Patrick Hancock, University of Virginia

Poster Title: (ir)rationally Natural And (de)polarized: The Impact Of Natural Descriptive Analogies On Support For Climate Engineering Approaches

Abstract: This paper presents the preliminary results of an experimental survey which looks to investigate the effect of descriptive framing analogies, on a scale of "naturalness", in moderating support for climate engineering approaches. The research outlined here is on-going and subject to change with new developments. The most up to data information will be presented at the conference. In part, our research, hopes to investigate the risks, if any, to public perception by how the delineation between sub-categories, of climate engineering, impacts the perception of particular approaches and possibly the entire domain of climate engineering. How the public perceives climate engineering is likely to have great influence on how widely and quickly climate engineering could realistically be adopted. By studying and understanding what moderates the public's perception, a clearer understanding can be developed about decision making, by the public, in periods of uncertainty, time scarcity, and complexity of novel approaches for problem solving. In the study, participants were randomly assigned into one of two sub-categories of climate engineering (carbon dioxide removal or solar radiation management) with either a "natural" or "anthropogenic" descriptive framing analogy or an independent control group without an analogy, in addition to a basic shared description of their assigned approach. Our preliminary results indicate two main findings. First, a statically significant difference was found in the support for use, of climate engineering approaches, between sub-categories. Second, a trend, which will be explored further in powered up experiments, of a possible irrational increased support of "naturally" framed climate engineering approaches, moderated by political ideology, within both sub-categories. The data suggests self-identified liberal's might be more prone to an increased support of SRM due to a "natural" framing, whereas self-identified conservatives might be more prone to an increased support of CDR due to a "natural" framing. The impacts of political polarization on both mitigation and adaptation have been resounding in terms of slowing the collective response to climate change. The implication of these possible findings could provide a context of where friction points may develop in the ongoing deliberations of what role, if any, that climate engineering approaches have in effective climate action policy.