THE RIGHT MESSAGE
Communicating Clean Water
Audience
Language
Messenger
AUDIENCE

Who are you trying to reach?

Who is your target?
Ex: Elected official who is up for re-election next year.

Who do they care about/want to hear from?
Ex: Their constituents.

DIVE DEEPER! What sub-group of that audience can we motivate around our issue?
Ex: Women who live within 10 miles of the river who enjoy taking their children outside.
OUR WATER IS FOR Swimming

ChooseCleanWater COALITION
#OurWaterMd | choosecleanwater.org/stop-fracking
When explaining an environmental issue...
- Nature protection
- Pollution control
- Enough clean water
- Wildlife conservation

When addressing the “so what” question...
- Future Generations
- Healthy
- Family & Children
- Safe
- Trends

When encouraging somebody to do something...
- Make a Difference
- Doing my/your/their part
- It affects you
- What you can do
- Working together
- Save Money

When asking somebody to take your side...
- Accountability
- Corporations (evokes negative feelings)/Businesses (evokes positive feelings)
- Choice
- Fair
- Balance
- Planning Ahead
- Responsible
- Freedom
- Investment
- Law
MESSAGING DIAL TESTING

People listened to a recording of a message.

While they listened the moved their cursor to indicate positive or negative reactions.
We all love our families and want a better world for our children. But some people want to increase taxes and create burdensome regulations around water that will hurt middle class families and their children. We need to focus on creating good paying jobs, attracting new businesses, and growing our economy. Raising taxes right now for government water projects would set us back. It would hurt our local economy, cut jobs, and make it harder for people to make ends meet. We need to create jobs and encourage new businesses, not raise taxes on hard working families to pay for more government spending.
Every day, water connects each of us to others in our lives. It fills the pools that bring children relief on a hot summer day. It runs through the rivers people enjoy by fishing or boating. It fills our glasses, and is in our morning coffee, and the beer or glass of wine we may enjoy with dinner. Without water there is no life. We must protect the water around us and keep our water safe and clean, which means building projects that restore and protect our local rivers and streams, because water brings us together and is central to life.

“It fills our glasses, and is in our morning coffee and the beer of glass of wine we may enjoy with dinner”

“Without water, there is no life”

“Protect the water around us and keep our water safe and clean”

“Because water brings us together”

“And is central to life”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Say</th>
<th>Instead of</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Prevent” pollution</td>
<td>“Reduce” pollution</td>
<td>Prevent generates more urgency and provides greater space for solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Restore and protect”</td>
<td>“Protect” by itself</td>
<td>Additional solution frame which resonates with persuadables and alienates opponents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Set aside money”</td>
<td>“Dedicated fund”</td>
<td>Tax sensitive adults see little difference, but set-aside is stronger language for those who are NOT tax sensitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The water we drink”</td>
<td>“Drinking water”</td>
<td>Both are strong, but “the water we drink” stronger with our base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water is essential for our health</td>
<td>Water is essential for our economy</td>
<td>Health is a stronger values orientation. Linking to the economy risks priming economic cross-pressures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>People are very solutions-oriented, and focusing on solutions helps to alienate opposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Everyone needs to take steps to reduce pollution”</td>
<td>“Others are not doing enough”</td>
<td>We are stronger when positive, collective, and not accusatory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some people propose passing federal legislation that requires energy companies to use an emissions trading system to reduce CO2 output. Do you support or oppose this proposal?

% of Republicans supporting: 52

Democrats in Congress propose passing federal legislation that requires energy companies to use an emissions trading system to reduce CO2 output. Do you support or oppose this proposal?

% of Republicans supporting: 43%

Republicans in Congress propose passing federal legislation that requires energy companies to use an emissions trading system to reduce CO2 output. Do you support or oppose this proposal?

% of Republicans supporting: 75%

President Donald Trump proposes passing federal legislation that requires energy companies to use an emissions trading system to reduce CO2 output. Do you support or oppose this proposal?

% of Republican supporting: 83%