruption. Focusing on liberal individuals and those likely to be more easily receptive to a moral call to action on climate disruption makes sense as a starting point. However, some research shows that concern over environmental damage is mostly a liberal phenomenon, while concern about violating the purity and sanctity of nature cuts across ideological lines.³ This is not an

³ Feinberg, M. & Miller, R. (2013). The moral roots of environmental attitudes.

Psychological Science January 2013 vol. 24 no. 1 56-62 doi: 10.1177/0956797612449177. Epub 2012 Dec 10.

abstract issue. Violating the purity and sanctity of nature tend to provoke emotional and visceral feelings of disgust in both conservatives and liberals. This suggests that organizations making a moral call to action on climate disruption have a great opportunity to change the politics of the issue by reaching out to conservatives.

- **Consider Ways to Increase Advocacy:** Most of the organizations that responded to the survey listed education as their primary strategy. Direct advocacy ended up at the bottom of their list of strategies and tactics. Education in all of its forms is very important. However, although it must be done with a great deal of care, and could be off putting to some constituents, especially more conservative individuals, organizations might increase their effectiveness by pushing the envelope a bit more and encouraging their more committed members to support or engage in more direct advocacy (e.g. building relationships with members of congress through in-state office visits or attending events such as the recent Forward On Climate rally in Washington D.C.).
- **Develop Better Measurement and Evaluation Methods:** One of the most consistent themes that emerged from the survey is the need for organizations of all types, sizes, and focuses to improve their measurement and evaluation methods. It is difficult, if not impossible, for organizations to know if they have established the proper goals or adopted effective strategies and tactics to achieve them without effective measurement and evaluation mechanisms. Some organizations might need more support than others in increasing their capacity to define and measure success. However, most organizations would benefit from improvement in this important area.
- **Grow the Movement by Developing Stronger Linkages Between Increasing Personal Engagement and Achieving Policy Change:** Based on the responses, we surmise that organizations focused primarily on increasing personal awareness of and engagement in climate solutions would benefit by learning from and developing platforms to turn increased engagement into policy enactment. This would help individuals who become engaged turn their concern about the climate crisis into support for new policies. At the same time, organizations focused primarily on policy enactment might benefit by linking more closely with organizations focused on personal awareness and engagement. This could expand the number of individuals that will support new policies. Together, these linkages could help grow the size and the effectiveness of the movement to address the climate crisis.

Recommendations for Funders Interested in Growing the Moral Movement on Climate

The study demonstrated that there are diverse needs within organizations involved in making a moral call to action. Growing the moral movement on climate will require internal improvement by the organizations involved in the movement. However, it will also require assistance from funders. Given the needs of the organizations identified by the survey respondents, in addition to the recommendations listed above, the following recommendations are offered to funders interested in helping to improve and grow the moral movement on climate.

- **Abstract vs. Concrete Goals:** Responses suggest that organizations could use help making links between broad visionary goals and practical, smaller goals. For example, some of the organizations that responded to the survey have large and rather abstract goals such as changing the entire economic system, but we could not determine the sequence of actions they propose to achieve that visionary goal. Others have more narrowly defined goals such as promoting specific types of behavioral changes, yet it was difficult to determine how they intended to transform those changes into broader policy change. Funders might provide resources to help organizations learn how to develop practical goals that can be linked to the attainment of larger visionary objectives.
- **Impacts vs. Solutions:** Many organizations tend to focus their call to action solely on the moral implications of the impacts of climate disruption. However, perhaps even more importantly, the moral call to action also involves calling on people to realize that the decisions made in response to all aspects of the crisis, including the prioritization and implementation of solutions, will be based on their most deeply held moral and ethical values. Explicit acknowledgment of the values involved in decision-making around climate change creates a more transparent process. Funders might ask which aspect of the moral call to action organizations focus on, and if they focus on only one they might consider providing resources to help them expand their orientation to include both aspects (impacts and explicit acknowledgement of values) of a moral call to action.
- **Staff Training and Development:** Given the lack of formal professional development by leaders of organizations within both of the clusters, funders might consider providing resources to support professional development on a range of topics. A special emphasis might be on education and training programs for volunteers. In addition, funders might consider funding the development of education and training programs specifically focused on effective messaging on and communication of the moral call to action on climate disruption. This communication could be both around the moral impacts of climate change, as well around the decision-making process that necessarily involves moral questions of how we prioritize our values.
- **Support Education In Evaluation and Measurement:** Funders should consistently ask how an organization measures success. A small set of the organizations seem to have good measurement tools, but a large percentage need help setting concrete, practical goals to move them towards their larger mission and purpose. They also need help in developing indicators of success, and methods for measuring and evaluating success.

Further Research

If the moral movement on climate disruption continues to grow in size and impact it has the potential to become a major contributor to progress on climate issues. This survey provided a great deal of information about the current status and future needs of organizations involved with the movement. We also learned quite a lot about how to develop and administer this type of survey. It might be worth doing a follow up survey in a year or two to determine if and how progress has been made and the ways in which the population of organizations devoted to a moral or values-based call to action has changed.

Future research of organizations using a moral or values-based call to action could use the work described here as a model and learn from both the advantages and the limitations of our approach. First, the questionnaire was rather long and a quarter of the respondents did not finish all of the questions. While the lengthy instrument provided a great deal of valuable information, a shorter instrument might produce a larger rate of completed questionnaires. Second, the questionnaire was anonymous in nature. Respondents who wished to participate in follow-up interviews could provide their names and those of their organizations, but this was not required. While the anonymity no doubt helped prompt frank answers, knowing the names of the organizations involved could provide the possibility of having additional independent information on the groups. Third, we did not have direct measures of the quality of the organizations' work or their success. Such a measure would be important for future analyses and would be easier to obtain if organizations had been identified by name. Finally, our sampling technique was, by necessity, nonprobability in nature. This is understandable given the emerging nature of the movement. As it matures, however, it will be possible to use more advanced sampling methods.

Appendix A: Detailed Results

This appendix provides tables with statistical details related to the material given in the body of the paper. The major sections follow those used in the description of results. Tables 16 and 17 summarize the major findings.

Our preliminary analysis of the data indicated that there was wide variability among the organizations in the sectors with which they were affiliated, their size, the extent to which they used a values or morals-based call to action as their primary focus or as simply as one of many frames of reference, how long they had been established, and whether or not they had experienced difficulties or failures in their work. Our preliminary analysis also revealed that the organizations identifying with the religious sector tended to differ in many ways from other organizations. Table 1 gives frequencies on each of these variables: sector (Q26), annual budget (Q27), experience of difficulties (Q21), primary focus (Q7), and how long the organization had been engaged in a moral or values-based call to action (Q8).

| Table 1 -- Frequency Distributions, Sector, Budget, Experiencing Difficulties, Focus, and Time Using the Moral or Values-Based Frame | |
|--|----------|
| What sector is your organization affiliated with? (Check all that apply.) (Question 26) | |
| <u>Sector</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Religious | 74 |
| Business | 3 |
| Educational | 29 |
| Youth | 15 |
| Environmental or wildlife conservation | 33 |
| Social Justice | 33 |
| Sustainable Development | 25 |
| Media and communications | 8 |
| What is the annual operating budget of the organization or program that is making a moral call to action on climate disruption? (Question 27) | |
| <u>Amount</u> | <u>%</u> |
| \$0 to \$999 | 15 |
| \$1,000 to \$49,999 | 27 |
| \$50,000 to \$99,999 | 9 |
| \$100,000 to \$249,000 | 15 |
| \$250,000 to \$999,000 | 12 |
| \$1 million or more | 20 |
| In the past 1-3 years has your organization or program experienced any difficulties or failures in making its moral or values-based call to action on climate disruption? (Question 21) | |
| | <u>%</u> |
| Yes | 68 |
| No | 32 |
| | |

TABLE 1 CONTINUED**Is a moral or values-based call to action the only way your organization or program urges action on climate disruption or is it just one of a number of ways? (Question 7)**

| <u>Responses</u> | <u>%</u> |
|--|----------|
| Yes, it is our only approach | 23 |
| It is our primary, but not the only approach | 56 |
| It is one of many approaches equally used | 21 |

Approximately how many years ago did your organization or program begin to make a moral or values-based call to action on climate disruption? (Question 8)

| <u>Responses</u> | <u>%</u> |
|----------------------|----------|
| Within the last year | 4 |
| 1 - 2 years ago | 16 |
| 3 - 4 years ago | 27 |
| 5 or more years ago | 52 |

There were 101 responses to the question on sector, 99 to the question on budget, 108 to the question on difficulties, 126 to the question on the sole focus of the organization, and 122 responses to how long the organization had been using a values-based call.

Table 2 shows the association of membership in the religious sector with budget, primary focus, length of time established, and reports of difficulties, all of which were collapsed to dichotomies to preserve degrees of freedom. All of the associations, except with reports of difficulties, were statistically significant. Based on these associations, we used cluster analysis to determine two groups of respondents. The calculations were designed to produce mutually exclusive groups of respondents who were as similar as possible on these five variables (sector, budget, focus, primary or sole focus on ethics, and reports of difficulties). (The STATA statistical program was used, employing means procedure.)

The two resulting clusters of groups are those discussed in distinctions in the text. Average scores of members of the two cultures of groups on each of the key elements are given in the second panel of Table 2. The first includes organizations that are much more likely to have smaller budgets, be longer established, have a primary or sole focus on a values or moral-based perspective, and to be in the religious sector and are termed personal responsibility-focused in the text. The second cluster is much more likely to include organizations in non-religious sectors, to have larger budgets, use a moral or values-based call as only one of many approaches and to be more recently established and are termed policy-focused in the text. Note that the measure of difficulties does not produce significant differences. However, a set of extensive analyses revealed that its inclusion in producing the clusters resulted in much more distinct groupings; and thus it was retained in the analyses that produced the groupings. All results presented in the text and appendix are based on cases that provided sufficient data to be placed within one of these two groups (i.e. finished the questionnaire) (n=96). Results with the total group (responses varying from one question to the next) are substantively identical to those presented here and are available upon request.

| Table 2--Association of Sector (Religious/Non) with Budget, Focus, and Age of Organization and Groupings by Defining Factors | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Religious Sector | | | | | |
| | <u>No (%)</u> | <u>Yes (5)</u> | <u>Total (%)</u> | <u>Chi. Sq.</u> | <u>Prob.</u> |
| Budget of \$100 K or greater | 70 | 39 | 48 | 7.5 | 0.006 |
| Values/Moral-Based Call Primary or Only Focus | 63 | 87 | 79 | 9.44 | 0.002 |
| Established 5 or More Years | 38 | 60 | 52 | 5.34 | 0.02 |
| Experienced Difficulties | 78 | 64 | 31 | 1.95 | 0.16 |
| Groupings Distinguished in the Analysis | | | | | |
| | <u>Gp 1 (%)</u> | <u>Gp 2 (%)</u> | <u>Total (%)</u> | <u>Chi. Sq.</u> | <u>Prob.</u> |
| Religious sector | 97 | 31 | 73 | 48.01 | <.001 |
| Budget > = 100K | 28 | 86 | 49 | 29.78 | <.001 |
| Values/Moral-Based Call Primary or Only Focus | 89 | 66 | 80 | 7.29 | 0.007 |
| Established 5 or more years | 72 | 31 | 57 | 15.06 | <.001 |
| Experienced Difficulties | 62 | 74 | 67 | 1.44 | 0.23 |
| To determine the percentages associated with the missing category (e.g. budgets of less than \$100K or multiple focus), subtract the given percentage from 100. Degrees of freedom were equal to 1 for all analyses. | | | | | |

Table 3 reports frequencies on each of the other variables described in the background section of the results: the use of paid or volunteer staff, education and training requirements, sources of funding, and membership characteristics. Data are given for each of the two clusters and the total sample and tests of significance, comparing the two groups are included. Note that again, to preserve degrees of freedom, many of the responses were collapsed to dichotomies. In most cases the decisions to collapse reflected the median response given. To determine the percentages associated with the missing category (e.g. budgets of less than \$100K or multiple focus), subtract the given percentage from 100. Degrees of freedom for the reported chi-square values were equal to 1 for all analyses.

| Table 3-- Staff Characteristics, Funding Sources, and Membership Characteristics by Analysis Group | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Respondent Paid or Volunteer (Question 26) | | | | | |
| | <u>Gp 1 (%)</u> | <u>Gp 2 (%)</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>Chi. Sq.</u> | <u>Prob.</u> |
| Respondent director rather than staff | 85 | 76 | 82 | 1.11 | 0.29 |
| Respondent in Paid Position | 58 | 86 | 69 | 6.55 | 0.01 |
| How do people who direct the daily operations of your organization or program expand their skills? (Check all that apply) (Question 30) | | | | | |
| | <u>Gp 1 (%)</u> | <u>Gp 2 (%)</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>Chi. Sq.</u> | <u>Prob.</u> |
| Through voluntarily chosen education and training programs | 81 | 88 | 84 | 0.75 | 0.38 |
| Through required education and training programs | 0 | 12 | 4 | 7.25 | 0.007 |
| No Voluntary or Required Training of Staff | 25 | 9 | 19 | 3.81 | 0.05 |
| What are the primary sources of your organization or program's funding? (Question 26) | | | | | |
| | <u>Gp 1 (%)</u> | <u>Gp 2 (%)</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>Chi-sq</u> | <u>Prob.</u> |
| Foundation grants from secular environmental organizations | 37 | 42 | 38 | 0.18 | 0.67 |
| Foundation grants from religious organizations | 35 | 13 | 27 | 4.92 | 0.03 |
| Other foundation grants | 24 | 29 | 26 | 0.31 | 0.58 |
| Large private donors | 12 | 35 | 21 | 6.61 | 0.01 |
| Membership dues | 25 | 23 | 26 | 0.09 | 0.77 |
| Small donations from members of constituents | 63 | 45 | 56 | 2.42 | 0.12 |
| Earned income from services | 24 | 10 | 17 | 2.48 | 0.12 |
| Corporate donations | 4 | 10 | 6 | 1.12 | 0.30 |
| What is the approximate size of your organization or program's membership, defined as people who may dues or regularly participate in activities? (Question 31) | | | | | |
| | <u>Gp 1 (%)</u> | <u>Gp 2 (%)</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>Chi-sq</u> | <u>prob.</u> |
| Membership Larger than 100 | 62 | 87 | 70 | 6.33 | 0.01 |
| How would you describe the overall political orientation of your members or constituents? (Question 34) | | | | | |
| | <u>Gp. 1</u> | <u>Gp. 2</u> | <u>Total</u> | | |
| Percentage of members who are political liberal (Mean) | 62.2 | 74.7 | 66.8 | | |
| Standard Deviation | 20.4 | 16.3 | 19.9 | | |
| T-ratio | 2.86 | | | | |
| Probability | p = .01 | | | | |

Tables 4 to 8 give the data used to describe the organizations' strategic focus. Table 4 describes the communication frames that were used (Q6); Table 5 describes their goals and hopes (Q9), Table 6 describes target audiences (Q10), Table 7 describes strategies (Q 11), and Table 8 describes tactics (Q12). Tables 9 and 10 report results for the questions about changes in target audiences, strategy or tactics (Q13) and changes in communication framing (Q14). Again data are given for the total group, the two comparison clusters, and the results of tests of significance are included. To determine the percentages associated with the missing category (e.g. non-religious sector), subtract the given percentage from 100. Degrees of freedom were equal to 1 for all analyses.

| Table 4--Frames of Reference: Organizations may use a variety of frames of reference when making a moral or values-based call to action on climate disruption. What frames of reference does your organization or program use? Check all that apply. (Question # 6) | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Frames of Reference | Gp 1 (%) | Gp 2 (%) | Total | Chi-sq | Prob. |
| Religious | 97 | 31 | 73 | 48.01 | <.001 |
| Climate justice | 79 | 66 | 74 | 1.95 | 0.16 |
| Social equity | 75 | 66 | 72 | 1.03 | 0.31 |
| Future generation | 87 | 80 | 84 | 0.80 | 0.37 |
| Human rights | 62 | 63 | 62 | 0.003 | 0.96 |
| Human health | 67 | 51 | 61 | 2.34 | 0.13 |
| Ecological health | 69 | 71 | 70 | 0.07 | 0.79 |
| Personal responsibility | 66 | 43 | 57 | 4.69 | 0.03 |
| Jobs/economic growth | 48 | 54 | 50 | 0.40 | 0.52 |
| Economic benefits | 56 | 57 | 56 | 0.02 | 0.89 |

| Table 5--Hopes and Goals: What does your organization or program hope to achieve through its moral or values-based call to action on climate disruption? (Check all that apply.) (Question 9) | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|
| Hopes and Goals | Gp 1 (%) | Gp 2 (%) | Total | Chi-sq | Prob |
| Reframe the political/public discourse about climate disruption | 85 | 80 | 83 | 0.39 | 0.53 |
| Encourage elected officials to introduce and/or support climate protection policies | 85 | 69 | 79 | 3.59 | 0.06 |
| Motivate the actively engaged public to press elected officials to enact more or stronger climate protection policies | 70 | 71 | 71 | 0.02 | 0.88 |
| Motivate the actively engaged public to press government officials to oppose/prevent/stop climate damaging actions or policies (e.g. coal-fired power plants) | 72 | 69 | 71 | 0.10 | 0.75 |
| Motivate the actively engaged public to adopt more sustainable behaviors | 82 | 60 | 74 | 5.35 | 0.02 |
| Motivate the unengaged public to support public policies that protect the climate | 73 | 57 | 67 | 2.64 | 0.10 |
| Motivate the unengaged public to adopt more sustainable behaviors | 72 | 51 | 64 | 3.94 | 0.05 |
| Expand our membership or constituency base | 55 | 40 | 49 | 1.99 | 0.16 |
| Generate greater financial, time or other commitments from our members or constituents | 43 | 26 | 37 | 2.95 | 0.09 |
| Motivate our members or constituents to adopt more sustainable behaviors | 82 | 49 | 69 | 11.42 | 0.001 |
| Motivate our members or constituents to actively urge other people to support climate protection actions and policies | 75 | 66 | 72 | 0.94 | 0.33 |

Table 6--Target Audiences: What are the target audiences of your organization or program's moral or values-based call to action on climate disruption? (Check all that apply.) (Question 10)

| Target Audiences | Gp 1 (%) | Gp 2 (%) | Total | Chi-sq | Prob. |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| U.S. Congress | 67 | 44 | 59 | 4.81 | 0.03 |
| U.S. president or federal agencies | 62 | 50 | 58 | 1.35 | 0.24 |
| State elected officials or agencies | 67 | 41 | 58 | 6.07 | 0.01 |
| Local elected officials or agencies | 54 | 38 | 48 | 2.2 | 0.14 |
| Business executives | 15 | 26 | 19 | 1.95 | 0.16 |
| Religious leaders | 92 | 47 | 76 | 23.82 | <.001 |
| Lay leaders in faith communities | 90 | 32 | 69 | 34.4 | <.001 |
| Other climate action groups | 20 | 44 | 28 | 6.41 | 0.01 |
| Think tanks/research organizations | 7 | 21 | 12 | 4.2 | 0.04 |
| Academics/climate scientists | 16 | 32 | 22 | 3.23 | 0.07 |
| Economically disadvantaged communities | 34 | 29 | 33 | 0.25 | 0.62 |
| Communities of color | 38 | 41 | 39 | 0.11 | 0.74 |
| Youth | 44 | 44 | 44 | 0.0002 | 0.99 |
| Mass media | 28 | 50 | 36 | 4.65 | 0.03 |
| Likely voters | 21 | 32 | 25 | 1.41 | 0.24 |
| Your members | 74 | 62 | 69 | 1.48 | 0.22 |
| Individuals sympathetic to, but not yet members | 61 | 41 | 54 | 3.33 | 0.07 |
| People who do not accept reality of climate change | 36 | 32 | 35 | 0.13 | 0.72 |
| People who accept reality of human induced climate disruption | 66 | 62 | 64 | 0.14 | 0.71 |

Table 7--Strategies: What strategies are used by your organization or program to make its moral or values-based call to action on climate disruption? (Check all that apply.) (Question 11)

| Strategies Used: | Gp 1 (%) | Gp 2 (%) | Total | Chi-sq | Prob. |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Educating people about science re climate change | 72 | 71 | 72 | 0.03 | 0.87 |
| Providing information on why impacts are morally wrong or unjust | 87 | 74 | 82 | 2.65 | 0.10 |
| Providing information on morally right and just solutions to climate disruption | 82 | 68 | 77 | 2.52 | 0.11 |
| Using moral and ethical principles to build common ground with opponents of climate protection | 52 | 41 | 48 | 1.11 | 0.29 |
| Expanding our impact by collaborating with organizations with similar moral or ethical views | 84 | 76 | 81 | 0.72 | 0.40 |
| Motivating senior leadership to influence others by understanding their moral and ethical duties | 64 | 38 | 55 | 5.82 | 0.02 |
| Mobilizing grassroots engagement in morally and ethically just climate protection activities | 84 | 68 | 78 | 3.23 | 0.07 |
| Using moral and ethical precepts to motivate simple and then more difficult behavioral changes | 85 | 35 | 67 | 24.78 | <.001 |
| Helping people live out their moral and ethical values by engaging them in hands-on projects | 61 | 24 | 47 | 12.07 | 0.001 |
| Using the arts or other cultural activities to spark interest in climate protection | 23 | 29 | 25 | 0.48 | 0.49 |
| Capturing the attention of the mass media | 39 | 56 | 45 | 2.41 | 0.12 |
| Encouraging people to reduce their consumption of energy by emphasizing their moral and ethical obligations to the natural environment | 92 | 47 | 76 | 23.82 | <.001 |
| Encouraging people to reduce their consumption of energy by emphasizing their moral and ethical obligations to other people | 84 | 38 | 67 | 20.44 | <.001 |
| Encouraging people to reduce their consumption of energy by emphasizing their moral and ethical obligations to the natural environment or other people | 74 | 41 | 62 | 9.85 | 0.002 |

Table 8--Tactics: What tactics does your organization or program use to make a moral or values-based call to action on climate disruption? (Check all that apply.) (Question 12)

| Tactics Used: | Gp 1 (%) | Gp 2 (%) | Total | Chi-sq | Prob. |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Social media campaigns | 61 | 72 | 65 | 1.15 | 0.28 |
| Religious or spiritual vigils | 57 | 22 | 45 | 10.68 | 0.001 |
| Mass petitions | 44 | 34 | 41 | 0.85 | 0.36 |
| Newsletters and posters | 75 | 53 | 68 | 4.77 | 0.03 |
| Direct mail solicitations | 26 | 31 | 28 | 0.26 | 0.61 |
| Letter writing campaigns | 52 | 41 | 48 | 1.18 | 0.28 |
| Opinion editorials | 48 | 59 | 52 | 1.18 | 0.28 |
| News coverage | 45 | 62 | 51 | 2.56 | 0.11 |
| Press briefings | 32 | 44 | 36 | 1.32 | 0.25 |
| Letters to govt. officials | 59 | 59 | 59 | 0.001 | 0.97 |
| Policy reports | 15 | 47 | 26 | 11.00 | 0.001 |
| Boycotts | 5 | 9 | 7 | 0.66 | 0.42 |
| Organized protests or marches | 32 | 41 | 35 | 0.74 | 0.39 |
| Civil disobedience | 8 | 19 | 12 | 2.24 | 0.13 |
| Strikes and/or walkouts | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3.90 | 0.05 |
| Small group meetings in homes | 28 | 22 | 26 | 0.39 | 0.53 |
| Private meetings with key leaders | 46 | 44 | 45 | 0.04 | 0.84 |
| Conferences and workshops | 75 | 72 | 74 | 0.14 | 0.71 |
| Fundraising | 30 | 28 | 29 | 0.02 | 0.89 |
| Canvassing, door knocking | 0 | 9 | 3 | 5.91 | 0.02 |
| Get out the vote events | 2 | 12 | 5 | 4.87 | 0.03 |
| Teach-ins | 30 | 31 | 30 | 0.03 | 0.84 |
| Social Events | 31 | 16 | 26 | 2.64 | 0.10 |

Table 9--If your target audiences, strategy, or tactics have changed over the past 1-3 years, what led your organization or program to shift its focus? (Check all that apply) (Question 13)

| Causes of Change in Tactics/Strategies: | Gp 1 (%) | Gp 2 (%) | Total | Chi-sq | Prob. |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Lack of success in reaching target audience | 21 | 19 | 20 | 0.03 | 0.85 |
| Feedback from our members | 24 | 15 | 20 | 0.70 | 0.40 |
| Changing political circumstance | 36 | 65 | 49 | 4.90 | 0.03 |
| Greater clarity on or change in our mission and goals | 36 | 46 | 41 | 0.58 | 0.45 |
| Greater clarity on or change in our strategy and tactics | 61 | 73 | 66 | 1.01 | 0.32 |
| Fear of political backlash | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0.80 | 0.37 |
| Concerns about jeopardizing 501 (c) 3 status | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1.29 | 0.26 |

Note: 61% of the respondents responded to this question, indicating that their target audiences, strategy or tactics had changed in the last 1 to 3 years.

Table 10--Does your organization or program alter its communication framing in response to the frames used by opponents and why does it alter its communications framing?

| Frame/Scope Altering: | Gp 1 (%) | Gp 2 (%) | Total | Chi-sq | Prob. |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Alters framing (% yes) | 37 | 47 | 41 | 0.85 | 0.36 |
| Lack of success in reaching target audience | 32 | 20 | 27 | 0.63 | 0.43 |
| Feedback from our members | 36 | 20 | 30 | 1.14 | 0.28 |
| Changing political circumstance | 68 | 67 | 68 | 0.01 | 0.92 |
| Greater clarity on or change in our mission and goals | 32 | 40 | 35 | 0.26 | 0.61 |
| Greater clarity on or change in our strategy and tactics | 41 | 67 | 51 | 2.37 | 0.12 |
| Fear of political backlash | 9 | 7 | 8 | 0.07 | 0.79 |
| Concerns about jeopardizing 501 (c) 3 status | 9 | 0 | 5 | 1.44 | 0.23 |

Tables 11 and 12 summarize the responses to the questions on measurement and evaluation. Table 11 reports the ways in which they define success, and Table 12 reports the ways in which they measure success and how effective they consider their evaluation methods to be.

| Table 11--Defining Success: How does your organization or program define success of its moral or values-based call to action on climate disruption? (Check all that apply) (Question 16) | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Defining Success: | <u>Gp 1</u> <u>(%)</u> | <u>Gp 2</u> <u>(%)</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>Chi-sq</u> | <u>Prob.</u> |
| Positive feedback from members | 75 | 52 | 67 | 5.53 | 0.02 |
| Greater understandings by target audience | 79 | 70 | 76 | 0.94 | 0.33 |
| Growth in membership base | 54 | 48 | 52 | 0.27 | 0.60 |
| Visible personal behavioral changes | 64 | 30 | 52 | 9.71 | 0.002 |
| Changes in way climate disruption is publicly described | 43 | 55 | 47 | 1.22 | 0.27 |
| Elected officials who support climate protection policies | 28 | 55 | 37 | 6.52 | 0.01 |
| Elected officials who publicly state that climate disruption is moral and ethical issue | 31 | 42 | 35 | 1.20 | 0.27 |
| New climate protection policies adopted | 43 | 67 | 51 | 4.95 | 0.03 |
| Table 12--Measuring Success | | | | | |
| <i>How does your organization or program measure the success of its moral or values-based call to action on climate disruption? (Check all that apply) (Question 17)</i> | | | | | |
| Measures: | <u>Gp 1</u> <u>(%)</u> | <u>Gp 2</u> <u>(%)</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>Chi-sq</u> | <u>Prob.</u> |
| Qualitatively (through formally gathered interviews, case studies etc.) | 31 | 38 | 34 | 0.49 | 0.48 |
| Quantitatively (through formally gathered numerical data) | 36 | 41 | 38 | 0.24 | 0.62 |
| Informally (through anecdotes, etc.) | 79 | 68 | 75 | 1.41 | 0.24 |
| No measurement tools | 20 | 18 | 19 | 0.06 | 0.81 |
| <i>How effective do you consider your measurement and evaluation criteria and methods to be? (Choose one) (Question 18)</i> | | | | | |
| Effectiveness: | <u>Gp 1</u> <u>(%)</u> | <u>Gp 2</u> <u>(%)</u> | <u>Total</u> | - | - |
| Excellent | 5 | 9 | 7 | | |
| Medium | 63 | 55 | 60 | | |
| Poor | 32 | 36 | 34 | | |
| Chi-square | 0.87 | | | | |
| Prob. | 0.65 | | | | |

Tables 13 through 15 summarize the responses to the questions regarding perceived strengths, weaknesses, obstacles and needs of their organizations. Table 13 reports results regarding factors that have contributed to their successes, Table 14 describes factors that they believe have been important in their program's difficulties or failures, and Table 15 summarizes factors that have been important in increasing their effectiveness. Note that these questions asked respondents to rate the importance of each area on a five-point scale, with 1 equal to unimportant and 5 equal to important. Thus, higher scores indicate that a given area was seen as more important. The tables give means and the results of t-tests examining the difference between the means.

Table 13--How important have each of the factors listed below been to your organization or program's successes? (1 to 5 rating, 1 = unimportant, 5 = very important) (Question 20)

| Factors Leading To Success: | Gp 1 (M) | Gp 2 (M) | Total | t- ratio | Prob. |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Clarity of purpose | 4.6 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 1.94 | 0.06 |
| Carefully designed strategy and tactics | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 1.81 | 0.07 |
| Ability to touch people at emotional level | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 0.36 | 0.72 |
| Effective framing and messaging | 4.4 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 2.46 | 0.02 |
| Effective leadership | 4.4 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 0.48 | 0.63 |
| Effective fundraising | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 1.05 | 0.30 |
| Non-partisan approach | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 1.12 | 0.26 |
| Very partisan approach | 1.6 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 2.72 | 0.01 |
| Development of partnerships with like-minded orgs | 4.2 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 2.32 | 0.02 |
| Development of common ground with skeptics | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 0.45 | 0.65 |

Table 14--How important have each of the factors listed below been to your organization or program's difficulties or failures? (1 = unimportant, 5 = very important)

| Factors Leading to Difficulties/Failure: | Gp 1 (M) | Gp 2 (M) | Total | t- ratio | Prob. |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Lack of funding | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 0.74 | 0.59 |
| Lack of clear purpose and goals | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 0.66 | 0.51 |
| Discomfort with using the terms or talking about morality and ethics | 1.6 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 2.64 | 0.01 |
| Lack of clarity on our target audiences | 2.6 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 1.61 | 0.11 |
| Inability to touch people at the emotional level | 2.7 | 3 | 2.8 | 1.05 | 0.3 |
| Ineffective communications framing and messaging | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 0.65 | 0.52 |
| Ineffective leadership | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 1.24 | 0.22 |
| Too partisan an approach | 1.9 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 1.84 | 0.07 |
| Not aggressive enough | 2.9 | 3 | 2.9 | 0.46 | 0.65 |
| Lack of partnerships with like-minded organizations | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 1.06 | 0.29 |
| Inability to develop common ground with skeptics | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 0.02 | 0.49 |

Table 15--How important are the factors below in increasing the effectiveness of your organization or program's moral call to action on climate disruption? (1 = unimportant, 5 = very important) (Question 23)

| Factors Leading to an Effective Climate Program: | Gp 1 (M) | Gp 2 (M) | Total | t- ratio | Prob. |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Additional funding | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 0.61 | 0.55 |
| Additional staffing | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 0.19 | 0.85 |
| Assistance with strategy development | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.24 | 0.81 |
| Assistance with communication framing and messaging | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 0.18 | 0.85 |
| Assistance with partnership development | 3.2 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 2.32 | 0.02 |
| Greater links with regional and/or national groups | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 0.94 | 0.35 |
| Assistance with program evaluation and measurement | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 0.12 | 0.91 |

Table 16 summarizes the results, listing the characteristics and factors noted by two-thirds or more of the organization or program's representatives. Table 17 summarizes the distinctions between the two cluster groups of organizations.

Table 16 -- A Summary Picture of the Total Group

| |
|---|
| Organizational Characteristics: |
| Religious sector Respondent in Paid Position Membership Larger than 100 |
| Values/Moral-Based Call Primary or Only Focus of the Organization Members are politically liberal |
| Experienced difficulties or failures in last 1-3 years Respondent director rather than staff |
| Program directors expand skills through voluntarily chosen education and training programs |
| Frames of Reference Used When Making a Moral or Values-Based Call to Action: |
| Religious (e.g. we are stewards of God's creation) |
| Climate justice (e.g. treat all people equally and fairly in new policies and projects) |
| Social equity (e.g. prevent climate impacts on those who emitted the least) |
| Future generation (e.g. protect future options for our children) |
| Ecological health (e.g. protect ecosystems and biodiversity from climate impacts) |
| What They Hope to Achieve: |
| Reframe the political/public discourse about climate disruption |
| Encourage elected officials to introduce and/or support climate protection policies |
| Motivate the actively engaged public to press elected officials to enact more or stronger climate protection policies |
| Motivate the actively engaged public to press government officials to oppose/prevent/stop climate damaging actions or policies (e.g. coal-fired power plants) |
| Motivate the actively engaged public to adopt more sustainable behaviors |
| Motivate the unengaged public to support public policies that protect the climate |
| Motivate our members or constituents to adopt more sustainable behaviors |
| Target Audiences: |
| Lay leaders in faith communities & Your members |

TABLE 16 CONTINUED

Strategies

- Educating people about science re cc
- Providing information on why impacts are morally wrong or unjust
- Providing information on morally right and just solutions to climate disruption
- Expanding our impact by collaborating with organizations with similar moral or ethical views
- Mobilizing grassroots engagement in morally and ethically just climate protection activities
- Using moral and ethical precepts to motivate simple and then more difficult behavioral changes
- Encouraging people to reduce their consumption of energy by emphasizing their moral and ethical obligations to other people & environment

Tactics

- Newsletters and posters
- Conferences and workshops

Why changed framing:

- Greater clarity on or change in our strategy and tactics

Why Alter Communications Framing in Response to Opponents:

- Changing political circumstance

How Define Success:

- Positive feedback from members
- Greater understandings by target audience
- New climate protection policies adopted

How Measure Success:

- Informally (through anecdotes, etc.)

Factors Influencing Organization or Program's Success:

- Clarity of purpose
- Carefully designed strategy and tactics
- Ability to touch people at emotional level
- Effective framing and messaging
- Effective leadership
- Development of partnerships with like-minded orgs

Factors that Would Increase Organization or Program's Effectiveness:

- Additional funding
- Additional staffing

For the queries regarding factors that influence success or the program's effectiveness items that received an average score of 4.0 or higher on a five point scale (indicating important or greater) were listed. For all other items those endorsed by two-thirds or more of the organizations' representatives were listed.

Table 17 - Defining Features of Both Clusters*

Defining Features of the Behavioral Change Focused Programs and Organizations

Defining Features of the Policy Change Focused Programs and Organizations

Characteristics:

Religious Sector
 Annual budget less than \$100K
 Established 5 or more years
 Volunteer staff
 No voluntary or required training of staff
 Smaller paid membership
 More varied political views of members
 Financial support from religious foundations

Characteristics:

Non-religious sector
 Annual budget greater than \$100K
 Established less than 5 years
 Paid staff
 Larger paid membership
 Members more liberal political orientation
 Financial support from private donors

Frames

Values/ethics primary or sole frame
 Religious frame
 Personal responsibility frame

Frames

Values/ethics one of many frames used

Hopes

More members, constituents, and engaged public to adopt more sustainable behaviors

Hopes

-

Targets:

Congress
 State elected officials
 Religious leaders

Targets:

Other climate groups
 Think tanks
 Academics and climate scientists
 Media

Strategies

Motivating senior leadership to influence others by understanding their moral and ethical duties
 Using moral and ethical precepts to motivate simple and then more difficult behavioral changes
 Helping people live out their moral and ethical values by engaging them in hands-on projects
 Encouraging people to reduce their consumption of energy by emphasizing their moral and ethical obligations to the natural environment
 Encouraging people to reduce their consumption of energy by emphasizing their moral and ethical obligations to other people
 Encouraging people to reduce their consumption of energy by emphasizing their moral and ethical obligations to the natural environment or other people
 Encourage reduced consumption via ethical motives

Strategies

-

Tactics:

Religious vigils
 Newsletters and posters

Tactics:

Policy reports
 Get out the vote events

Influences on changing focus:

-

Influences on changing focus:

Changing political circumstance

TABLE 17 CONTINUED

Defining Features of the Behavioral Change Focused Programs and Organizations

Defining Features of the Policy Change Focused Programs and Organizations

How Success is Defined:

Positive feedback from members
Visible personal behavioral changes to reduce energy use or emissions by our members

How Success is Defined:

Number of elected officials who support climate protection policies
Number of new climate protection policies adopted

Influences on success:

-

Influences on success:

Effective framing and messaging
Very partisan approach
Development of partnerships with like-minded orgs

Influences on difficulties:

-

Influences on difficulties:

Discomfort with using the terms or talking about morality and ethics

Factors that are important in increasing effectiveness of the organization or program:

-

Factors that are important in increasing effectiveness of the organization or program:

Assistance with partnership development

* Note: Areas are listed only if the difference between scores of the two groups was significant at the .05 level or less.

Appendix B: Members of Social Science Advisory Committee

Dina Biscotti

Lecturer, Department of Sociology and Postdoctoral Scholar,
U.C. Davis Energy Efficiency Center
University of California, Davis

Hilary Schaffer Boudet

Assistant Professor, Climate Change and Energy
School of Public Policy - Sociology
Oregon State University

Michael Nelson

Ruth H. Spaniol Chair of Natural Resources and
Professor of Environmental Philosophy and Ethics
Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society
Oregon State University

Jean Stockard

Professor Emerita
University of Oregon
Department of Planning, Public Policy and Management

Appendix C: Members of Project Steering Committee

Jacqui Patterson, NAACP

Jose Aguto, Friends Committee on National Legislation

JP Leous, US Climate Action Network

Bill Bradlee, Interfaith Power and Light, The Regeneration Project

Fanz Matner, NRDC

Adrianna Quintero, NRDC

Richard Cizik, New Evangelical Partnership for the Common Good

Jenny Holmes, Oregon Interfaith Power and Light

Lise Van Susteren, Interfaith Moral Action on Climate

Dave Waskow, Oxfam

Catherine Woodiwiss, Center for American Progress

Valerie Serrels, Kids Against Global Warming/I Matter Campaign

Sarah Levinson/Jonathan Lane, Coalition on the Environment in Jewish Life

Alexis Chase, Georgia Interfaith Power and Light