

Stephen Duncombe & Silas Harrebye
25 May 2018

FINAL REPORT

The Nordic Experiment: Measuring Affect and Effect of Artistic Forms of Free Expression in the Public Sphere

The Challenge

Free and open democracies necessitate a vibrant civil society in which engaged citizens challenge their community. It is therefore necessary to know how political parties, campaigners, activists and organizers can best raise awareness, move people, change their views, and get them engaged.

The past decade has witnessed a surge in “artistic activism,”¹ both in its practice and its study. Leveraging the affective qualities of the arts and the effective capabilities of activism, the practice has been embraced by artists looking to have social impact, activists operating on an increasingly mediated political landscape, cultural institutions seeking civic relevancy, and civic organizations looking for creative ways to engage the public and change policy.

While artistic activism has become an increasingly established field, its foundation is still a matter of faith more than fact. Some theoretical work has been done on the question of the affect and effect of the practice, practitioners have been interviewed regarding their own ideas and own assessments of what constitutes “success,” and survey studies on how different groups of citizens view the strengths and weaknesses of artistic activism compared to other types civic engagement -- indeed the authors of this proposal have done all three -- yet what has not been done is an evidence-based, empirical study of the variable impact of creative forms of activism on a public audience in terms of ideas, ideals and actions. This is what we did with the Nordic Experiment² -- a real-world experiment to gauge the success of different forms of engagement, some creative, some not, with passersby around a social issue.

¹ “Artistic activism” goes by many names: creative activism, socially engaged arts, social practice arts, community-based arts, arte util, political art, activist art, activism -- each with slightly different emphases. What unites them all is the mobilization of both affect and effect.

² More accurately “The Copenhagen Experiment,” as we were unable to mount a comparative experiment in Oslo as initially planned, the reasons for which are discussed later in this report.

Working with our research partners: ActionAid, RAPolitics and Roskilde University in Denmark, and the Center for Artistic Activism and New York University in the USA, we staged **the first ever public experiment on the comparative efficacy and afficacy of artistic activism vs more conventional forms of activist interventions.**

Experiment Description

Over the course of three days -- 15,16,17 May, 2018 -- we mounted activist interventions in the middle of Dronning Louises Bro (aka "Hipster Bridge"), a popular and well-traveled bridge in the middle of Copenhagen, Denmark. Each day, from 15:00 to 17:00 **we paired a conventional activist intervention -- public speaking, petitioning, flyerling -- with a creative way of accomplishing the same task in a classic A/B experimental model.** Observers watched interactions and took notes, a camera person filmed the interactions to capture micro-dynamics and general movement patterns, and interviewers stopped passersby to ask their opinions, recording their responses and gathering contact information for a follow-up survey. We chose as our "issue" a Meat Tax being proposed in Denmark as a way to curb climate damaging methane emissions produced by meat production. We picked this issue because it was a current concern, one we thought had a robust "informational" component and, in Denmark at least, an issue that people did not have too strong and fixed preconceptions and biases about.

Day 1. We compared conventional activist speech on a soap box with a creative alternative. We provided Pelle Møller, a freestyle rapper from the Danish group RAPolitics, with factual information regarding the issue, and with our assistance and with selected examples of conventional activist speeches to guide him, he wrote a standard political speech and delivered it in a manner someplace between a tired politician and a shrill activist. Behind the speaker was a banner that stated, in a plain font, "Meat Production is the Biggest Cause of Pollution on the Planet. We Need a Green Tax on Meat." Pelle then took the same information and composed a rap, and rapped it out on the bridge to passersby. This time, the banner was flipped to reveal a colorful design, illustration, and provocative message: "This Shit Is An Issue! You Need to Think of this Shit When You Eat." Each version was staged multiple times, in staggered intervals to maximise audience diversity. Observers noted the interactions and coded them on prepared worksheets to account for such things as audience Attention, Interest, Uniterest, Anger, Interaction, Participation and Documentation. Interviewers caught people who seemed interested and asking them about what they thought, felt, and planned to do, and asked for contact information for a quick follow-up survey in the future. (See 1 and 2 in Appendix.)

Day 2: We take on the much loathed, and sometimes very necessary, activist practice of petitioning. The issue remains the same, the Meat Tax, and we created a petition asking for the Meat Tax that will be sent to the relevant ministry in Denmark. We divided into teams: Petitioners, Interviewers and Observers. Petitioners asked strangers for their signature, while noting those whom they approach who refuse as well. Interviewers -- in white lab coats -- then

followed up with those who agreed to sign, and asked them why they did it. And observers watched the whole process, especially those who refused to stop and sign. First is our creative approach: colorful banner, petitioners dress as cows, with personal bluetooth speakers and a massive sound system on a bike emanating *loud* fart noises, making the sonic argument that cow farts are the leading cause of release of methane. Cows approached passersby and ask for signatures. We do this for a bit over a half hour and then switch. The sound system goes silent, we switched the banner, and petitioners stripped off their cow outfits and and ask for signatures for the same period of time. (See 3 in Appendix.)

Day 3: The grand finale of the Nordic Experiment. This day we test out different means of flyer distribution. There are two versions of a flyer giving information about the environmental impact of meat production, with the same facts but different design. One is black and green and leads with facts. The other displays a picture of a pile of cow shit, with the provocative statement: "This Shit is an Issue!" We divided up the flyers into pre-counted packs and performers handed them out to passersby on the bridge, while we timed how long it takes to get rid of the flyers. As with the previous days, other members of the team observed the process or interviewed people who have taken a flyer.

First up were performers with the conventional pamphlet wearing civilian clothes. It went much as expected, and all the flyers are handed out to passersby. Performers then don the cow costumes, we roll out the mega-fart sound machine, and in the *pièce de résistance*: assemble mounds of real (and smelly) cowshit, each with its own little sign, in a minefield across the walkway of the bridge. The same performers handed out flyers again. As one might guess, the response was quite different: big smiles and wrinkled noses. And, in the middle of it all, a police car and van with flashing lights pulls up and we have to explain the whole experiment to a burly Danish cop; all of us trying to keep straight faces as our explanation is punctuated periodically by super-loud farts. That night the biggest tabloid in Copenhagen lead with a story of our "demonstration." (See 4 in Appendix.)

Preliminary Results

While much more analysis remains to be done on our data -- which includes more than 100 interviews, 30 observation sheets, petition and pamphlet tallies, hours of film footage, and 100 follow-up surveys to still be administered in two weeks time -- the preliminary results are encouraging.

Quantitative Measures

In every quantitative measure we employed, the creative approach is more successful than the conventional activist one.

Comparing the rap with a public speech (day 1), our observers noted **considerable increases in audience Attention, Interest, Interaction, and Documentation when the speech was rapped**. While the category of audience Participation favored the traditional speech slightly, the participation was largely negative, with people voicing their objections to what was being said in the Speech. (See 5 in Appendix.)

Pairing conventional petitioning with a creative approach (day 2) we also found marked differences. We determined how successful each approach was by counting the number of signatures each “facer” received on a petition and compared this to the number of total approaches to passersby the performer made. Each of the four petitioners were able to secure more signatures, relative to approaches, while wearing cow costumes, and backed up by the creative banner and cow-fart sound track. In percentages, **conventional facers were successful in garnering signatures a little less than 17% of the time, whereas the cows succeeded a bit more than 28% of the time**. (See 6 in Appendix)

Comparing the speed in which our performers were able to hand out flyers, and the receptiveness of passersby to accepting those flyers (day 3), also might suggest the relative efficacy of the creative approach. Handing out a conventional flyer in street clothes, our performers distributed 160 flyers in 27 minutes. Donning cow costumes, and approaching people after they had walked through the minefield of cow shit, our performers handed out 160 creatively designed and provocatively worded flyers in 19 minutes, **creatively distributing the same amount of pamphlets in approximately 30% less time**. An impressive difference. *However*, because of the technological failure of our GoPro camera we were depending upon to count the total number of people passing on the bridge during the time period relative to the time it took to hand out flyers, **these numbers remain merely suggestive, not conclusive**. (See 7 in Appendix.)

Qualitative Observations

As clear as these numbers are, far more interesting were the qualitative data, as it is here we can observe what people *think* and *feel* about the relative interventions. After our initial coding and categorization of our observation sheets and recorded interviews, several overall patterns quickly emerged.

People find conventional activists predictable and annoying

Most people find the conventional formats of public speaking, petitioning, and flyering boring because they are predictable and facers are perceived as annoying. When asked about their interactions with our conventional facers, a significant number of the interviewees reported that they did not really care about the issue, or for the intervention. “I don’t know if I feel anything about it,” one person said, continuing, “I don’t know how often you really take notice of it [the intervention].” This finding is supported by our observations showing that most people, when

approaching our conventional activists looked down, walked in circles around them, or just politely said, “No.” “They are fucking (Danish: Pisse) irritating,” another person we interviewed said. They continued:

Since I was young the Moonies and the Scientologists and what have you, have been on the street. And they were also fucking annoying. And many of them just want to tell you something until you have spent some of your precious time and dear heart and then they just want a donation in the end. Fucking irritating.”

A significant amount of those interviewed also felt that those doing the traditional actions were trying to manipulate them, and that they are often “tricked” into buying whatever these people are “selling”.

Related to this sense of general annoyance at conventional activist interventions is the resentment that people apparently feel when the political speaker, petitioner, or facer is telling them what to do. “I think these people are tiresome (Danish: Træls) when they tell people what to do,” said one, who went on to say: “I think you need to inspire people....You cannot tell people that they *cannot* eat beef. It’s hard to influence people.” Another interviewee explained “it can be very moralizing and invasive.”

Creative forms of activism make people curious and more affected

Instead of being stopped and told, our findings indicate people prefer to be prompted to stop themselves to find out what is going on. Our experiment suggests that instrumental creativity is one way to do this. One person we interviewed, after hearing Pelle rap about his own ambiguous feelings as an avid meat eater himself, expressed it like this:

There was a bit of irony in his rap. So I felt like he wanted us to reflect. It made me think....Sometimes when I feel like people are telling me what to do I feel like; don’t tell me what to do. But this was different.”

Many others said similar things. It was “Funny. I paid a lot of attention. And in a different way than if he had just been talking,” said another person, then elaborating, “So it makes you stop and pay attention, which I wouldn’t have had it just been a regular facer.”

So, instead of alienating the public by preaching at them, a creative approach seems to draw passersby in, encouraging people drop their predetermined bias and barriers. For example, on person we interviewed said,

It felt strong. First of all it was good entertainment. It was well done. Some demonstrations can feel rather aggressive. This performance felt more civic-minded (Danish: Medmenneskeligt). There was a lightness to it, despite of the heavy topic, that made me feel sympathy with the guy.

The creative actions throughout all three days got people more curious and thus did not only lead to us getting more signatures and pamphlets handed out, it also led to more interaction. Triangulating our interviews with our observation only confirms these results. One observer noted a child asking her mother as they were walking through the cow shit “labyrinth” (as it was

independently referred to several times), “Why is this shit here?”. Part of the creative manoeuvre is to pose questions and get people thinking, as opposed to just feeding them information and telling them what to do. For example, our conventional flyer and banner *tells* people the problem and what they must do. While our creative flyer and banner issues a provocative challenge and *asks* the question: What is this Shit About?

Similarly, part of the reason for the more intense interaction with the creative interventions seems to be that these were simply different from what people are used to. The creative interventions prompted people to say things like: “It wasn’t what I had expected when I stopped. It was different than an add on Facebook or a bus commercial. So it was another way to convey an old message.” This might also explain why our observers registered that *our* creative facers outperformed facers working further down the bridge using conventional tactics to gather signatures and solicit donations. Over the course of the three days a number of these “real” facers came over to us to ask questions about what we were doing and how it was working. Their frustrated supervisor even tried to bully us off the bridge saying that it was their turf.

The creative means used in the activist interventions adds a sensuous dimension that reaches people on an *affective* level. As one person narrated:

The action format is interesting. I mean the content I know. I was inspired by that kind of messaging in public...It touches me and all my senses. As opposed to me reading something or watching people just saying ‘no’. This is inclusive and it makes you laugh and listen because of the particular form.

When describing what they had experienced during the creative actions people often used the word “feeling” in their phrasing. “Funny,” “attention,” “interesting,” “capturing,” “inspired.” “entertaining,” “lively”, “cool”, “not aggressive”, and “empathy” were all words people used to describe their experience with the more creative activist actions. This is opposed to words and phrases like “annoying,” “irritating,” “selling,” “tiresome,” and “I don’t know if I feel anything” that were used by people asked about the conventional actions.

Creative forms of activism can -- productively -- disturb and unsettle

Another issue raised by several of the people interviewed is that the political speech can be thought of as more “serious,” while the rap, for example, seemed to some as a bit “silly”. As one person said, “I don’t know. I prefer the speech, which is more serious than a rap, which can become a bit circus-like (Danish: gøglet).” This serious vs silly can be interpreted in different ways. One, as a condemnation of creativity as frivolous, and thus easy to dismiss as mere entertainment to be, at best, enjoyed but not acted upon. But conversely, silliness can be understood as a way to break down the whole idea of politics a “serious” issue only to be taken up by “serious actors” like politicians and policy analysts, and not everyday people.

The word “disturbing” also came up a few times in relation to the more provocative actions, which can also be interpreted as either condemnation or praise. One person coined the ambivalence that many felt like this:

I think it was a bit weird, I thought: what is this about? It was different than what you are used to. It made me curious. I also thought that it was a bit annoying....I think it is a good idea because you remember it a little better, because you notice it.

As a woman who was walking with her young daughter explained to us on the last day of our experiment, after we had dropped cow shit onto the bridge:

My first thought was that it was lovely in the middle of the town because my daughter needs to get the countryside into town. My second thought was, what is this? That is why I took a flyer, otherwise I wouldn't have cared.

At this point the police rolled up to our action. The woman, noting this, continued:

That is annoying huh?! Anyways, that is pretty likely. But that is only because you are putting shit on the street. Had you just been standing here you would have made no difference."

One of the great strengths of art is its ability to disturb and unsettle the common sense perspectives we hold on the world and its politics and possibilities. Artistic activism seems to have the capacity to do this as well.

Lessons We Learned

In addition to all of the study findings we have analyzed, and will continue to analyze in the coming months, the other, major finding we have made so far is this: a study like this takes an immense amount of work, a large number of participants, and deep partnerships with local organizations.

Our original research plan called for us to do two sets of experiments, one in Copenhagen and the other in Oslo, during two consecutive weeks of field work. In Denmark we were able to assemble a team of artists and activists to brainstorm the actions in Copenhagen in advance, and strong partner organizations that provided space, resources and volunteers, and a stable crew of participants during the week of actions. In Norway, however, despite repeated conversations with local artists and contact with numerous environmental and educational organizations, we were never able to assemble an interested and committed team to help us with what we were realizing was a large undertaking. Although, we wish we could have replicated our experiment in Oslo, and may hope to do so in the future, concentrating all our time, labor and resources on the effort in Copenhagen allowed us to pull off a project that exceeded our expectations.

We will elaborate on methodological delimitations and necessary cultural contextualization and their implications for the scientific validity of the project later on in our more scholarly publications.

Future Plans

This report is the first and most important part of what we are formally required to hand in to Fritt Ord in return for generously funding our work. Our economic report will follow soon.

As we further examine the data we have collected during the course of the experiment, do a reflection debrief with the core team involved, and collect and analyse the results of the follow-up survey in the weeks to come, we plan on **expanding this report in the form of 1) a white paper targeting foundations, NGOS, and policy makers, 2) an academic research article aimed toward scholars, and 3) one or more popular pieces meant to reach a broader audience**, including artists, activists, and social movement networks, and journalists. These are planned to come out in both English, Danish, and maybe even Norwegian. **The video documentation of our experiment will be edited down to a short 3 - 5 minute case-study film** visually showing what we did, why it is important, and how it is useful. We hope this format will open up our experiment and its findings to social media and thus reach a third type of audience. All of these publications will of course be sent to Fritt Ord, and we hope that together we can distribute the findings far and wide.

Although the Nordic Experiment was meant as a pilot study, the results are nevertheless important. But as groundbreaking as this present study is, it has a serious limitation: it studies how *artistic tactics* can meet conventional *activist objectives*. What it does not do is test the political efficacy and afficacy of what art does best: provide new perspectives to view the world as it is and stimulate imaginations to envision new possibilities of worlds to come. We therefore **plan to follow up and further develop our design. This will include testing other types of artistic activism better atuned to stimulating the power of imagination and applying a wider definition of artistic activism** than the rather instrumental one focused on in this study. We would also like to **conduct future experiments in different cities around the world**, thus accounting for a wider range of cultural contexts.

We therefore hope we can continue the fruitful collaboration we have had with Fritt Ord around the issue of how free speech is creatively expressed and can work in different ways. One way we can do this is to **plan an event at Fritt Ord next year where local artists and activist are invited to explore the potential and value of closer collaboration between those two fields**. Besides facilitated debates (words), we suggest the inclusion of a collaborative development and implementation of a concrete creative intervention in Oslo (action) as the final outcome of the event. Looking forward a bit further, **we would like to continue to work with the Fritt Ord Foundation on creative experiments and interventions which expand the range and scope of artistic activism**.

Thank you again for all your support in this pioneering study measuring the effect and affect of artistic activism. We could not have accomplished it without the Fritt Ord Foundation.

Appendix

1. Speech/Rap Pictures



Speech, with people riding by



Rapping, with the cow posse

2. Speech/Rap

Speech:

Kære Københavner!

I er mange der idag er ude og nyde det gode vejr. Solens stråler brænder stærkt for tiden, og det er tydeligt her på broen at mange af jer sætter pris på det

Næh Spørgsmålet er nok nærmere om i er klar over den pris planeten er i gang med at betale for disse klimaforandringer der foregår overalt i verden.

For Vores CO₂ aftryk er tårnhøjt, og kloden kan slet ikke følge med.

I 2015 indgik verdens lande en aftale for at sænke CO₂ forbruget, en aftale som Donald Trump i 2017 valgte at melde forbrugsmastodonten USA udaf.

Vi blev alle forargede over hans ligegyldighed, og havde nu endnu en god grund til at pege fingre af ham. Så der stod vi, pegende 1 finger mod vest, mens de resterende 4 fingre pegede direkte tilbage på vores eget hykleri.

For vi skal alle være med til at sænke CO₂ aftrykket, ikke blot se patetiske og handlingslammede til, imens vi trøstespiser den barske sandhed væk.

Den sandhed som jeg taler om idag er et af vor tids største problemer, nemlig den vestlige verdens massive overforbrug af Oksekød.

Hver enkelt dansker spiser årligt 52 kg Oksekød, det er altså 1 kg saftige bøffer, steg og shawarma hver eneste uge.

Det er alt alt for meget. Det efterlader køkkenbordet med blodrøde tal.

Hver eneste kilo oksekød har det samme CO₂ aftryk, som at tage bilen 155 Km, hvilket svarer til at køre herfra og til Odense.

Den store belastning af miljøet kommer fordi det er så energi ineffektivt at opdrætte klovdyr. Der skal 8 gange så meget energi til at fremstille et kg okse, som der skal til for at fremstille samme mængde Kylling eller fisk, 5 gange så meget som at producere et kg flæskesteg.

Det er altså bedre for miljøet at du spiser kylling hver eneste dag, end at du lever som flexitar og bare spiser bøffer en gang imellem.

Det handler idag ikke bare om at spise mindre kød, men også om at vælge kød med lavere miljøomkostninger.

Omkostninger som vi allesammen betaler for.

For noget lugter råddent i det moderne samfund, og selvom vi idag kan nyde en klar og skyfri himmel, så kan vores næse alligevel godt fornemme stanken på afstand.

Det er lugten af Metangas, eller på godt gammel dansk koprutter, som er igang med at ætse sig vej gennem ozonlaget.

Så dette er et opråb fra en kødspiser til en hel kædelskende nation.

Lad os sammen gøre en indsats for at sænke vort oksekødsforbrug, det vil være en kærkommen og nødvendig gestus til vores medmennesker og de kommende generationer der skal betale for vores valg. Det vil DE sætte pris på!

Tak for jeres tid

Rap:

Mine damer og herre, den her tale er til jer
Tag det som en undskyldning til alle og enhver
At anerkende sine fejltrin er altid så svært
Så lad mig starte der, for Jeg beklager desværre
For polerne smelter og kloden den kæmper
Med drivhuseffekt og for store procenter CO2 kvotienter
Alle Følgevirkninger af at være beboet af mennesker
Vores unaturlige livsstil har naturligvis konsekvenser
Og det absurd når man tænker på de utrolige mængder
Kul ilte der ender op i ozonlaget igen og
Det burde vi ændre, os forbrugseksistenser
Men ligenu nyder vi bare at solen den skinner

Ahhhh - Så er jeg klar til at undskylde igen for

Jeg har klokket i det, og det er os alle der får lov at bøde
min kæmpe brøler efterlader mig i åndenød
For min hjerne siger nej, men min mund siger fuck miljøet
Hver eneste gang jeg bider i et saftigt stykke oksekød

Mmmmm Solide mængder proteiner ender
Mellem mine tænder hvor de mætter min Guilty pleasure
Det er aldrig nemt at forlade det vi Virkelig elsker
Men jeg har nu engang indset at mit forbrug har Konsekvenser

For co2en vi ligger i at producere mere beef
Er en ineffektiv industri og det vil sige
Den bruger 8 gange så meget energi som fiskeri
5 gange så meget som hvis det var en svinesti
Det er noget svineri, der udleder masser methan
Fordi køernes prutter forurener ekstremt
Ozonlaget kan blive smadret totalt, katastrofalt
Det ik falsk reklame der går væk hvis du ser en anden kanal
Der kommer alligevel intet revolutionerende på tv Lorry
Og Det her er alvorligt, vi propper os med bøf , 52 kg årligt

Det sætte aftryk som 155 kilometer i bil
Deprimerende Real, det svarer lidt til
At kører herfra til Odense i en Peugeot 409
Det kræver alt for meget energi, ligesom din facebook profil

nu hvor vi har vores dokumentation
Forhindres kollision med Rekonstrueret kommunikation
Koldsveden kan kun kureres kvæ en ny konstruktion
Som Kræver en kolossal kovending ellers kommer konfrontationen

Undskyld ko
Jeg må finde andet at spise nu
Jeg håber på at du kan forstå
At dig og mig og det her, det kan ik gå x2

Undskyld, for jeg er ik L.o.c eller til melodi grand prix
Medlem af Green peace eller af grøn energi
Men jeg ved at hvis vi hellere vil tag end at gi
Ender vi i et oversvømmet vinterhi, cest la vie

Men enhver forandring starter med et lille skridt
En bevægelse, der sagtens kan rykke os milevidt
os allesammen, for naturen kender ik til dit og mit
Og på klimakontoen der er ingenting kvit og frit

Så den her er til dig! Ja dig, Der ikke er paleofanatisk speltmor
Der ik selv strikker dit tøj udaf stofrester du genbruger
Jeg kunne ligesågodt tale til mig selv ligesom ekkoer
For du og jeg er genboer, almindelige mennesker på denne jord

Sammen med dig! Ja dig, med din kommune grønne kompostspand
Der spiser flexitarisk og lever af kærlighed og postevand
Der tager ansvar og ik lader andre tage faldet som en stuntmand
Og ik tænker på Gandalf når jeg snakker om en troldmand

Det bare os, lige her på dronning Louises bro
Og jeg er glad fordi vi ku indgå i denne ensidige dialog
For sammen har vi magten, der er stadig lidt tid endnu
Til at hjælpe klimaet til at gro ved at spise bare lidt mindre ko

Og synge
Undskyld ko

Jeg må finde andet at spise nu
Jeg håber på at du kan forstå
At dig og mig og det her, det kan ik gå

3. Petition Pictures



Cow petitioner



Mega-Fart Sound System



Interviewers, in lab coats (and shorts)

4. Flyer Pictures



Flyers (front and back)



Cow shit with protest sign



Police interrogate cow

5. Speech/Rap Table

Rap and Speech each given 5 times total over 4 time periods: 3 speech, 3 rap, 2 speech, 2 rap

SPEECH RAP Total #s %increase/ decrease of Rap over Speech	Attention person stops and takes notice 10-15 sec	Interest get closer / smile / nod / point/ talk to friends about	Uninte rest look bored or confused	Anger look upset or mad	Interact laugh/clap/ call out	Participate ask question/join in discussion (note what people say/ask)	Document take photo/video
Soren street side	72 124 72%	14 44 214%			2 11 450%	2 3 50% (speech: 1 arguing against climate change)	6 11 83% (rap: ppl smiling laughing)
Louise street side	6 19 216%	6 4 33% decrease	10 12 20%			0 1 100%	1 1 0%
Pernille street side	40 98 145%	23 50 117%	4 5 25%		2 9 350%	3 1 67% decrease speech: 3 "I'm gonna eat more meat"; I ain't giving up schwarma"; "I don't believe that CO2 leads to climate change"	3 9 200%
Steve across street	20 45 125%	6 31 416%	14 10 29% decrease				2 (1*) 6 200% *speech: 1 taking photo of river in opposite direction
Bjarke bench	13 14 7.7%	4 2 50% decrease	40 37 7.5% decrease		7 16 128%		

NOTE 1: Given low total numbers, percentages are merely suggestive.

NOTE 2: Comparisons *within* Observer are valid as these Observers, we assume, are using the same criteria for observation and notation. Comparison *across* Observers, even though

standard criteria were given at the beginning (e.g. 10-15 sec. means “attention,” can double-dip, etc) vary so much that this comparison of data is not meaningful.

6. Petition Table

Cows, then Humans. 35 minutes each. 83 signatures total. 393 Approaches.

Petitioner	Farting Cow Signatures/Unsuccessful Approaches Signatures/Total Approaches	Earnest Human Signatures/Unsuccessful Approaches Signatures/Total Approaches
1	10/25 10/35 = 28.6%	7/33 7/40 = 17.5%
2	9/31 9/40 = 22.5%	14/76 14/90 = 15.5%
3	7/45 7/52 = 13.5%	10/66 10/76 = 13.2%
4	15/3 15/18 = 83.3%	11/31 11/42 = 26.2%
TOTAL	41/104 41/145 = 28.3%	42/206 42/248 = 16.9%

7. Flyer Table

Flyer	Number Distributed	Start Time	End Time	Time Elapsed	Percent Difference
Conventional	160	15:07	15:34	27	
Creative	160	15:50	16:09	19	29.6% less

Note 1. Police show up at 4:01 and leave at 4:08

Note 2: Unfortunately, these percentages and cross comparisons remain only suggestive because we do not have an account of how many people crossed the bridge during the respective times, due to our GoPro camera fail.