

Subject: Re: [gbird] GBIRd messaging resources...
From: <Keith.Hayes@data61.csiro.au>
Date: 3/15/2017 5:27 PM
To: <heath.packard@islandconservation.org>, <gbird@lists.ncsu.edu>

Thanks Heath – both very interesting....

K

From: gbird-owner@lists.ncsu.edu [mailto:gbird-owner@lists.ncsu.edu] **On Behalf Of** Heath Packard
Sent: Wednesday, 15 March 2017 2:15 AM
To: gbird@lists.ncsu.edu (gbird@lists.ncsu.edu) <gbird@lists.ncsu.edu>
Subject: [gbird] GBIRd messaging resources...

GBIRd colleagues,

You might enjoy these resources. Both are helpful in thinking about how we message/market the GBIRd suitability investigation.

What surprised me in the DuPont message testing and will change the way I recommend we talk about GBIRd with most audiences is to not use the arguments that we've been altering plant genomes for 1000s of years through plant breeding. There are some other nuances that will help as well...'edit/altering genes' are to be avoided, as are 'scissors' analogies.

Akin et al abstract: **Mapping the Landscape of Public Attitudes on Synthetic Biology**

This research offers one of the first analyses of the US public's views about synthetic biology, based on nationally representative survey data. We provide in-depth, multiyear descriptive results of public attitudes toward this issue and compare them with individuals' attitudes toward other issues. Our data indicate that the public does not generally feel informed about synthetic biology or believe it is personally important. However, Americans express more reservations about the moral downside of synthetic biology than about other issues. Multivariate analysis reveals that values and predispositions—particularly religiosity, deference to scientific authority and trust in scientists—are linked to support for synthetic biology. We also see evidence indicating that deference to scientific authority reduces the potential for religiosity and distrust in scientists to polarize public attitudes about synthetic biology. We conclude by describing the implications of our findings for the development of synthetic biology research and upstream public engagement.

Interesting 'synthesis' in the introductory context:

There are several reasons why science and politics do not neatly disentangle (for a review, see Scheufele 2014). First, scientists can act as political advocates (Pielke 2007) and as policy advisors who play integral roles in the policymaking process (Jasanoff 1990). Second, science and the media are increasingly linked, in that media are increasingly important in shaping public opinion and science is becoming increasingly dependent on public acceptance and public support for funding (Weingart 1998).

Enjoy,

Heath Packard

Director of Marketing & Communications

Island Conservation

360.584.3051 (mobile)

Learn more www.islandconservation.org

Network www.linkedin.com/company/island-conservation

Keep in touch www.facebook.com/preventingextinctions

Talk to us www.twitter.com/noextinctions

