

## ***Interactive comment on “Representing the majority and not the minority: the importance of the individual in communicating climate change” by Sam Illingworth et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 30 June 2018

**General Comments:** This paper will be of interest to researchers across different disciplines, particularly those who are considering doing outreach or public engagement of their own. I found its justifications, methods and materials to be clear and coherent and it raises some important points about the use of qualitative research embedded in communities.

**Specific Comments:**

A couple of small ones.

**Poetry:** I agree with the first reviewer's comments that the reasons for selecting poetry needed to be given slightly more space. The authors' proposed additional paragraph

C1

goes much of the way towards rectifying this. It strikes me that many of the positive points here could be applied to other types of creative-writing exercise, and it seems that one of the reasons was the expertise of the workshop co-ordinator as playing the role of 'more knowledgeable other'. (No Problem with that.) However, at certain points the article touches on some poetry-specific features e.g. the way participants really engaged with poetry despite it being seen as elitist/difficult'. There are also some considerations of the way these workshops could be re-visited/repeated elsewhere. I think it is worth having a couple of sentences at least considering, during future/follow-up workshops, poetry could be more than, as the authors call it, a 'tool'. After all poetry has a highly developed (and comparatively accessible) tradition of thinking about and engaging with both place/community and 'nature'. In sum: Is it worth saying something about whether such community workshops could incorporate the reading as well as the writing of poetry, even if only to rule it out?

**Religion:** Hearing how the participants from different faith communities engaged with the workshop was one of the most interesting parts of this article. I agree with the conclusion that working with faith leaders to develop dialogue across the diverse communities is a worthwhile initiative, and that awareness of different publics' perspectives, needs and worldviews is part of climate change communication. Therefore it strikes me that the article could do slightly more to engage with the relationship between religious discourses and ecological awareness in their own terms rather than too quickly putting them into an already familiar language of sustainability. The things in the discussion about neighbourly responsibility, or living in the moment with less focus on consumption, are not just connected to community experience but in part emerge from a religious world view that might complement but also find itself in tension with aspects of ecological communication. And while the implications need not be discussed in detail here they could perhaps be better acknowledged/signposted in a few sentences (e.g. in regard to Laudato Si, or even a Quaker sense of stewardship etc etc.).

Both of the above are really quite small quibbles and would only require very minor

C2

amendments.

Technical Corrections: None.

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2018-3>, 2018.