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I dedicate this thesis to the 7.5 billion people out there in the world (myself included). We all have a commitment to leave this world better off than it was for the sake of future generations. Whether it is recycling a piece of paper on the ground or eliminating meat from your diet, or working to create programs and activism efforts, sustainability starts with us. We may feel hopeless at times and not see the impact of our actions, but one small act makes a difference, I promise. I hope this research leads to some good down the road. Let us be motivated. Let us be caring. Let us be selfless. Let us treat each other and this world with love for it has given us everything. If we do not start taking better care of this world and making bigger strides as a whole towards sustainability, we better hope that the plot of *Interstellar* was actually just NASA test-driving their latest plan to get us off this planet.

**Otherwise, we are doomed.**
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ABSTRACT

The concept of sustainability encompasses environmental, social, and economic issues. A sustainable approach encourages a balanced earth in both well-being and resource conservation for the sake of future generations. Unfortunately, awareness of and participation in various dimension of sustainability are currently inadequate given the current projections of the negative impact of climate change to humanity. Therefore, this project was designed to research if there was a relationship between viewing sustainably-themed films and becoming more sustainably-conscious as a way to explore a potential avenue for mental and behavioral change. Furthermore, this project examines audience perception of sustainable messaging and content across various film genres in order to investigate sustainable community practices on a college campus, and participant’s level of interaction with sustainability.

This research design draws on similar studies on film’s influence on behavior (Zillman and Weaver, 1999), current perceptions and practices of sustainability on college campuses (Stafford, 2011), and the use of mass media to promote sustainable behavior (Minton et al., 2012). Data was collected from primarily college-age students, utilizing pre-screening and post-screening surveys, which were designed to elicit perceptions of sustainability (generally) and sustainable messaging in film content. Additional contextual data was collected during post-screening discussions. The result of this study suggests that there was an immediate change in viewers’ perceptions from the pre-screening survey to the post-screening survey. Viewers agreed that their definition of sustainability had changed post-viewing.
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INTRODUCTION

As an undergraduate student majoring in broadcasting and film, I have always been fascinated by the effects of mass media on human thought and behavior. Today, mass media and technology’s influence strongly correlate with what the average citizen views, learns, and creates. In fact, those who lack technological products are regarded as aged or outdated in the United States. To be progressive, one must be technologically savvy and constantly in sync with all the platforms of media being put out across multiple channels. I remember reading about a study in my freshmen year “Process and Effects of Mass Media” class. In response to Albert Bandura’s bobo doll experiments, psychologists Liebert and Baron performed a study that exposed children ages 5 to 9 to violent television programming for an allotted amount of time (Liebert and Baron, 1972). Post-viewing, the children that were exposed to the violent programming (labeled “The Untouchables”) were more likely to hurt the other non-violent children than to help in a scenario test that they took immediately post-viewing the violent clips. We might suggest that this experiment demonstrates that all children were negatively impacted by the exposure to violent mass media. This evidence of the relationship between cause and effect using mass media sparked further thought in me. What else could the power of social media, television programming and film content do? Is it only able to encourage what society considers “negative habits” such as aggressive behavior, smoking, or sexual promiscuity? Or could there also be some sort of positive reinforcement triggered through a mass media product like eating healthier, smoking cessation or better work-life balance. While I was fascinated with this subject, my mind at the time was focused on
continuing my work with my other great passion: sustainability. In fact, it would not be until three years later that these two fascinating passions would join together to create this project.

Since I was a junior in high school and serving as a member of the Environmental Club, sustainability has been one of my greatest passions. While many people can attest to the urge to recycle or eat local as their due diligence to “live sustainably,” I try to continually work on “living sustainably.” In fact, I feel this responsibility to build my immediate community into a place that actually lives and works sustainably. My current community is at Western Kentucky University (WKU). From the moment I stepped foot on this campus four years ago, I knew WKU was a place for me to promote awareness and increase participation in sustainability initiatives for students, faculty, and the Bowling Green community. As many have said before me, it only takes one small change to make a difference. In fact, a small moment of sustainability-focused behavior is the example needed to encourage others to ask questions, learn more, and actively participate. I joined the Environmental Club my junior year of high school, and this passion intensified during my senior year when I took an Advanced Placement (AP) Environmental course with Mr. Jacobelli. An avid, yet hilarious and creative, environmentalist himself, Mr. Jacobelli never sugarcoated the reality of environmentalism, and always first to explain to our class that “the world was going to shit, and we should do something about it.” His advocacy and passion for sustainability inspired me get further involved. Upon his recommendation, I applied for the Lexington Bluegrass Youth Sustainability Committee. This is a group of 1-2 high school seniors from every public and private school in Lexington, KY, that meets to discuss our various
schools’ sustainability practices, plan sustainability activities like a city-wide Earth Day and understand how youth can impact local sustainability and environmentalism. During my time on the committee, I wrote, produced, directed and edited our promotional video, which was one of my first ever video portfolio pieces. In fact, making this video pushed me towards majoring in Broadcasting and video production at WKU. Overall, I credit Mr. Jacobelli and these experiences for making me “on-fire” for sustainability.

To my shock as a 19-year-old freshman, WKU’s campus lacked a student-centered sustainability organization. Fortunately, WKU had the Office of Sustainability. The Office of Sustainability is WKU’s hub for sustainability initiatives and education. The office houses a garden, food pantry, bike shop, educational activities and so much more. The Office of Sustainability works to get students more actively involved in sustainability. The previous student-centered sustainability organization was led by the Office, and unfortunately fizzled out due to lack of membership. While the Office of Sustainability is a wonderful resource, a student-centered organization with student leaders would inspire more student involvement on campus. Therefore, I decided to do something. Fast-forward to me being elected to WKU’s Student Government Association (SGA) as a Freshmen Senator. From my understanding, student government is one of the most effective forms of students implementing change on campus based upon the concerns and voices of other students. No better place than this to seek out a student-based sustainability organization. In fact, my choice to run for Freshmen Senator was highly motivated by the encouragement of the student body president at-the-time, JayTodd Richey. His idea for a SGA permanent standing committee focused on sustainability inspired me to run for SGA senator and become the first ever Student
Sustainability Coordinator for the student-centered Sustainability Committee of SGA. A month into my college career, I was sworn-in and serving as the co-founder and first ever Student Sustainability Coordinator of the SGA Sustainability Committee at Western Kentucky University. It was truly one of the proudest moments of my life. This opportunity not only fostered a committee that remains strong and powerful to this day, but it also promotes green initiatives, inspiring campus events like the annual Earth Day festival, and student-based sustainable change at WKU. This position as the Student Sustainability Coordinator was highly rewarding because I was committing myself to a completely extra-curricular, non-academic experience that was benefitting others, the local environment, and the local community. I spent most of my free time freshman year working on this committee, writing sustainable legislation, promoting on social media, and leading green activities while balancing an 18-hour course load, sorority life, and the challenges of entering college. It was a lot, but the positive learning experiences that it brought into my life was the greatest benefit. Unfortunately, I resigned from the position for my sophomore year in order to complete a study abroad experience. However, I am still a committed member and helper to the committee. I always try to find a new way to expand this passion by doing things like producing a video\(^a\) on the Office of Sustainability’s Project Grow gardening initiative for my production class.

After completing my study abroad experience and returning to WKU, during my junior year I had a brainstorming meeting with the Honors College about pursuing a Thesis/Capstone project. I knew that I wanted to do something that incorporated

---

\(^a\) Link to Project Grow Video: https://youtu.be/Jm9Fh6KPO5E
sustainability and the study of sustainability awareness. However, I also felt the urge to stay true to my major and focus on something that would aid me down the road for my portfolio video and/or provide further experience going into the television and film industry. The answer was obvious. Why not merge the two together somehow into one capstone project? In that moment, the lightbulb went on and that previous fascination with mass media effects popped into my brain as if it was freshman year all over again. Could I use a similar method as the Liebert and Baron (1972) method, but instead with an intended positive reinforcement effect on the viewer? Could there be a way to make people more sustainably-conscious and involved using mass media?

Figure 1 below is an example of what commercials and social media campaigns can do for sustainability. Greenpeace International’s successful video campaign ended the partnership between LEGOS and Shell with the “Everything is NOT Awesome” campaign (Goodin, 2016). But, could this be done with a visual art form like a full-length feature film? Could the cinematic and narrative techniques combined with the sustainable messaging in a film inspire the audience to become more sustainably-conscious?
Figure 1: Greenpeace’s #LEGOBlockShell Campaign is one of the most successful sustainability marketing campaigns using visual storytelling.

As a film studies minor and a broadcasting major, I study the intentions and stylistic effects of mass media to inspire an intended effect from the audience. I am interested in exploring questions such as: Is the director’s intention always conveyed to the audience? Is there a different effect on the audience from what the director intended? From my experience, there is always some degree of effect on the audience. For example, I viewed the 2010 documentary film *The Dark Side of Chocolate* last year with the SGA Sustainability Committee, and I still feel the effect of this film. The film documents slave trading and trafficking of African children for chocolate harvesting companies like Mars and Cadbury nearly 10 years after the 2000 BBC special *Slavery: A Global Investigation* brought this issue to light (“The Dark Side of Chocolate.”). To this day, I have a hard time eating a Milky Way bar since it is owned by Mars. While this may seem super simple, every Milky Way that I forgo is hopefully working to stop a child from suffering for my sweet tooth.
Film has the ability to impact the ways in which people make decisions. Therefore, I surmised that if I could select films with sustainability-based themes (whether that be the intention of the director, a part of the narrative, or even woven into the style and technique of the film), I could create a film series that would explore a range of sustainability-forward cinema to possibly trigger a positively reinforced effect on the understanding of the viewer to make them more sustainably-conscious post-viewing.

What I find so fascinating about this project is that it has the potential to provide insight into the genres and styles of filmmaking that resonate with audiences the most. If filmmakers can determine which films have the greatest impact on viewer sustainability awareness, this gives future filmmakers some idea of what technical and narrative elements to produce future sustainably impactful content. Furthermore, if we see a direct correlation between viewing films and a positive sustainable awareness on our viewers, then we are potentially fostering more sustainability advocates to continue spreading the message for awareness and involvement on campus. For instance, shortly after watching The Dark Side of Chocolate, I went to Cookout for a late-night snack. I normally get a chocolate milkshake, but before ordering, I asked the employee what kind of chocolate they used in their milkshakes. He said that they used Hershey’s, which was not mentioned in the film. In the end, I did not order a milkshake that night, but I explained to the employee my rationale for asking and told him about the film. We had a great deliberative dialogue on the issue while standing in line at Cookout. While this is a highly personal anecdote and not a research-based experience, this is a similar effect to what I am trying to achieve with an academically rigorous, data-based project.
SUSTAINABILITY DEFINED

How are everyday American’s understanding the concept of sustainability? How are you, the reader, defining sustainability? What is the definition? How is sustainability being implemented in policy? And how is this policy being perceived? Drawing from Kuhlman’s and Farrington’s (2010) review on “What is Sustainability” and the Brundtland Report of 1987, sustainability and sustainable development is defined by the UN World Commission on Environment and Development/Brundtland Report as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet their own needs” (World Commission on Environment and Development, Chapter 2). Kuhlman and Farrington (2010) argue that this can be simplified into two main concerns: development and the environment, or in different terms, needs/short-term versus resources/long-term. Issues of sustainability will always address a battle of welfare versus resource conservation. However, since this definition was conceived, sustainability has been further defined as having three dimensions (social, economic and environment) which must be in harmony with each other instead of recognizing these two main concerns (Kuhlman and Farrington, 3436). This three-part notion of sustainability originates “from the Triple Bottom Line concept, coined by [businessman] Elkington” (Kuhlman and Farrington, 3438). Therefore, this suggests that this view is more profit-oriented (as is the goal of business strategy) when “government [policy] is not supposed to be a profit-making venture” (Kuhlman and Farrington, 3438).

Equating those two main concerns into these three dimensions does not necessarily improve our understanding of sustainability, but rather obscures the original conceptualization of the term. Kuhlman and Farrington argue that what made “the
original Brundtland concept [strong and relevant] was precisely that it posed the question of how to reconcile one goal ‘development’ with another ‘sustainability’” (Kuhlman and Farrington, 3439). Therefore, I agree with Kuhlman’s and Farrington’s conclusion that these various dimensions should be condensed down into two main concerns: well-being (this encompassing the social and economic dimensions) and sustainability (this encompassing the environmental dimension). Not only is this “more precise…[but it is] more comprehensive than the way the concept of sustainability is commonly used at present” (Kuhlman and Farrington, 3445). Overall, I believe that readers of this thesis must understand that beneath the arguments, policy, and tension is that the ultimate “point of sustainability appraisal must be that a balance is sought between the requirements of stewardship on one hand and the desire for a better life on the other” (Kuhlman and Farrington, 3445). These definitions need to move off of the page of the textbook and into our learning communities, where sparking conservation and spreading awareness about sustainability to encourage involvement and participation in students is paramount to potential change.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

I am studying the possible effects of screening sustainability-related films on a viewer’s understanding and willingness to participate in sustainable practices. I want to determine if there is a correlation between viewing sustainability-themed films and becoming more sustainably-conscious post-viewing. In order to examine this, I created a sustainability-themed public film series on Western Kentucky University’s campus for the Fall 2018 semester called the Gender Images & Sustainability Fall Film Series. This
film series included five films that I selected for viewing, that represent varying levels of sustainable messaging each from a different film genre. The level of sustainable messaging within the films range from subtle to overt, and the film genres were documentary, a large-budget major motion picture, two small independent films, and an animated feature.

My research participants were primarily college aged students from Western Kentucky University, as the screenings were organized as public on-campus screenings, and open to all students, faculty and community members. My primary data collection instrument was a pre- and post-film screening survey that I asked participants to complete. The same surveys were used each film screening, and were designed to elicit information about general demographics, and level of sustainable awareness and practices. A second source of data came from a question and answer session with audience members after each screening. During this time, I asked questions pertaining to the film and recorded fieldnotes from the audience answers to be utilized in my analysis as contextual information to the survey data.

My overarching hypothesis is that my research study will demonstrate that there is a correlation between viewing sustainably-themed films and becoming more sustainably-conscious. I believe that films with sustainable messaging have the power to motivate and change an individual to become more sustainably conscious and action-oriented post-screening.
LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, I explain the relevant literature and scholarship that I have drawn on for this research project. In the first section on sustainability literature, I draw on current sustainability practices on college campuses, pre-determined factors that influence positive sustainable behavior, and the role of mass consumption in sustainability. For the second section about mass media exposure and effects, I draw upon mass media reception studies, the effect that mass media exposure has on behavior relating to violence, sexual promiscuity and smoking, and how to utilize mass media to specifically increase sustainable behavior. I understand the importance of using precedent scholarship and studies to help form the nature of this project. In fact, I could not have made my surveys without creating a literature review first and understanding what to ask my viewers based upon previous application. However, it was difficult to find sources that had the same or a similar purpose as mine. I did not understand some of the statistical data in some of the studies, and a lot of the studies did not prove their hypothesis, so I was discouraged that this project would not amount to anything.

SUSTAINABILITY LITERATURE

Students’ Responses to Improve Environmental Sustainability Through Recycling: Quantitatively Improving Qualitative Mode (Ahmad et al., 2016).

This study is relevant to my research because it helps me to understand the various factors of what it takes “to encourage people to engage in positive recycling behavior,” or rather positive sustainable behavior as a whole (Ahman et al., 254). This study focuses on identifying the factors associated with positive sustainable behavior like
recycling. Using a survey that utilized the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) and The Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA), the authors tested 230 college students in Pakistan about their current recycling behaviors and their attitudes/beliefs towards recycling. The Theory of Reasoned Action from Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) infers that it is the intention of any individual that majorly determines whether to act or not act in a certain manner. This proximate determinant is in turn subject to an individual’s inclination to assess the favorable or unfavorable consequence of that behavior along with the pressure of social norms that the individual faces while performing a certain behavior (p 255).

The Theory of Planned Behavior extends “the TRA by establishing perceived behavioral control as the third variable, which determines an individual’s awareness of their ability and ability to consider the implication of their actions (based on rational inference) to perform the particular behavior” (Ahman et al., 255). The conclusion was that students’ attitudes towards recycling was largely affected by the “moral values and general norms of their own society” (Ahman et al., 253). How students choose to interact with recycling comes from their prior awareness of the environment, past experiences, their own personal knowledge and overall about of time they can commit to recycling.

**Classroom as Cinema: Using Film to Teach Sustainability (Clemens and Hamakawak, 2010).**

This study is entirely relevant to the nature of my project because the concept of using film to teach sustainability in the classroom is essentially what my project is based-upon. Utilizing the effect that Hollywood and films have on students to introduce sustainability topics and spark discussion is proved to be effective since students are more willing to embrace film as an educational tool. There are three blockades to the
success of utilizing film as a teacher is: 1) “instructors need to identify the relevant learning objectives that correspond to the specific film” 2) instructors need to select appropriate video material that will correspond with the learning objectives” and 3) “instructors need to manage logistics” by planning the course preparation in advanced to be able to collect the relevant films (Clemens and Hamakawa, 561).

While this proves to be an effective method for teaching, it comes with obstacles. For my project, these obstacles included identifying the learning objectives that I wanted the viewers to takeaway from each film, selecting the correct films to inspire what I intended for the viewers, and planning out the film series presentation and surveys to ensure my intended effect. I found selecting the films to be the most difficult aspect of designing this research project because there are so many films to choose from. I ended up selecting relevant films that I had familiarity with, and relied on the advice of the film department faculty more so than evidence-based research for each film.

**Building Sustainable Societies: Exploring Sustainability Policy and Practice in the Age of High Consumption (Isenhour, 2010).**

This is relevant to my research because it provides examination into why people are less likely to participate in sustainability activities despite being concerned about them, which is what spawned my idea of using mass media to jumpstart the initiative. This dissertation focuses on “how humans in wealthy, post-industrial urban contexts understand sustainability and respond to their concerns given their sphere of influence,” specifically examining sustainable consumption policy/practice in Sweden (Isenhour, Abstract. The author determines that the Swedish are relatively strong in their response to sustainability practices and activities, and their strength is driven by “social, economic
and ecological issues,’’ as well as rooted deep into their equality history (Isenhour, Abstract). However, Isenhour’s research also suggests that citizens are possibly losing their strength towards sustainability as they continue to become consumers in the free market and do not feel the need to act unless personally threatened. She concludes that sustainability policy must begin to break down structural barriers that hold people back from actually wanting to participate with sustainability.

**How Green is Your Campus? An Analysis of the Factors That Drive Universities to Embrace Sustainability (Stafford, 2011).**

This study “examines the factors that influence the adoption of sustainable practices by institutions of higher education (IHEs) in the United States” (Stafford, 337). This was relevant to my research project because I needed to understand 1) demographic data from their study 2) the attitudes of students and faculty in these IHEs in order to determine the possibility of research participants for my project. The results suggest that the size of the institution and individual wealth were high contributing factors to adopting sustainable practices. The faculty, alumni and the community all played equally important role as a student does when factoring all of this in. Furthermore, based off of these results, this suggests that WKU might not be as well suited for sustainability and green initiatives as it is a public institution of only 20,000 people and has recently suffered budget cuts significantly decreasing the budget in my opinion.

**What is Sustainability? (Kuhlman and Farrington, 2010).**

This paper is relevant to my research because it provides varying definitions of sustainability, and whether or not the current definition is more focused on short-term welfare for all versus long-term sustainability. Based on the Bruntland Report of 1987,
Sustainability means “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (Kuhlman and Farrington, 3438). It encompasses three dimensions: social, economic and environmental, and focuses on providing for the present needs of humans or rather well-being. The authors suggest that this “(a) obscures the real contradiction between the aims of welfare for all and environmental conservation, (b) risks diminishing the importance of the environmental dimension; and (c) separates social from economic aspects, which in reality are one and the same” (Kuhlman and Farrington, 3436). They suggest returning to the original definition of sustainability that focuses on the well-being for future generations by working to conserve irreplaceable natural resource. I agree with the authors conclusion that there needs to be a balance between both definitions and long-term sustainability/short-term welfare.

MASS MEDIA EFFECTS LITERATURE

Female Youths’ Perceptions of Smoking in Popular Films (Jetté, Wilson and Sparks, 2007).

This study is informative about the power of mass media and film effect on adolescents. In particular, it is examining how female Canadian teenagers were affected by viewing smoking in films and if this reinforced positive smoking-related attitudes and behaviors. The authors conducted interviews with twenty smokers to see what influenced them, and the role that films with smoking scenes had in their decision-making. While the findings suggest that participants do not overtly think that smoking scenes in films directly impacted their decision to begin smoking, there are suggestions that these scenes
indirectly influenced them to start smoking and/or continue smoking. In fact, some even went onto say that seeing someone smoke in a film caused the participate to “crave a cigarette when they see an actor smoke” (Jetté, Wilson and Sparks, 330). For the non-smoker group, the general conclusion is that they noted the smoking habit or materials in the film, but it did not take away from their viewing attention or the appeal of the film. In fact, they viewed smoking as a character-building device within the film. This is relevant to my research in that it shows how powerful media exposure is to adolescents and youth. While I am studying college students, the average person is not fully matured until they reach twenty-five years of age, so my average audience member is still growing at this point since the demographic data indicated that the average participant was 19.3 years old.

**New Ways to Promote Proenvironmental Behavior: Promoting Sustainable Behavior: An Introduction to Community-Based Social Marketing (McKenzie-Mohr, 2000).**

This is relevant to my study because I am essentially taking relevant sustainability literature to design a sustainability program (e.g. a public film series) that will possibly inspire improved sustainability awareness and behavior. This article focuses on encouraging the incorporation of psychological knowledge and literature on sustainability into the planning of sustainability programs by non-psychologist program planners. The author demonstrates that there is a lack of change to sustainable behavior in programs that only provide sustainable knowledge. Therefore, the McKenzie-Mohr encourages utilizing community-based social marketing as a means to collect the sustainable literature available and utilize it to design a program to put it to action. The four steps of community based social marketing include: “uncovering barriers to behaviors and
then…selecting which behavior to promote; designing a program to overcome the barriers to the selected behavior; piloting the program; and then evaluating it once it is broadly implemented” (McKenzie-Mohr, 546). The author has found success with this method in cases of improving water efficiency.

**Sustainable Marketing and Social Media: A Cross-country Analysis of Motives for Sustainable Behavior (Minton et al., 2012).**

This is relevant to my research project because it is examining another subgenre of mass media (social media) to determine how best to advertise and eventual motivate consumers to practice sustainable behavior. I am essentially researching something very similar, but interchanging social media for film. In order to deliver impactful sustainable advertising, this study examines the motives for sustainable behaviors utilizing social media applications like Facebook and Twitter. As green marketing is growing, it is necessary to understand “the influencers of attitude development…for designing effective advertisement” (Minton, et al., 70-71). This study examined three different countries: Germany, South Korea and the United States, and hypothesized their varying level of involvement motives. The sustainability motives lead to recycling behaviors and green transportation use for all three of the countries, while the USA and Germany also lead to antimatieralistic views and organic food purchase. The concluding factor was that motives are more complex to fully understand for advertisers. Social Media is the best outlet to deliver green advertisements though.
Exposure of US Adolescents to Extremely Violent Movies (Worth et al., 2008).

Similar to the data on the effects of film on adolescent smoking habits, this study measures the effects of mass media exposure in violent movies on viewers to determine if this increases the likelihood of violent behaviors in those same viewers. This was one of the main precedents for the basis of this research project and what sparked the idea for the film series. This study gave me the idea to utilize five different films versus the original idea of three films and basing the selection of those five films off of various factors like box office statistics, budget, and genre. While this study did not necessarily test for the effects of the exposure of violent films on the viewer, it did raise important questions about the current movie rating system and the role of the parent in allowing their child to be subjected to these violent films through things like placing a television in the child’s room without adult supervision at all times (Worth et al. 2008).

Effects of Prolonged Exposure to Gratuitous Media Violence on Provoked and Unprovoked Hostile Behavior 1 (Zillman and Weaver, 1999).

This study gave hope to my research project because having an impact is possible through exposure of films. Similar to the data on the effects of film on adolescent smoking habits, this study also measures the effects of mass media exposure in violent movies on viewers to determine if this increases the likelihood of violent behaviors in those same viewers. This study focuses more directly on the relationship between media violence and aggression. In the study, participants were exposed to violent or nonviolent intact feature films for 4 consecutive days. One day following the exposure of the last film, the participants were then tested on emotion recognition unrelated to the film content. During the test, they were abusively treated by a research assistant, and then
directly put into a position to harm this research assistant. The results found that “both provocation and exposure to violent films fostered markedly increased hostile behavior” (Zillman and Weaver, 145), therefore proving the effects of watching films with overt content messaging such as violence. More importantly, this showed that this exposure can instigate violent behavior in unprovoked men and women, which is alarming.

In conclusion, this relevant scholarship assisted in guiding my methodological approach and data analysis to reflect the past precedents of both sustainability awareness and mass media effects. Despite this portion of the project being difficult, I now have better research exploration skills and am better at navigating databases to explore relevant literature. In the next section, I will address the methodology and the procedures that took place for the study. My methodology is heavily influenced by the preceding scholarship, especially when selecting the films, creating my pre- and post-surveys, and conducting my statistical data analysis. I specifically borrowed from Worth et al. 2008 the idea to use various films of various genres to inform my viewers understanding and awareness of sustainability. McKenzie-Mohr 2000 laid out the design of a pro-environmental behavior program that I utilized when promoting the film series itself. Finally, Ahmad et al. 2016 gave me the basis of my survey questions based upon their research into the various factors that encourage positive environmental participation, like “moral values” and “higher education backgrounds.”
METHODOLOGY

In this section of my paper, I will be describing the process of creating and conducting the research study design for this project, from its initial conception to the present. This begins with the planning and selection of the films for my semester-long film series that served as the tests for my research study. It also includes the creation of the pre- and post-surveys that the controls in my research study. Finally, I will detail the recruitment process for finding research participants, and how I conducted my presentation at each film series screening.

THE INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD PROCESS

In the summer of 2018, I drafted my research proposal for the Honors College and reached out to potential faculty to be my readers on this endeavor. Initially, I sought out Christian Ryan, my college mentor and the former head of the Office of Sustainability, to be my primary reader for my Capstone/Thesis project. However, she was leaving Western Kentucky University after obtaining another job opportunity in Nashville, TN. This revelation was a bit shocking considering she worked with me to create the idea for this project, as well as served as my main advisor throughout my collegiate sustainability journey. However, before parting, she recommended reaching out to Dr. Stinnett in the Folk Studies and Anthropology department to be my primary thesis reader, and she agreed with my decision to approach Dr. Hovet as my secondary thesis reader. Dr. Stinnett’s background in visual anthropology, ethnography, and community-based participatory research appealed to the nature of my thesis. Dr. Hovet’s background in cinema studies and his teaching philosophy of student engagement through “exhibitions”
beyond the classroom equally appealed to the nature of my thesis. Both agreed to be my readers, and I successfully turned in my research proposal and it was approved by the Honors College.

The next step consisted of meeting with both Dr. Stinnett and Dr. Hovet to determine the plan for the semester, and more importantly this school year-long process. With Dr. Stinnett, we began the process of applying for Internal Review Board and Human Subjects Research (IRB) approval and completing my Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI). In order to work with human participants, I had to have CITI certification to ensure that I adhered to the ethical principles as a principle investigator of a research project that incorporated human research participants.

After I received my CITI certificate (2018), the next step was to write a Human Subjects research proposal that is evaluated by WKU’s IRB board. This was an in-depth application process that required a thorough explanation of my research plan, including my data collection protocol, recruitment strategy, and consenting procedure in order to ensure that my work with human research participants conformed with the ethical and legal guidelines set out by WKU’s IRB board. As a Broadcasting major with a concentration in video production and producing, this type of research process does not necessarily come easy to me. I observe people through the lens of a camera, not through a planned, precise test with months and months of prep work and foreign terminology. However, with the help of Dr. Stinnett, I crafted an application that was approved by the IRB and was able to begin my project.

Upon meeting with Dr. Hovet, he suggested that I might consider making this into some sort of campus-wide film series instead of the small group lab viewings. This could
increase the number of research participants and expand the audience demographic if it was open to campus. We determined that this would increase the number of participants, provide equitability in the type of screening (which means comparable data), and ultimately be better for my schedule as principle investigator. Not to mention, this decision to create a film series as the test for my research study was equally fueled by the partnerships across campus that it would create. For this project I partnered with the Gender Women Studies minor, the Film Department, the Office of Sustainability, the Student Government Association, and even an Italian film production company called MyBossWas. More on all of these partnerships to come. The film series is the best way to get more people and requires somewhat easy promotion. I also have a minor in event planning, so this strategy allowed for me to add something to my resume, build on my skills, increase my research participates and do what I love was impossible to pass up.

PLANNING THE FILM SERIES

As a student with a likely career in television producing, there is one thing that I know that I am good at, and it’s planning (especially event planning). This is the third passion that I have in my life, one that I share along with mass media and sustainability.

I worked very closely with Dr. Hovet and the building coordinator for Cherry Hall to determine dates, times and the location for the film series. Each screening took place approximately within one to two weeks of each other and were held in the late afternoon and evening. Apart from one screening that was held in the Jody Richards Auditorium, all screenings were held in the Cherry Hall 125 Auditorium. We wanted to design the series to feel as sequential and connected as possible so that it would inspire participants to
attend more/all of the screenings, and allow for the possibility of a progressional effect on repeat participants as the series went on. What helped the most in creating this feeling were the partnerships that I created along the way to make this series possible, specifically my partnership with the Gender and Women's Studies Department. Dr. Dawn Hall, another faculty of the WKU Film Department and a mentor in this process, worked with Dr. Hovet and me on the selection of the films. During this process when we were starting to discuss the potential for a fall film series, she mentioned that the Gender and Women's Studies Department (GWS) holds a fall film series every year and that this might be opportunity to merge the two since sustainability and GWS share many of the same ideals. Upon further talking and her connecting me to the head of the department (Dr. Kristi Braham), my film series gained its first partner/sponsor and official title. It would be deemed the 2018 “Gender Images & Sustainability Fall Film Series.” Now, it was time to get everything into motion.

SELECTING THE FILMS

The selection of films chosen for this study was definitely one of the most challenging aspects of this process. I feared that I was not going to choose the right films and therefore, not get comparable results. When I say the “right” films, I am meaning films that will generate meaningful data and have a large enough impact on the viewers to inspire a change in sustainability consciousness from pre- to post-survey. In my mind, a “right” film has a storyline interwoven with sustainability themes but does not obviously present them. It was filmed with the intent to inspire sustainability, but that was not the sole intention like some environmental films are (e.g. The Inconvient Truth).
The nature of this research study is to explore any possible correlation between sustainability messaging in a film and post-viewing sustainability awareness. The “right” film would generate results that correspond to this intended purpose. Fortunately, with the aid of Dr. Hovet and Dr. Hall, I made my final selection of five films for this study. Originally, the idea was to choose five films based upon a gradient set of zero sustainable messaging, subtle sustainable messaging, and overt sustainable messaging (similar to a Likert scale).

Upon further thought, Dr. Hovet and I discussed that this would be too difficult to assess, and so we instead focused more on a few specific film characteristics for consistency. The main characteristics were genre (we wanted a range of genres), budget (studio versus independent; high versus ultra-low), and the intent of the director when creating the film. Some of the films were more overt with the sustainable messaging than others, but none of the films lacked a level of sustainable messaging. A film with a zero level of sustainability would only serve as another control in the research study when the pre- and post-surveys already serve as the necessary control. Furthermore, I wanted a series of films that shared a common sustainability message. This common sustainability message was human consumption of the Earth’s natural resources and man-made offerings. In my opinion, the human race’s fatal flaw is how inconsiderate we are of the Earth. We continue to take, take, and take without necessarily ever giving back. Though this can be attributed to our highly advanced way of being in comparison to all of Earth’s life forms, we have absolutely taken a toll on the Earth with our continuous and excessive consumption. Therefore, I wanted films that explored how human beings consume the Earth in a variety of ways with a variety of awareness of the consequences. These choices
yielded these five films as the final selection for the film series, and they were screened in following chronological order:

1) *Leave No Trace* (2018):

![Figure 2: Movie Poster for *Leave No Trace*](image)

**Screening Date:** October 17th, 2018  
**Rating:** PG  
**Director:** Debra Granik  
**Budget:** Unlisted  
**Genre:** Drama / Contemporary Fiction
Plot Summary:

Will and his teenage daughter, Tom, have lived off the grid for years in the forests of Portland, Oregon. When their idyllic life is shattered, both are put into social services. After clashing with their new surroundings, Will and Tom set off on a harrowing journey back to their wild homeland. ("Leave No Trace (2018) – Financial Information," 2018).

Rationale:

At the time of the screening, Leave No Trace was fairly new on the independent film scene. It was highly recommended by Dr. Hovet after its success at the 2018 Sundance Film Festival. This is an independent film directed by Debra Granik, an indie director and screenwriter well-known for her Academy award-nominated film Winter’s Bone starring Jennifer Lawrence in her breakout role. It was limitedly released by small American distribution company, Bleecker Street, in June 2018. While the approximate budget for this film is unlisted, one can surmise that it was most likely the average low-budget independent film ranging from around $2-$10 million dollars (Bernstein, 2015). In the box office, it garnered more $7.6 million dollars and has an 100% Rotten Tomatoes approval rating.

I would rank this film as a subtle example of sustainable messaging in film. This seems fitting considering that Granik’s previous films range between $500,000 to $2 million-dollar budgets. Additionally, this film is set apart from the other independent film in the series due to the relatively unknown cast. While Ben Foster (playing the role of the father Will in this) has been on the acting scene for a long time now, it is Thomasin McUpon’s breakout role as the daughter Tom that truly sets this film apart as an independent model with sustainable messaging. One of the main themes of Leave No
*Trace* focuses on living without unnecessary material things in your life. Will and Tom live off the grid in a national park without the standard living conditions of a house, healthcare or technology. While this theme is interwoven with the larger themes of post wartime PSTD and family, the somewhat positive message associated with living without all of the material wealth and items shows through the close connection that Will and Tom share. Their relationship is not clouded or buried beneath material possessions; they are each other’s greatest possession, which inspires a sympathy from the audience to understand their desire to live off the grid. Additionally, this film serves as a good starting point because it fulfills the low-level of sustainably messaging desired, yet it is a good starting point to introduce potential viewers to the film series.

2) *Avatar (2009):*

![Figure 3: Movie Poster for Avatar](image)
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Screening Date: October 30th, 2018
Rating: PG-13
Director: James Cameron
Budget: Reportedly $237,000,000 (“Avatar [2009],” 2009).
Genre: Action / Science Fiction

Plot Summary:

Jake Sully is a wounded ex-marine, thrust into an effort to settle and exploit Pandora, an exotic moon rich in bio-diversity and inhabited by the Na’vi, a ten-foot-tall humanoid species. After Neytiri, a female Na’vi, rescues Jakes after he becomes separated from his team, he learns more about the planet and eventually crosses over to lead the indigenous race in a battle for survival. ("Avatar [2009] - Financial Information", 2009).

Rationale:

When I started researching for the five films, Avatar was an obvious choice. Avatar has made the biggest strides when it comes to creating a sustainability-themed film with great international success and audience reach. Not only is it the highest grossing film of all time worldwide (“All Time Box Office,” 2019), but it utilizes brand-new motion capture filming technologies and techniques (Johnson, 2009) and it picked up three academy awards out of the nine it was nominated for in 2009 (Box Office Mojo). It has one of the largest film budgets ever. It was distributed by 20th Century Fox, which has since been acquired by Walt Disney Studios, making it and its planned sequels a studio motion picture movie franchise. It was helmed by an A-list director and creator, James Cameron, with well-known celebrities like Sigourney Weaver, Zoe Saldana, Sam Worthington and Michael Rodriguez starring. Avatar is definitely one of the most recognizable sustainability-themed films ever done.
Due to this, I would rank *Avatar* as overt messaging. There is not necessarily any subtly to the message that James Cameron is trying to convey: what is price of achieving wealth and power if it comes at the cost of destroying life? It is the age-old power struggle between man and nature. The Earthly humans come to Pandora under the guise of assimilation and extraterrestrial immersion to harvest the resources of the planet for their own greed and well-being. This is at the expense of the Na’vi species that already inhabits this planet and these resources. This film uses metaphorical messaging of the human race on Earth destroying the environment and the homes of many life forms for the sake of human progress. When it is the home of animals and plants like the rainforest, I feel that it is easier for humans to pass that off as being acceptable since plants and animals are considered societally to be for human use. However, when it is another human-like species inhabiting the environment that humans want, as in *Avatar*, this leads to all out warefare (another shared thread between the humans in *Avatar* and the humans on Earth).

Furthermore, the character progression of Jake Sully echoes one of the themes of this film, which is choosing to value life rather than giving into your own self-gain and greed. While Jake Sully was not necessarily on this mission for greed, he definitely was there for self-gain. As a paraplegic, Jake regains the ability to walk when transformed into the Avatar host. Once entangled with Neytiri and the Na’vi people, Jake is initiated into the Na’vi society and learns the important connection that the Na’vi people have with Pandora. His understanding and love for nature, these people and life outweighs his selfish human gains, which ultimately makes him the Na’vi leader to stand against the human forces. One scene that is particularly poignant with sustainably messaging is
towards the end of the film, on the eve of battle when Jake prays to the Pandoran mother
goddess, Eywa, for help in this battle. He turns to nature and the planet for help,
completing forsaking the human species in this moment.

Therefore, the narrative and intended purpose of Cameron combined with the major
motion picture techniques and aspects of this film made it necessary to be involved in this
series. I had wanted to see the effects of a film with more overt messaging about
sustainability would play out in my study, especially with it following the lower-level
messaging of Leave No Trace.

3) Night Moves (2013):

Figure 4: Movie Poster for Night Moves
**Screening Date:** November 5th, 2018  
**Rating:** R  
**Director:** Kelly Reichardt  
**Budget:** Unlisted  
**Genre:** Thriller/Suspense / Contemporary Fiction

**Plot Summary:**

Three radical activists plot to blow up Oregon’s Green Peter Dam in an act of environmental sabotage. As their plan marches towards fruition, they soon discover that small steps have enormous consequences. (“Night Moves (2014) - Financial Information, 2019).

**Rationale:**

*Night Moves* was another film recommended to me by Dr. Hovet and Dr. Hall of the film department, more specifically Dr. Hall in this case. While it is a low-budget independent film like *Leave No Trace*, this film centers on the extreme side of environmental activism. In terms of the overt degree of attention to environmental issues, *Night Moves* surpasses *Avatar* through the eco-terroristic plan of the three main characters, especially considering this film is not a metaphor like *Avatar* since it is set in our actual world. Furthermore, this film raises the question of, “What more can we do,” considering both the main characters already practice highly sustainable lifestyles like living and working on a farm, yet perform a very extreme action. I would rank this film as an overt example of sustainable messagining in film.

The director, Kelly Reichardt, is known for her mimimalist film style allowing the audience to have time to contemplate the film while viewing. Additionally, she is known for her feminist approach to filmmaking, whether this means having female-driven films...
or giving men more feminist characteristics that challenge mainstream gender roles. In *Night Moves*, there are strong eco-feminist themes that unfortunately are smothered as the film goes on. Dakota Fanning’s character is very capable and independent at first. Her stand-off with the manager at the fertilizer plant showcases her willingness to perform this task without relying on a man to help her. Unfortunately, and fortunately, after seeing the negative effects of blowing up the dam, she immediately begins to feel guilty and wants to go to the authorities. While this could possibly be viewed as her being weak and reverting back to her “feminine emotions,” her reaction is a valuable lesson in that sometimes our extreme efforts do not garner the wanted results. Furthermore, her “feminine emotion,” and wanting to tell the authorities, ultimately gets her killed by Jesse Eisenberg’s character. This sub-genre of feminism is the marriage between feminism and sustainability that has long been overlooked. Just like the Earth, women have been oppressed for hundreds of thousands of years, yet women are also the more likely of the two genders “to rate the environment a high priority” (Cromwell, 2016). Therefore, this film is not only a basic sustainably-themed film, but it also incorporates important topics that factor into sustainability like feminism and terrorism.
4) *Princess Mononoke* (1999)

Figure 5: Movie Poster for *Princess Mononoke*

- **Screening Date:** November 12th, 2018
- **Rating:** PG-13
- **Director:** Hayao Miyazaki
- **Budget:** $20,000,000
- **Genre:** Action / Fantasy / Animation
Plot Summary:

The Emishi people are under attack from a demon boar god. Its prince, Ashitaka, is compelled to save his home. Though he succeeds, a deadly curse is implanted upon him. Knowing his fate, he leaves his village on a journey for answers. He comes upon Irontown where the ambitious Lady Eboshi resides. His life is entwined with a mysterious girl named San and, eventually, the battle between nature and civilization will unfold. (“Mononoke-hime (1999) - Financial Information,” 2019).

Rationale:

When selecting these films, I knew that I also wanted to include an animated feature in the selection. This led me to Princess Mononoke, an age-old tale of man versus nature. Audience members see the spirituality and connectedness underlying living sustainably. This film suggests that humans on Earth fight just the same as Lady Eboshi and the people of Irontown to survive. Earth is an equally monstrous, yet a beautiful beast (The Shishigami, giver of life and death) that threatens to wipe out the fruits of humanity when provoked enough. This film certainly emphasizes the idea of opposing forces (man versus nature) coming together for the greater good, which is always a lesson to be learned post warefare and casualties. I consider Princess Mononoke one of these most powerful and inspiring films of the film series.

Princess Mononoke stands apart from the other films because it is an animated feature. The epic nature of this film and how it depicts nature is unparalleled and impossible for a live action feature to match. The fantasy storytelling combined with the reality of deforestation and humanity’s gluttonous resource consumption is captivating. As a viewer, this film captures the spiritualism of nature and creates god figures in
nature, like the Great Forest Spirit. Glorifying nature in this way makes the scene where the Great Forest Spirit is killed by Lady Eboshi so much more devastating. In the world of *Princess Mononoke*, murdering a forest god appears equal in gravity to murdering a president or royal figure in our world. Killing the Great Forest Spirit not only devastates nature and turns the remaining forest gods’ evil, but it also devastating to see nature ruined due to selfish humanity. Therefore, the lengths that people go to in this film to restore the balance and bring the Great Forest Spirit back to life is a call to arms for viewers. It is a commentary showcasing that our wreckless actions and overuse of natural resources is disrupting the balance of Earth just like Lady Eboshi and the people of Irontown. However, unlike Lady Eboshi and the people of Irontown, humanity on Earth is not going to great lengths to restore the balance. In fact, it seems like humanity continues on in this careless pursuit to use all-natural resources to further our wants and desires. I would rank this film as the perfect medium between subtle and overt sustainable messaging in film.
5) *Beautiful Things* (2017)

**Figure 6: Movie Poster for Beautiful Things**

**Screening Date:** November 28th, 2018  
**Rating:** Not Yet Rated  
**Director:** Giorgio Ferrero  
**Budget:** Unlisted  
**Genre:** Drama / Documentary
Plot Summary:

“Beautiful Things is a journey into our obsessive consumption. The many objects that we accumulate, and we believe to be essential begin their production journey in silent secluded industrial and scientific sites. The film describes the hidden mechanical liturgy within four different remote locations where borderline men work in complete isolation without any interference from the outside world. These men trigger, unconsciously, the long chain of creation, transport, commercialization and destruction of the objects feeding our modern lifestyle. They are monks inside temples of steel and concrete. They repeat the same liturgy every day. And we don’t even know that they exist.” (“Beautiful Things,” 2018).

Rationale:

This film was another recommendation from Dr. Hovet and Dr. Hall, which they saw at the Edinburgh Film Festival in the summer of 2018. Beautiful Things is the only documentary film of the series. It highlights the lives of four real-life men working in very isolating atmospheres and jobs that are necessary as a direct result of our excessive consumption as human beings. Using a combination of cinematic technique, sound, and theatrical production design, Beautiful Things plays similarly as a fictional narrative and as an ethnographic documentary.

I would rank this film as the another medium between subtle and overt sustainable messaging in film, but leaning towards the overt side versus subtle. While clearly promoted as a film exposing the negative effects of obsessive mass consumption on Earth, the use of narrative storytelling through “The Couple” makes Beautiful Things a hybrid documentary. “The Couple” storyline refers to a sub-plotline juxtaposing each of
the four men’s stories to a storyline centered on a seemingly married couple and their high use of mass products and resources in their life. This is showcased at their home, at a birthday party, and in the mall. Without this sub-plotline, this film would not carry the same weight that it currently does. The story of each man is harrowing and inspires sympathy for the men and/or disgust for our abuse of the world, but “The Couple” drives home the impact. This is why the film ends on them dancing inside of the empty and haunting mall. These men are isolated instances that the audience can sympathize with and understand, but the audience will most likely never know what it truly is like to be any of these men. Therefore by watching only the four mens’ stories, viewers might continue on with their life and resource usage, only being immediately effected by the film and not in the long-term. This is what makes “The Couple” essential to the impact of this film. Most everyone has had a birthday party, shopped at a mall, or live in a home filled with their dearest material possessions. “The Couple” is the audience, and watching them frivolously dance around despite knowing the immense desctruction that their dance/our dance of mass consumption has on these four men and the Earth is a sickening, yet completely effective.

Arranging Beautiful Things to be screened on WKU’s campus as a part of my film series was somewhat challenging. This film was unreleased at this time, only touring the festival circuits. Therefore, how was I to obtain this unrated Italian documentary film for my screening? Once Dr. Hovet instructed me on how to obtain the contact of the production company, it was actually fairly easy to email them. I was nervous and prepared to either received a simple “no” or no response at all. To my surprise, I received an email from a representative of the film’s distribution company, Filmotor, and the
director of the film, Giorgio Ferraro. Both were delighted by my request and the prospect of their film being used for this project’s purpose.

I was shocked to say the least, but very excited. To be honest, the willing participation of these two individuals made me feel confident in this project for one of the first times. They believed in the project enough to give me a generous discount on screening fee for the film, as well as a discount on the library license for acquiring a copy of the film for the Visual & Performing Arts Library to be open for use by students, faculty and staff. The latter was their idea. As stunned as I was at all of this, I was as equally determined to make this happen. In order to acquire the funds, I applied for a grant through the Honors College, got additional funding from the SGA Sustainability Committee, and coordinated with SGA, the Herald and other campus organizations to essentially “hype up” campus for this screening. It was a very exciting and rewarding experience. Not to mention, Giorgio and Michaela are looking forward to reading my thesis and seeing the potential results.

CREATING THE SURVEY

The pre- and post-survey instrument is the same for each of the five screenings. The pre-screening survey and the post-screening survey differ slightly, with questions parallel with the screening activity (see the Appendix Section for the surveys). The topics that I addressed in the surveys were 1) audience demographics, 2) daily interaction with sustainability, 3) sustainability on campus, and 4) the effects of the film on the viewer. Most importantly, I wanted to ensure that the questions I was asking on the pre-survey translated well to the post-survey in order to determine if there was a change made in
answer by the participant post-screening. This required adding phrasing to each of the pre-survey questions that qualified it as a post-screening question. For example, Pre-Screening Survey Question #2: “I understand what the term ‘sustainability’ means,” was rephrased as Post-Screening Survey Question #1: “I feel that the meaning of the term ‘sustainability’ has changed for me post-screening,” in order to test for any sort of effect from pre- to post- answers from a participant (see figures 7 and 8 below).

![Figure 7: PreSQ2: What is Sustainability](image)

![Figure 8: PostSQ1: What is Sustainability Post-Screening](image)

Additionally, all demographic questions were placed only on the Pre-Survey at the beginning as it is not necessary to collect the same information twice from the same participant. In addition to the demographic questions such as age (1A), gender (1A), ethnic identity (1B) and university level (1F), I also included questions about transportation (1E) and home location (1C, 1D and 1H) questions to see if there was a trend between popular home areas and similar answers on the survey. Additionally, I was interested in exploring if participants were more likely to commute via walking or biking answered in favor of sustainability throughout the survey. I chose to ask what majors or
minors a person was studying (IG) to see the range of scholarship. Asking about the type of area that the participant was from and their household income provided information about practicing sustainability and a particular demographic. Lastly, in order to create these surveys, I consulted three other surveys for question phrasing, format and content.

The first survey is AASHE’s Campus Sustainability Survey Questions (Document 3 in the Appendix Section). AASHE is the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education and they work with universities across the country on improving their sustainability practices on campus. This survey is a model to be utilized by universities to create their own survey that studies student perception and involvement with sustainability. I created my survey to reflect the content of this survey as it questions students not only on their knowledge of what sustainability is, but also how/if they interact with it and their views on certain aspects of it. The various sustainability efforts listed in question 1 on this survey helped to create the sustainability efforts listed in question 7 on my pre-survey and question 6 on my post-survey. The rest of the questions on this survey were either deleted or rephrased into a new question that would apply specifically to my case. I also used their answer system of Strongly Agree (A/1), Somewhat Agree (B/2), Agree (C/3), Disagree (D/4), Strongly Disagree (E/5) and Unsure (F/6) in my surveys. It is understandable, easy to code for data testing and provides thorough options to answer the question. Furthermore, this survey does an excellent job of trying to monitor a university’s commitment to sustainability through a student’s perception on the amount of activity or involvement that is offered.

The second survey that I referenced when creating my own was the WKU Sustainability Survey (Document 4 in the Appendix Section). This survey was actually
discovered on the AASHE website as well. It is one of AASHE’s examples of a good sustainability culture assessment survey on a university campus. A sustainability culture assessment “addresses sustainability-related values, behaviors or beliefs (e.g., perceptions, beliefs, dispositions, behaviors, and awareness of campus sustainability initiatives)” (“Assessing Sustainability Culture,” 2019). This survey is more in-depth than the surveys I created. It polls students on their demographics (going as personal as religious and political affiliations), personal opinions/awareness/values, campus culture and behaviors all relating to sustainability. The survey does a good job of assessing the student’s awareness level of what WKU has to offer in terms of sustainability practices and activities. This helped when I created my WKU questions. This survey is something that I would really be interested in seeing the results of because of how personal and in-depth the questions are. I incorporated this into my surveys, but with the study being focused on the correlation of thought-based change between pre- and post-screening, I did not see the need to be as focused into the sustainability culture of the student. Understanding if there was a change taking place between pre- and post-screening was more of my concern.

The third and final survey that I used when creating my own surveys was Dr. Stinnett’s “Dutch Butcher Survey.” (Readers may contact Dr. Stinnet to request a copy of the survey instrument). Dr. Stinnett gave me her survey from a research project as a model example of how to format my own surveys. My surveys are identical to the layout and formatting of the large table-like document. I utilized her method of laying out the questions and answers in my own survey, especially for the table within a table that she
did for question 6 on her survey. This is what I created my question 7 on the pre-survey and my question 6 on the post-survey to look like.

Additionally, I began my survey with an identical introductory paragraph explaining this purpose of this data and who I am as principle investigator. Also, the demographics section utilized in my pre-survey was heavily modeled after this survey, but the question content was geared toward people in the WKU community (students, faculty, staff, community members, etc.). Finally, I liked Dr. Stinnett’s use of qualitative questions integrated into the quantitative questions on the survey, so this was utilized throughout my own surveys for questions like 4 and 10 on the pre-survey and 3, 7 and 11 on the post-survey. Overall, Dr. Stinnett’s survey was the most essential of the three surveys for providing form and layout to my own surveys’ questions.

Through the creation of these surveys, I now understand the types of questions needed to track change across a time period or experience. I had to ensure that I was not priming participants with any of my questions and therefore, unduly influencing their responses. I learned that the more detailed answers given (i.e. agree, somewhat agree, strongly agree, disagree, strongly disagree, unsure, etc), the more accurately the participant can answer based upon their own feelings. Additionally, when wanting to receive qualitative feedback, I learned that you have to ask direct questions with open-ended potential. The question could not yield a simple yes or no answer. Therefore, I had to ensure that what I was asking was clear yet brief enough for the participant to understand and jot something down before moving on. Furthermore, creating these surveys has improved my communication skills. I heavily rely on my verbal communication skills to connect with people. This opportunity taught me how to improve
my written communication skills to understand what people think and do. I feel confident in my skills to create another survey if I had to. The most challenging aspect of this process was ensuring that the questions from the pre- to the post-survey aligned with one another to create a trackable correlative effect if there was one possible (see Figures 7 and 8 above for an example of a pre- and post-survey set of questions).

WORKING WITH SGA

At this point, I had been lucky enough to partner with the Gender & Women’s Studies Department to create the Gender Images & Sustainability Fall Film Series 2018, but there still were more partnerships that needed to be made in order for this film series to be successful. Primarily, this partnership was with the WKU Student Government Association (SGA) to provide funding for the screening fee of the Beautiful Things film. Michaela at MyBossWas offered me a generous deal of 350 EUR for the screener fee and 300 EUR for the year-long library license of Beautiful for VPAL; it was originally 700 EUR for the screener fee and 350 EUR for the library license.

The original invoices can be found as Documents 6 and 7 in the Appendix Section. In order to obtain the screening fee funding, I appealed to the current Student Sustainability Coordinator and together we wrote a legislation requesting $450 of the SGA Student Discretionary Funds to cover the screening fee. After presenting at SGA on the project, the bill passed, and I received the funding, as well as SGA as an official co-sponsor of the film series. The rest of the funding for the Beautiful Things library license, payment for the DVD rentals of the other films, conference registration fees and materials
(like pens and paper) came from an Honors Development Grant for $480 that I applied for.

Gaining this partnership was extremely beneficial to the project and overall success of the film series. Furthermore, it was a full-circle journey. As I explained in my introduction, I founded the SGA Sustainability Committee four years ago, so it was only fitting for the committee to be involved in the final sustainability project of my collegiate career. I consider that committee one aspect of my legacy here at WKU. Seeing it continue to grow and help students, faculty and the community realize their sustainable dreams is indescribable, especially considering it helped me with my own. A great takeaway from this experience is to never turn your back on partnerships and those who have helped you in the past/those who you have helped in the past. This applies in the professional, academic, and social world. You need support to succeed so this experience was a wonderful reminder of that.

RECRUITMENT

In order to comply with my IRB proposal, I did not provide any type of monetary incentive for people to participate in my research study. The project did however offer a benefit to participants in the form of “swipes.” “Swipes” refers to swiping a WKU student’s ID in a cardreader, which would then mark them as in attendance for this event. The incentive accompanying a swipe is usually an extra credit class opportunity that a professor predetermined (not me), or some sort of campus involvement award that WKU Student Activities predetermines (not me). For example, students enrolled in the Film 155 Film Attendance class have to attend a certain number of on-campus outstide-of-class
screenings per semester. Through work with Dr. Hovet, all of the films in my film series counted as a screening for that class. Therefore, the “swipe” would mark that student in attendance for the Film 155 professor to verify later on. Dr. Stinnett also offered extra credit incentives to her students for coming to the film series, which were tracked with a swipe.

Apart from offering swipes, there was no tangible incentive to offer participants. This made recruitment somewhat difficult as I was really just depending on the goodwill of people to show up, which meant relying on word-of-mouth marketing, and promotion primarily to get the word out about the film series. My means of doing this were through classroom visits, emailing various departments/professors/organizations, and telling everyone I knew. Fortunately, this research study was not meant to be limited to only certain participants; anyone was welcome so that helped increase the number of participants.

Additionally, I created a flyer for the film series that I posted in several common-area places on campus. This included the Downing Student Union (DSU), Cherry Hall, Jody Richards Hall, Garrett Conference Center, the Academic Complex, Minton Hall, Pearce-Ford Tower (PFT), the Environmental Sciences and Technology building (EST), the Mahurin Honors College and International Center building, and the Ivan Wilson Fine Arts Center (FAC). I chose frequented buildings, dining locations and heavy traffic bulletin boards. The flyer was meant to be eye-catching, informative and relatable. While it informed the onlooker that this was a research project, it still incorporated the film posters and a colorful film-themed background that was persuasive to those going past it (see Figure 9 below for the official flyer of the film series).
While the flyer and the word-of-mouth recruitment methods were helpful tools in recruiting potential participants, it was actually my partnership with Dr. Hall of the film department that turned out to be the most beneficial in recruiting participants. Dr. Hall teaches a FILM 201 Introduction to Cinema course, which is a required course for both Film majors and Film Studies minors. When planning out the film series, Dr. Hall recommended *Night Moves* not only for the reasons listed above in the film selection section, but also because she was showing this film as a part of the syllabus for this class. Not only would this film be shown to her section of the 201 class, but to all sections of the course. Dr. Hall offered that she would open up this screening to the public and let me use it as my third film screening in the series, meaning that over 100+ people were
guaranteed to be coming to this screening as a part of their class. Granted, students and attendees did not have to participate if they did not want to, but I had a higher chance of having a larger number of participants for this screening. Dr. Stinnett gave approval for this upon the condition that none of these students were forced to participate by Dr. Hall or myself, but only voluntarily chose to themselves. This was a condition for all of my participants, but more specifically this screening since a higher number of participants was more likely at this screening.

DATA COLLECTION

In order to prepare for the film series presentation, I created a script and PowerPoint presentation to be used at all five screenings. This would limit variation in my presentation and, ultimately, improve the statistical reliability in the participants’ answers. I wanted to ensure that I said the same thing each time with the same inflection to ensure that I was not priming any of my participants to answer a certain way or pressure them to feel a certain way post-screening. While a significant amount of practice went into ensuring this, I did not entirely succeed. This was due to a combination of nerves, unpreparedness, and interruptions by late participants. However, the presentation remained the same for each film bar the name and running time of film changing. This was displayed via projector in the auditorium for participants to read upon arrival and it clearly instructed the basic procedure for the screening. The Gender Images & Sustainability Screening Script is Document 8 in the Appendix Section.
Figure 10: Slide 1 of the Gender Images & Sustainability PowerPoint Presentation

Gender Images & Sustainability Fall Film Series

1. Obtain research packet at door
2. Introductions & Review of Research Packet
   1. Consent Form – First Page
   2. Pre-Screening Survey – Second Page
   3. Post-Screening Survey – Third Page
3. You Must Be 18 years old or older to participate in this research study
4. If you chose to participate, sign the Consent Form (first page)
5. Fill out Pre-Screening Survey (second page)
6. Introduction of Film ➔ Beautiful Things (2017), Giorgio Ferrero
7. Screen Film ➔ 1 Hour 35 Minutes
8. Any Questions?

Figure 11: Slide 2 of the Gender Images & Sustainability PowerPoint Presentation

Gender Images & Sustainability Fall Film Series

8. Conclusion of the Film
9. Fill out Post-Screening Survey (third page)
10. Post-Screening Discussion
11. After Discussion, Place Completed Research Packet at Table in the Back of Room
12. Pick Up Blank Consent Form on Table & Take Home
13. Swipe WKUID at the Back of Room if Necessary
14. Free to Leave

Figure 12: Slide 3 of the Gender Images & Sustainability PowerPoint Presentation

Gender Images & Sustainability Fall Film Series

Post-Discussion Instructions:

1. Place Completed Research Packet at Table in the Back of Room
2. Pick up Blank Consent Form on Table & Take Home
3. Swipe WKUID at the Back of Room if Necessary
4. Free to Leave & Thank you for Participating!
In order to keep things simple, I organized the research participant materials on a table adjacent to the door for easy retrieval upon entry. This included the pre- and post-survey documents and the consent form document, as well as extra writing utensils. As participants entered into the auditorium/screening room, I instructed them to take one of each of the documents and a writing utensil if they did not already have one, and then sit down to wait for further instruction. After 2-3 minutes had passed from the official starting time, I went through the presentation and explained the nature of this research project/what they were supposed to be doing. I thoroughly detailed the consent form importance and pre-survey process, giving them 5-10 minutes to fill out both before starting the film. Once it seemed like the majority of the room was finished, I gave a brief introduction of the film (director, cast, synopsis) and started the film.

There were a few discrepancies that I had not anticipated that included late participants entering, having to adjust volume of the films, people leaving to use the restroom, the outside hallway light turning on and off, and specifically for the Beautiful Things screening, lagging subtitles. In the case of late participants, I remained in the back by the door during the screenings to ask if they wanted to participate, explain the instructions and give them their research study materials. I had paper copies of the powerpoint presentation that I gave along with materials, so they could better understand what was expected of them.

Once the film finished, I presented the second set of PowerPoint slides and instructed the participants to fill out their post-screening survey for 5-10 minutes if they had not already started working on it. Once it seemed like the majority of the room had finished, I then announced the transition into our post-screening Q&A discussion.
However, as per IRB protocol, before we began, I explained that this discussion was not mandatory, and that people could leave if they wanted to. I then outlined the instructions for leaving, which included placing your stapled pre- and post-survey packet and signed consent form in the back of the room on the table by the door in which you originally collected the materials. Additionally, I instructed the research participants to take a copy of a blank consent form for them to keep and use the swiper to swipe their ID card if they need attendance points. Usually Dr. Hovet was there to swipe IDs or I myself would do so to ensure that it was done correctly.

The Questions and Answer (Q&A) section of the screenings was developed based on the film’s content, technique, and overall sustainable messaging. I usually asked 6-8 questions per screening, and the discussion lasted anywhere from 20-45 minutes. At each Q&A, I ensured that I asked the same 2 questions each time, to ensure a level of parallelism and comparibility:

1) What is sustainability in the world? – A Broad Introspective Question
2) How did you see sustainability specifically within this film? – A Narrowed Film Question

While I took fieldnotes on all of the discussion, the answers from these two questions were primarily what guided my qualitative coding for themes in the discussion. Generally, the answers and discussion varied, but usually one or three people would consistently answer while others would occasionally contribute.

While I utilized the fieldnotes and discussions in my analysis/discussion portion of this thesis, I found that there was variability in these discussions. However, it does provide a good foundation for discussion and fortunately, many participants wrote their
comments and thoughts on the survey to be utilized qualitatively. Overall, I was happy to see the deliberative dialogue that this post Q&A brought, as well as watching my participants interact with conversations of sustainable messaging and discuss their impact/feelings post-screening.

Once the Post Q&A discussion came to a natural stopping place, the same instructions above for exiting the screening were given again. The surveys and consent forms were collected separately to ensure anonymity for the participants, and all those that needed to swipe their IDs were able to. Once everyone had exited, I collected all of the research materials and exited the room myself.

The success of the data collection process came from the Post Q&A discussion. This process not only further my deliberative dialogue abilities and verbal communication skills, but I connected with my participants over a topic very important to me. It was the opportunity to view sustainability through the eyes of someone else and expand my own knowledge and concept of the issues and subgenres of sustainability. In fact, after the screening of Princess Mononoke, a participant and I remained discussing the cinematic technique and powerful storytelling of Hayao Miyasaki, a director that we both highly admired. It was a conversation that I am very grateful for and it would have never happened without this project. On the other hand, the main limitation of this process also stemmed from the Post Q&A discussion. While I did my best to take fieldnotes of the discussion, it was difficult to accurately jot down the entirety of some participant’s answers and what they were trying to get across. Fortunately, qualitative coding helped to limit my notes down to just the general themes, but I wish it would have been possible to record their answers or type them to ensure that I was fully
understanding their answer. Though, as I said previously, the opportunity to hear from the participants was wonderful and informative.

POST-SCREENING CODING

At the end of each screening, I brought the separated surveys and consent forms to Dr. Stinnett’s lab in the Ivan Wilson Fine Arts Center building. As per IRB requirements, the consent forms were placed in a secure filing cabinet to remain for the next three years and kept anonymous forever. I created an anonymized systematic label for each pre- and post-surveys, which linked each participant, allowing for tracking across the surveys.

The surveys that were incomplete were still labeled with the same titling formula with the exception of adding INCOMPLETE to the end. The numbering of the participants was in random order of how the students piled up the survey packets which I collected post-screening. After labeling, I made copies of every pre- and post-survey to use in the inputing data phase. The original survey documents are in the secure filing cabinet with the consent forms in Dr. Stinnett’s lab in FAC.
Using the copies of the surveys, I input the information into a Microsoft Office Excel Spreadsheet for each of the different screenings. Next, I began the coding process for each of the surveys. This process was both quantitative and qualitative. Each question that give a selection of answers to choose from was coded to replace numbers as the potential answer instead of the written answers. Below are examples the coding key used to code each of the potential answers into numbers to then be used to calculate data results. For open-ended questions like that indicated in PreSQ4 of Figure 16 below, this was labeled as a qualitative answer. The qualitative questions/answers were coded for underlying themes to discuss as a whole in the discussion if relevant to see if multiple participants were thinking similar thoughts and ideas. Once every answer on each survey was either quantitatively coded or qualitatively coded, I combined all of the screening dates and participants into one spreadsheet. I then uploaded this spreadsheet into Jamovi,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PreSQ4</th>
<th>What is the main environmental issue that directly affects your life?</th>
<th>Qualitative Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6) Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreSQ5</td>
<td>I am very willing to participate in sustainability activities related to improving that environment.</td>
<td>1) Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6) Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreSQ6</td>
<td>I am well informed about what I can do to make campus more sustainable.</td>
<td>1) Extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) A Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Not At All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreSQ7A</td>
<td>How important are the following sustainability issues to you? Waste (i.e. Recycling &amp; Waste)</td>
<td>6) Unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Example of Coding Key Used to Quantitatively Code the Data Results on the Pre-& Post-Surveys.
a statistical analysis software program. Using the spreadsheet of all 129 participants in Jamovi, I calculated the demographic results first using descriptive tests to determine the average participant’s background. Once I had determined the demographic data, I split all of the coded survey data back into separate screening files by date. From there, I uploaded each separate screening spreadsheet into Jamovi individually and ran a series of tests including descriptives and t-tests. I ran descriptive on every quantitative question to determine mean, median, mode, and SD. I ran paired sample t-tests on each set of questions that covered one topic from the pre- and post-survey.

For example, **PreSQ2 “I understand what the term ‘sustainability means’ and PostSQ1 “I feel that the meaning of the term “sustainability” has changed for me** post-screening are parallels of each other from pre to post. These two questions were written in this nature to be compared to one another to see if there was an impact made on the participant after watching the film. I wanted to determine what the average participant answered on the pre- and post-surveys to measure their level of impact. I ran paired sample t-tests and descriptives/descriptive plots on the following sets of questions from my surveys: **PreSQ2/PostSQ1, PreSQ3/PostSQ2, PreSQ5/PostSQ4, PreSQ6/PostSQ5, PreSQ7A-G/PostSQ6A-G, PreSQ5/PostSQ9, and PreSQ8/PostSQ10.** These tests formed my upcoming results and discussion/analysis along with the qualitative answers from the surveys and the Q&A post-discussion.
DATA PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION

After conducting Descriptive Tests and Paired Sampled t-tests on the various data for each film, these are the results. Below is the Demographic Data of the 129 Participants of across all 5 films.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Table 1: Demographic Data of 129 Participants Across All 5 Films

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PreSQ1A (Age)</th>
<th>PreSQ1A (Gender)</th>
<th>PreSQ1B (Race)</th>
<th>PreSQ1C (Warren County)</th>
<th>PreSQ1D (On Campus)</th>
<th>PreSQ1E (Commute)</th>
<th>PreSQ1F (University Level)</th>
<th>PreSQ1H (Area)</th>
<th>PreSQ1I (Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mean (M)</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Standard Deviation (SD)</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary category of information to focus on from this table is the Mean calculations for each question. The Mean calculation provides the demographic average for each question and is how we can see a general profile of the participants.
### DEMOGRAPHIC AVERAGES:

Table 2: Demographic Averages of 129 Participants Across All 5 Films

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your AGE?</td>
<td>19.3 YEARS OLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your GENDER?</td>
<td>MORE THAN LIKELY FEMALE (M=1.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your RACE?</td>
<td>MORE THAN LIKELY WHITE (M=4.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you live in Warren County, KY?</td>
<td>MORE THAN LIKELY NO (M=1.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you live on WKU’s CAMPUS?</td>
<td>MORE THAN LIKELY YES (M=1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you COMMUTE to WKU’s campus?</td>
<td>MORE THAN LIKELY NO (M=1.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your current UNIVERSITY LEVEL?</td>
<td>MORE THAN LIKELY A SOPHOMORE LEVEL (M=2.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which best describes the AREA you are from?</td>
<td>MORE THAN LIKELY FROM PERI-URBAN AREA (M=2.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your HOUSEHOLD INCOME or your parent’s household income?</td>
<td>MORE THAN LIKELY A $35,000 TO $49,000 HOUSEHOLD INCOME (M=3.46)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To describe what is outlined in Table 2, my participants are most likely white sophomore females from peri-urban areas and a household income of $35,000 to $49,000. They live on WKU’s campus, but are not from Warren County/Bowling Green, KY and they do not commute to campus most likely because they already live here. You can refer to the Appendix Section for further demographic graphs displaying the answers to each question.

In addition to the Mean, it is also important to pay attention to the Standard Deviation for each question. The Standard Deviation (SD) is the amount of variability or
spread of the numbers in the data set. Specifically, the SD tells me where most of my data should fall in comparison to the averages; it is the typical distance of the data points from the mean/average. **PreSQ1A (Age)** has the largest standard deviation of **SD=7.06** while **PreSQ1D (On Campus)** has the smallest standard deviation of **SD=0.494**. The SD is important to understand because I need to know where my other participants are in relation to the average participant. This will allow me to gain a better understanding of the overarching breadth of the demographics. The smaller the number, the closer to the mean/more concentrated. The larger the number, the farther away from the mean. It appears that for the most part, the SD for each of my questions tended to be smaller and more concentrated to the mean.

**DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ANALYSIS**

While the average participant for my study has been outlined above, it is important to point out the meaning of the standard deviation for some of the questions above. Understanding the typical distance of my data points to the mean/average for each demographic question allows me to see how concentrated the answers to a question are, and therefore, how concentrated my participants’ backgrounds are. For example, while 19.3 years old was the average age, the mode was 18.0 years old which would seem like it would possibly be the average age. Therefore, it is important to understand the spread amongst participants for a question because 19.3 may be the average in calculations, but with presenting outliers like a participant that is 0 years old and a participant that is 56 years old, this changes what the mean/average will be. Overall, for the age demographic, having a larger standard deviation corresponds to having a larger distance between the
data points and the mean. However, this makes sense due to the various number of participants in this study (N=129), and that a variety of different ages were written for the answer to this question so the far spread is feasible.

Furthermore, the numbered averages listed in the demographic data correspond with the coded answer for each question. These answers can be found in the Appendix Section under Document 9, which is all of the bar graph plots for each of the demographic questions.

SUSTAINABILITY PERCEPTION DATA RESULTS

Table 3: Data Results of Paired Sample t-test between questions PreSQ2\(^a\) from the pre-survey and PostSQ1\(^b\) on the post-survey for all 5 films.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*PreSQ2 / *PostSQ1</th>
<th>Leave No Trace</th>
<th>Avatar</th>
<th>Night Moves</th>
<th>Princess Mononoke</th>
<th>Beautiful Things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>1.83 / 2.50</td>
<td>2.00 / 2.00</td>
<td>2.35 / 3.25</td>
<td>2.37 / 2.79</td>
<td>2.32 / 3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.00 / 2.50</td>
<td>2.00 / 1.50</td>
<td>2.00 / 3</td>
<td>3.00 / 3</td>
<td>2.00 / 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.17 / 1.52</td>
<td>1.25 / 1.56</td>
<td>1.21 / 1.47</td>
<td>1.01 / 1.47</td>
<td>1.42 / 1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.477 / 0.619</td>
<td>0.394 / 0.494</td>
<td>0.152 / 0.158</td>
<td>0.232 / 0.338</td>
<td>0.256 / 0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Statistic (t)</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-4.20</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(df)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value (p)</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\): PreSQ2: I understand what the term ‘sustainability’ means.

\(b\): PostSQ1: I feel that the meaning of the term ‘sustainability’ has changed for me post-screening.
Out of all of the comparable questions from my pre- to post-survey, I found that the comparison between PreSQ2 and PostSQ1 is the most important to the overarching purpose of this project. PreSQ2 asked participants to select how much they agreed with this statement: I understand what the term “sustainability means.” The answer options were Strongly Agree (1), Somewhat Agree (2), Agree (3), Disagree (4), Strongly Disagree (5), and Unsure (6). PostSQ1 asked participants to select how much they agreed with this statement: I feel that the meaning of the term “sustainability” has changed for me post-screening. The answer options were Strongly Agree (1), Somewhat Agree (2), Agree (3), Disagree (4), Strongly Disagree (5) and Unsure (6).

For the purpose of this project, I want to understand if there was is a possible difference in sustainability thought/awareness in my participants from pre-screening to post-screening, and this comparative test might reveal answers to this question. Therefore, I conducted a paired sample t-test to compare the pre-survey answers for the PreSQ2 question to the post-survey answers for the PostSQ1 question. Given the response rate differences for the films, the most relevant data to discuss is from the Night Moves and Beautiful Things screenings, as they had the highest number of participants, and therefore the strongest potential results. For Night Moves, the pre-survey mean/average participant answer was $M=2.35$ with a standard deviation of $SD=1.21$, and the post-survey mean/average participant answer was $M=3.25$ with a standard deviation of $SD=1.42$. These values indicate a significant difference in the answers from pre-survey to post-survey of Night Moves. Additionally, the t-test result for $t(62)=-4.20$ and p-value of $p=<.001$ (or less than .1%) also indicates there was a significant difference between the answers from pre-survey to post-survey for these questions.
For *Beautiful Things*, the pre-survey mean/average participant answer was M=2.32 with a SD=1.21 and the post-survey mean/average participant answer was M=3.06 with a SD=1.42. These values also indicates that there was a significant difference in the answers from pre-survey to post-survey of *Beautiful Things*.

Additionally, the t-test result for t(31)= -2.00 and the p-value of p=0.055 (or 5.5%) also indicates a that there was a significant difference between answers from pre-survey to post-survey for these questions. The lack of equitable number of participants makes the data for the other three screenings (*Leave No Trace, Avatar, and Princess Mononoke*) less statistically reliable to report individually. However, comparing PreSQ2 and PostSQ1 across all 129 participant answers together in one Paired Sample t-test provides an overall snapshot of my results. Refer to the table below.

Table 4: Data Results of Paired Sample t-test between PreSQ2 and PostSQ1 for all 129 participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptives &amp; Paired Sample t-test</th>
<th>PreSQ2 &amp; PostSQ1 For All 129 Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean (M)</strong></td>
<td>2.29 / 3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>2 / 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation (SD)</strong></td>
<td>1.23 / 1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Error</strong></td>
<td>0.108 / 0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t-test (t)</strong></td>
<td>-4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees of Freedom (df)</strong></td>
<td>128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P-Value (p)</strong></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, the pre-survey mean/average participant answer across all 129 participants was a \( M=2.29 \) with a standard deviation of \( SD=1.23 \) and the post-survey mean/average participant answer across all 5 films was a \( M=3.01 \) with a standard deviation of \( SD=1.52 \), which indicates that there was a significant difference between the pre-survey answers for \textbf{PreSQ2} and the post-survey answers for \textbf{PostSQ1}. The t-test result was \( t(128)=-4.44 \) with a p-value of \( p<.001 \) (or rather less than .1%), which also indicates that there was a significant difference from pre-survey answers to post-survey answers for this set of questions. The biggest caveat is the inability to equitably compare across the films, however these results are promising.

**SUSTAINABILITY PERCEPTION RESULTS ANALYSIS**

In order to understand the data results, it is important to understand the coded question and answering system that went with each set of questions. For the pre-survey average/mean for \textbf{PreSQ2} across all 129 participant responses, the \( M=2.29 \) with a standard deviation of \( SD=1.23 \). This means that the average participant “\textbf{Somewhat Agreed}” that they knew what the term sustainability means pre-screening. The standard deviation of only 1.23 suggests that there is a smaller distance between the data points and the mean, therefore signaling that most participants’ “Somewhat Agreed” with this statement too pre-screening. This is equally confirmed with the median of 2 /Somewhat Agree. For the post-survey average/mean for \textbf{PostSQ1} across all 129 participant responses, the \( M=3.01 \) with a standard deviation of \( SD=1.52 \). This means that the average participant now “\textbf{Agreed}” with the statement that they felt the meaning of the term ‘sustainability’ had changed for them post-screening. There is a clear significant
increase of .72 difference from the pre-survey average to the post-survey average with smaller concentrated standard deviations that indicate to me that this is what the mass population of all 5 films agreed with post-screening. This is further confirmed by the post-screening median of 3/Agreed for PostSQ1. You can refer to these numbers in Table 4 above.

Therefore, this difference from pre- to post-screening suggests that there was an impact made on the participant through watching the film, and that their meaning of sustainability changed after viewing the film. This is confirmed by the t-test and p-value results of these calculations. The t-test is used when deciding to support or reject the null hypothesis. The larger the t-test (negative number does not affect this), the more evidence that you have of a significant difference. The smaller the t-test value is evidence that your claim is not significantly different from the population mean. The p-value is used to determine the significance of the results in a hypothesis test, basically either confirming or rejecting the null hypothesis in favor of your project’s claim about a population. A small p-value (of either < and/or = 0.05) indicates strong evidence against the null hypothesis, meaning that you can reject it in favor of your claim about the population. A larger p-value (> 0.05) indicates weak evidence against the null hypothesis, which means that your claim is not significant enough to reject the null hypothesis in favor of our claim about the population. Together these two values will give you the evidence you need to understand if there is a significant difference between your test’s mean and the population’s mean. With a large t statistic of -4.44 and a very small p-value of <.001 (or rather less than .1%), this indicates that there is a verifiable high significance difference between participant answers from pre- to post-survey across all 129 participant
responses. A p-value that is less than 1% is considered highly significant and provides strong evidence through these results that an impact was made to the average participant’s knowledge of what sustainability means post-screening across all five films.

These findings for the entirety of all 129 participant responses are echoed in both the individual findings for Night Moves and Beautiful Things. For Night Moves, the pre-survey mean was M=2.35 with a standard deviation of SD=1.21, and the post-survey mean was M=3.25 with a standard deviation of SD=1.47. This indicates that the average participant’s initial “Somewhat Agreed” answer on the pre-survey changed to “Agreed” on the post-survey results with small standard deviation results meaning similar responses across the board for this film. For Beautiful Things, it was very similar results. The pre-survey mean was M=2.32 with a standard deviation of SD=1.42, and the post-survey mean was M=3.06 with a standard deviation of SD=1.55. This also indicates that the average participant’s initial “Somewhat Agreed” answer on the pre-survey changed to “Agreed” on the post-survey results with small standard deviation results meaning similar responses across the board for this film. Both films had larger t statistic values of -4.20 for Night Moves and -2.00 for Beautiful Things. It makes sense for Beautiful Things to have almost half the size of the t statistic considering the viewing population was half the size (31) as compared to Night Moves (63). Furthermore, both films had small p-values (Night Moves p= <.001 or less than .1% and Beautiful Things p=.055 or 5.5%), indicating that there was enough evidence from pre- to post-survey results to reject the null hypothesis in favor that there was an impact made post-screening.

This set of questions (PreSQ2 and PostSQ1) are the very essence of what this project is trying to accomplish. These results proved that there is a possible effect taking
place on the viewer’s sustainability conscious and awareness after viewing a film with sustainable messaging. While there is no way to guage whether this change for the participant’s definition of “sustainability” is positive or negative, there has still been an evidenced change. This feels like I successfully proved my hypothesis because a correlation of change from pre- to post-survey is evidenced in these results. However, this does not prove that there is a positive correlation between pre- and post-survey results. By this, I mean that there is no data that suggests that the average participant’s sustainability awareness improved positively from the pre- to post-survey. Partly, this is because this question does not yield an answer that would have a positive or negative correlation. It only asks if there was a change in the participant’s definition of sustainability, nothing more. Therefore, part of me wishes I would have either included a follow-up open-ended question to ask how their definition changed, or I would have included a follow-up question asking the participant to indicate if their definition change positively or negatively. These additions might have yielded the exact hypothesized results that I was hoping for. However, the evidence did prove the basis of my research question, which is a success in my book.

Looking back at the sustainability literature, Kuhlman and Farrington’s (2010) argument that the ultimate “point of sustainability appraisal must be that a balance is sought between the requirements of stewardship on one hand and the desire for a better life on the other” (Kuhlman and Farrington, 3438). Achieving this balance requires understanding the role of humans for sustainability and the desire for well-being. Both Night Moves and Beautiful Things call into question these two aspects in their narrative and story elements. Night Moves focuses on the extreme call to action for sustainability
and the consequences of that. Beautiful Things explores the role of four humans in their workplaces that are directly connected to mass consumption and the impact on sustainability and human well-being. At the very basis of both films, understanding sustainability is crucial to understanding the motivations and stories of them, no matter what occurs specifically in the plot of either. Therefore, the results of this study showcase the varying reactions to how/what sustainability is defined or framed in both of these films. For example, participant P032, initially selected 3/Agreed for the PreSQ2 question in Night Moves but selected 5/Strongly Disagree for PostSQ1 and wrote in their comments, “I really don’t understand this film nor any message it had behind sustainability,” which ultimately prove that despite having your own understanding of sustainability prior to viewing, the film’s messaging changes that prior knowledge of sustainability in some way. In this one instance, it appears for worst.

Furthermore, both films present unusual or unknown extremist approaches to sustainability (Night Moves) or isolating lifestyles because of sustainability (Beautiful Things) that differ from the normal conceptions of sustainable development and sustainability interaction. In Night Moves, this extremist action would likely shake any viewers previous thoughts about the concept of sustainability, especially considering this action is taken in the name of sustainability. At what cost and consequences? This is the question that many participants wrote into their surveys. In fact, from the qualitative questioning on the post-survey for Night Moves, a common qualitative theme put by several participants was that the film portrayed sustainability is associated with “negative consequences,” with participants saying things like they “used violence to make change,” “their actions were far too extreme,” “they bombed a damn,” and
“someone ended up being hurt in the process of trying to make a statement.” Some participants wrote that there were “negative consequences,” but they did not know why or “IDK,” suggesting that the viewing the film left some of the participants unsure about the film’s messaging on sustainability. In the Post Q&A discussion, when asked what the message of sustainability was in Night Moves, the overarching answers were that “this film spreads awareness, but there is positive and negative awareness, ” “everyone is not doing enough,” and there was confusion as to what people can do if this terrorist act “affected no one even though it was a big action and did a lot of harm.” One participant even questioned if “what is enough to make a real difference if blowing up a damn won’t do it?” Fielding these questions and hearing these answers was challenging due to suggested hopelessness about sustainability change and how people can help.

However, this was also very promising in that these are the conversations people need to be having in order to spark a fire and make change, which makes this event successful in my opinion. In the literature on the identifying factors associated with positive sustainable behavior, the authors described that “experiences and personal knowledge factor greatly into encouraging people to engage in positive” sustainable behavior (Ahman et al., 2016). These post Q&A discussions steeped in the participants’ previous knowledge, current knowledge, past experiences and new experience with this screening hopefully encourage these participants to possibly engage in positive sustainable behavior as a result. I know that at the very least, participant P074 responded in the final comments to “Vote Democrat,” which to me insinuates some sort of
potential participation in the sustainability conversation and interaction on their part or their perception that sustainability is linked with a specific political party.

Furthermore, in Beautiful Things, these isolating yet simple lifestyles as a direct impact of mass consumption and the lack of sustainability efforts are echoed in the literature on sustainability policy and practice in the age of high consumption. In Isenhour’s 2010 dissertation on cross-cultural sustainatability, she showcases that despite the relative strength of the Swedish population in sustainability practices and activities, this strength is decreasing in citizens as we all continue to become consumers in the free market. The four men showcased in Beautiful Things are the indirect consequence to the world’s sustainability strength decreasing in favor of consumerism in the free marketplace. Each of their roles directly relate to process of consumerism and making materials. One participant outlined it perfectly in the post Q&A discussion, “The order of the story is from birth to death. From oil to make the products, to cargo to transport products, to measure/sound to meet safety standards for the products, and, ultimately, to fire to burn these products to ashes.” The participant’s prior knowledge of sustainability was also highly impacted during this film in regard to the responses from the qualitative themes of the survey and the post Q&A discussion. There were many themes of misunderstanding and confusion about the film with survey answers like “I didn’t really understand this film at all” or “Honestly, this film really confused me,” which reinforces the statistical findings that there was a change in sustainability knowledge from pre- to post-survey results.

However, this film also garnered a mostly “negative impact” tag by the majority of participants. The qualitative themes mentioned by most participants had to do with
waste and the excessive consumption of human beings with write-in answers ranging
from “Did you see all that trash” to “We waste everything” to “It showed the way to
reduce the harm of waste.” Some answers called for action like “We’re using too
much, and people are being harmed and we can minimize it more than we have” and
to understanding the possible intent of the film messaging, “We waste so much when
others find beauty in minimalism.” Furthermore, in the Post Q&A discussion,
participants really pondered the price of consumption and the loneliness/isolation
attributed to it, at least for these four men. Some asked, “is it worth it?” Once again,
disheartened responses from viewers yet promising answers for the future. Once
conversation sparks, it will hopefully continue burning. Additionally, in the Post Q&A
discussion, participants connected the themes of the film to the film techniques used more
so than any of the other screenings, which demonstrates that this film utilized good
cinema technique that clearly made an impact on the viewer. The lack of sound and use
of silence in the film was noticed and mentioned by multiple people. Some participants
“related it back to our oblivion and how we ignore the hum of silence in the
background because we are too distracted by all the noise/consumerism.”

Additionally, many participants picked up on the role of the nameless, voiceless
couple juxtaposed throughout the course of the film and called them “the depiction of
the consumers suffering from excessive consumption” and that their role “pulls the
story altogether.” Even the title evoked a strong emotional appeal from participants,
fielding answers like “Beautifying these people” and “Making all these things
gorgeous (products) when they are really ugly.” Overall, the fact that these viewers
noticed the film technique and style as a part of their analysis reveals that this film
possibly uses techniques and storylines that inspire change/impact. Furthermore, are these things that could be emulated in another film in the future to garner similar results/effect on viewers for sustainability awareness?

*NIGHT MOVES* DATA RESULTS

For the rest of the data presentation, I am focusing on the results from *Night Moves* because this screening had the greatest number of participants and, therefore, the most statistically reliable results. I will describe the results from the comparative tests of question sets, *PreSQ5 / PostSQ4* and *PreSQ6 / PostSQ5*. I chose to further examine *PreSQ5/PostSQ4* because I wanted to compare my participants’ willingness to get involved from the pre-screening to the post-screening to determine if there was any possible change. *PreSQ5* asked participants to select how much they agreed with the following statement: *I am very willing to participate in sustainability activities related to improving that environmental issue indicated in Question #4*. The answer options were Strongly Agree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Unsure. *PostSQ4* asked participants to select how much they agreed with the following statement: *I more willing to participate in sustainability activities related to improving that environmental issue indicated in Question #3 post-screening*. The answer options were Strongly Agree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Unsure. In order to determine this intended effect, I conducted a Paired Sample t-test comparing *PreSQ5* and *PostSQ4*. The results are in the table below.
Table 5: Data Results of Paired Sample t-test between PreSQ5 and PostSQ4 for Night Moves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive &amp; Paired Sample t-test Results</th>
<th>PreSQ5 / PostSQ4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.71 / 3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3 / 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation (SD)</td>
<td>1.51 / 1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.190 / 0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Statistic (t)</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (df)</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value (p)</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For PreSQ5/PostSQ4, the pre-survey mean/average participant answer was M=2.71 with a standard deviation of SD=1.51 and the post-survey mean/average participant answer was M=3.10 with a standard deviation of SD=1.78. These values indicate that there is clearly an increase from pre-survey answers to the post-survey answers for this question set. Additionally, the t-test result for this set was t(62)=-1.71 with a p-value of p=0.091, or rather 9.1%, which also suggests that there was some sort of significant difference that took place from the pre- to post-survey results.

Next, I examined PreSQ6/PostSQ5 because I wanted to compare my participants’ current knowledge of sustainability on campus from pre-screening to post-screening to determine if there was any possible change in knowledge. PreSQ6 asked participants to select how much they agreed with the following statement: I am well informed about what I can do to make campus more sustainable. The answer options
were Strongly Agree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Unsure. 

**PostSQ5** asked participants to select how much they agreed with the following statement: 

**I am now more informed about what I can do to make campus more sustainable post-screening.** The answer options were Strongly Agree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Unsure. In order to determine this intended effect, I conducted a Paired Sample t-test comparing **PreSQ6** and **PostSQ5**.

Table 6: Data Results of Paired Sample t-test between **PreSQ6** and **PostSQ5** for **Night Moves**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive &amp; Paired Sample t-test Results</th>
<th>PreSQ6 / PostSQ5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.94 / 3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3 / 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation (SD)</td>
<td>1.28 / 1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.161 / 0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Statistic (t)</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (df)</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value (p)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For **PreSQ6/PostSQ5**, the pre-survey mean/average participant answer was **M=2.94** with a standard deviation of **SD=1.28** and the post-survey mean/average participant answer was **M=3.67** with a standard deviation of **SD=1.68**. These values indicate that there is clearly a significant increase from pre-survey answers to the post-survey answers for this question set. Additionally, the t-result for this set was **t(62) = -2.92** with a p-value of
p=0.005, or rather .5%, which also suggests that there was some sort of significant
difference that took place from pre- to post-survey results.

**NIGHT MOVES RESULTS ANALYSIS**

For the data analysis of **PreSQ5/PostSQ4** of *Night Moves*, the pre-survey
mean/average participant answer was M=2.71 with a standard deviation of SD=1.51,
which means that the average participant “Agreed” that they were willing to participate
in sustainability activities related to improving that environmental issue indicated in
Question #4 and the rest of the participants responded somewhat similarly due to the
smaller standard deviation. For the post-survey, the mean/average participant answer was
M=3.10 with a standard deviation of SD=1.78, which means that the average participant
still “Agreed” that they were willing to participate in sustainability activities related to
improving that environmental issue indicated in Question #3 post-screening and the rest
of the participants responded somewhat similarly due to the smaller standard deviation.
Additionally, the t statistic for this comparative test was -1.71 and the p-value was
p=0.091, or rather 9.1%. As previously mentioned, a smaller t-test statistical result
means that there is possibly not a substantial difference between the test mean and the
population mean. While -1.71 is still somewhat larger, it is not comparable to the larger
t statistics found with the previous question set (**PreSQ2 and PostSQ1**) t statistic results,
especially for a population of 62 participants with the degrees of freedom factored in. In
addition, the p-value, also the largest indicator of the strength of the results, is greater
than 0.05 or 5% in this case, which indicates weak evidence against the null hypothesis,
meaning that my claim is not significant enough to reject the null hypothesis. While there
appears to be a slight increase from pre- to post-survey for the mean results, these t-statistic and p-value results really just that there was not necessarily a difference, or at least enough evidence to provide one in favor of my claim that there was a possible effect on the participants’ willingness to participate in sustainability activities post-screening.

However, despite the lack of evidentiary support, the Median results in this case are important to notice. Both the PreSQ5 and PostSQ4 Medians were 3/Agreed in terms of answering the question. The fact that the answer for both the pre-survey and the post-survey remained the same would suggest that there should not necessarily be a statistical difference. In fact, this remains somewhat positive, considering participants still agreed that they were willing to participate instead of disagreeing or being unsure post-screening.

Additionally, Question #4 (PreSQ4) of the pre-survey and Question #3 (PreSQ3) of the post-survey asked the participants to write in the main environmental issue that directly affects their life (post-screening for PreSQ3). Whatever answer that they chose is the indicated answer in questions PreSQ5 and PostSQ4 above. Therefore, the willingness to participate also depends on their level of commitment to said environmental issue that directly affects their life, which is impossible to measure with just this survey. Qualitatively, the most common answers for the PreSQ4 were pollution (air, water and trash/litter specifically), climate change (CO² levels specifically), and global warming. For the PostSQ3 qualitative answers post-screening, the most common answers were wastefulness/consumption, climate change (CO²), and pollution (water specifically). The addition of wastefulness/consumption as the highest written-in answer
for PostSQ3 after having not been a prevalent answer for PreSQ4 is highly interesting, especially when you compare it to the events of the film.

Wastefulness and consumption are actually just two of Night Moves sustainability-related themes. Water conservation is another big one. In the film, one of the main reasons that these eco-terrorists decide to blow up the dam in Oregon is “to protest about the excessive power usage in the US and the diverting of water golf courses,” both indirectly tied to wastefulness and consumption (The Case for Global Film). Therefore, this suggests that the participants in this film were not only impacted in set of questions PreSQ5 and PostSQ4, but that after watching Night Moves, a majority of the participants changed their answer to be wastefulness/consumption, which is mostly a direct link between the two. Additionally, most of the post Q&A and write in answers from the surveys for Night Moves focused on this wastefulness and consumption environmental issue.

For the data analysis of the other comparative test for PreSQ6/PostSQ5 of Night Moves, the pre-survey mean/average participant answer was M=2.94 with a standard deviation of SD=1.28, which means that the average participant “Agreed” that they were well informed about what they can do to make campus more sustainable. The standard deviation suggests that the participant responses were somewhat concentrated across the board. For the post-survey, the mean/average participant answer was M=3.67 with a standard deviation of SD=1.68, which means that the average participant “Disagreed” with the statement that they were now more informed about what they could do to make campus more sustainable post-screening. The standard deviation once again suggests some concentration for the participant responses, but still distance between the mean and
data points. Additionally, the t-test statistic for this comparative test was -2.92 and the p-value was \( p=0.005 \), or rather .5%. As previously mentioned, a smaller t-test statistical result means that there is possibly not a substantial difference between the test mean and the population mean. In this case, I would consider -2.92 a larger t statistic comparable to the previous large t statistic of question set PreSQ2 and PostSQ1. In addition, the p-value is very slightly greater than 0.05 or 5% in this case, which indicates still strong evidence against the null hypothesis, meaning that my claim is significant enough to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, the increase of mean results from pre-survey to post-survey combined with the t statistic and p-value highly suggests that there was an effect from pre- to post-survey for this question set, and that there is a possible effect on the level of knowledge a participant has about what they can do to get involved on campus post-screening for *Night Moves*. This difference is obvious in the PreSQ6 and PostSQ5 Median results which were 3/Agreed and 4/Disagreed.

The results of this question set are highly significant because this is the first time that we are seeing a complete shift from participant agreement with the question statement to disagreement with the question statement. This difference in results from pre- to post-screening suggests that the possible effect placed on the participant post-screening was the participant felt that impacted enough by the film to feel that they were either the same or less informed about what they do to make campus more sustainable post-screening. To me, this is slightly alarming since previously in the pre-survey, the average participant indicated that they agreed that they felt informed about what they could do to make campus more sustainable. A possible rationale behind this shift could be that PostSQ5 is phrased slightly differently than PreSQ6 since it asks if you are now...
MORE informed about what you can do to make campus more sustainable post-screening versus PreSQ6’s. I am informed about what I can do to make campus more sustainable. The average participant might still feel the same level of informed about what they can do to make campus more sustainable when filling out the pre-survey; they just do not feel MORE informed than they previously did after screening the film. Therefore, they selected “Disagree” to reflect this.

To flip to disagreement post-screening either suggests that there is a flaw within the question, or that Night Moves is possibly triggering enough to make the average participant change their answer completely post-screening. If the latter is the case (and there is not necessarily a way to prove this), this is highly useful information to capitalize upon when creating sustainability-themed mass media in the future. My last intended effect would be to make someone not feel informed about what they can do despite previously feeling like they did. Or, this raises the question that was the film so overwhelming that viewers felt at a loss? In fact, I want to encourage involvement and being informed about sustainability on campus more so than anything. In regard to why I think this film might possibly make someone feel less informed is because it centers on very extreme measures in order to potentially solve a problem, but ultimately, these measures have grave consequences. Therefore, if something large and extreme could not solve this problem, what else is there for us to do? How can we compete if the biggest bomb does not even work?

As mentioned previously, this idea was apparent in the Post-Screening Q&A discussion. Participants said things like, the bomb “affected no one even though it was a big action and did a lot of harm,” and “what is enough to make a real difference if
blowing up a damn won’t do it.” However, when asked how we can get results without radical action, the participants responded with a variety of answers that still seem promising despite the disheartening end of Night Moves. Some ideas participants said were, “Voting democrat aka using your voice & using your vote,” “recycling,” “dieting, less meat consumption,” and “using water conservatively.” The comment that resonated the most as to what we can do is just “Practicing environmentalism. It’s still worth only doing a small part. Everyone is not doing enough. Do you have guilt? We want to be like Jesse Einseberg and turn his back on his choice to blow up the damn and be extreme with the environment, but we can’t.”
CONCLUSION

I feel that I answered my research question and determined that there was an effect and correlation between watching films with sustainable messaging and then becoming more sustainably-conscious post-viewing. This was especially showcased in the comparative Paired Sample t-test performed on the set of survey questions, \textbf{PreSQ2} and \textbf{PostSQ1}, for all 129 participants across all five films. The highly significant difference between the average participant’s definition of sustainability pre-screening and post-screening indicated that the participant felt that their definition of sustainability had changed post-screening. This finding is significant in order to effectively promote the mission of sustainability. These films teach viewers to be open-minded to all aspects of sustainability as demonstrated in the plotlines of sustainability and environmental issues presented through a variety of strategies and through different levels of intensity in the five films.

Learning that there was a pre- and post-survey impact on how informed the participant felt was both interesting and slightly alarming. If the average participant felt less informed post-viewing of \textit{Night Moves} after previously agreeing that they felt informed before viewing, this to me suggests either that there was a flaw in the questioning or the negative consequences of \textit{Night Moves} were enough to make the participant switch from agree to disagree post-viewing. If it is a fault in the question, then that is fixable by changing the wording of the question. However, if the fault lies in the content of the film, this opens up the conversation for what aspects of mass media work and do not work when trying to inspire others. Lastly, determining that the average participant was still willing to get involved both in pre- and post-survey results is
encouraging, especially if that participant is still willing to get involved despite feeling uninformed about how they can get involved on campus post-viewing. Showing initiative and willingness to do something despite not having all the answers is more important to my hopes for increasing awareness about issues of sustainability than knowing everything about sustainability but doing nothing to help the cause or get involved.

The most challenging aspect of this project was the lack of equitable research participants across all five films. I would have preferred to do comparative tests and deep exploration into the results of each film, as I did with Night Moves and Beautiful Things. However, despite their sustainable messaging and themes, the other three films (Leave No Trace, Avatar, and Princess Mononoke) were not statistically reliable enough to accurately assess and compare the results to the two former films. Sixty-three participants from Night Moves goes a lot further than six participants from Leave No Trace. Ideally, the most effective research study would have tested the same number of participants and the same participants across all five films to determine the possible correlation, as well as determine if there were any long-term effects.

For the future, if I were to conduct this study again or modify it, I would consider adding in long-term element to measure if there was any sort of long-term effect on sustainable thought and behavior post-screening. At this point, the study really only tests for the short-term time immediately post-screening, and nothing else. A possible idea that was recommended to me by a faculty member at Berea College during the Anthropologists and Sociologists of Kentucky Conference this semester was to possibly have each participant write themselves a letter challenging them to do some sort of sustainability-driven task or effort that they then report back to me about to document.
The participant would write their name and address on the letter, and I would send those out to the participants after the two-month post-viewing marker. The goal is that participants would fulfill their sustainability task and report the information back to me to track the progress.

In addition to the results and analysis, this year-long process taught me many lessons. It was my first in-depth scholarly research project that involved conducting research study, planning a film series, going through the IRB process, and analyzing statistical data. Four years ago, as a freshman on the Hill, I do not think I could have imagined this culmination of my major and greatest passion to form into a project that hopefully has merit and provides information about how to continue spreading sustainable awareness. I think what is most important about all of this process are the various conversations that were started about sustainability and how we can continue doing our part. The purpose of this project was to answer this research question, and I did. However, this experience taught me so much more than that. I hypothesized that there would be an effect for a reason. It makes sense that this project would prove successful in some regard based solely off of the effect that my iPhone, Netflix and mass media have over me. This extremely helpful, yet an equally dangerous mechanism that can be harnessed to change the world sustainably.

If I could only choose one thing good to come out of this project, I think it would be the building bridges of communication and open dialogue formed between people with differing opinions and background after the screenings. My end-goal is to determine if there is this positive correlation between watching these films and becoming more sustainable, but broadly, I am really just hoping that these films open people’s eyes and
minds to this topic and the many subgenres related to this topic. Our world might be cursed, but connection and building those bridges with new and different people keep it living.
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**Document 1:** Pre-Screening survey, 2019.

### Screening Pre-Survey 2019

Hi, my name is Chelsea Faught. I am a student at Western Kentucky University conducting a survey on fellow student’s sustainable livelihoods. All of the information collected is anonymous, so no one will know what your answers are. The information will be used to help me evaluate your experience living sustainably. It should take about five to ten minutes. You can choose to not answer questions or stop your participation at any time. Will you take the survey?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. What is your age and gender?</td>
<td>□ American Indian or Alaska Native □ Asian □ Black or African American □ Hispanic □ White □ Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. What is your ethnic identity?</td>
<td>□ Freshmen □ Sophomore □ Junior □ Senior □ 5th Year or more □ Graduate Student □ Gatton Academy Student □ Faculty □ Staff/Administrator □ Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Do you live in Warren County, Kentucky?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No If No, where do you live: ___________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Do you live on or off of Western Kentucky University’s campus?</td>
<td>□ On □ Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. Do you commute to Western Kentucky University’s campus?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No If Yes, how: ________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f. What is your current university level?</td>
<td>□ Less than $20,000 □ $20,000 to $34,999 □ $35,000 to $49,999 □ $50,000 to $74,999 □ $75,000 to $99,999 □ Over $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g. Major(s)?</td>
<td>□ Minor(s): __________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h. Which best describes the area where you are from?</td>
<td>□ Urban □ Pen-Urban □ Suburban □ Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Next I’d like to ask a few questions about your daily life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I understand what the term “sustainability” means.</td>
<td>□ Strongly Agree □ Somewhat Agree □ Agree □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree □ Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am very concerned about environmental sustainability issues.</td>
<td>□ Strongly Agree □ Somewhat Agree □ Agree □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree □ Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What is the main environmental issue that directly affects your life?</td>
<td>□ Strongly Agree □ Somewhat Agree □ Agree □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree □ Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am very willing to participate in sustainability activities related to improving that environmental issue indicated in Question #4.</td>
<td>□ Strongly Agree □ Somewhat Agree □ Agree □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree □ Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am well informed about what I can do to make campus more sustainable.</td>
<td>□ Strongly Agree □ Somewhat Agree □ Agree □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree □ Unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. How important are the following sustainability issues to you? Please check your level of importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Waste (i.e. Recycling &amp; Waste Reduction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. Energy (i.e. Conversation efforts, alternative energy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Water (i.e. rooftop gardens, rain gardens, clean streams)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Transportation (i.e. Biking, Transit, Alternative Fuels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Deforestation (Slash &amp; Burn, Endangered Species)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. Climate (i.e. carbon reduction, air quality, temperature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Consumption (i.e. food, land entitlement, resource)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. My interest in learning more about sustainability issues has grown due to campus activities, events, and/or courses offered by my institution.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Somewhat Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Unsure

9. Have you participated in this research study before by attending a previous screening(s)?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

10. Is there anything that you would like to add? ________________________________________________
Hi, my name is Chelsea Faught. I am a student at Western Kentucky University conducting a survey on fellow students' sustainable livelihoods. All of the information collected is anonymous, so no one will know what your answers are. The information will be used to help me evaluate your experience living sustainably. It should take about five to ten minutes. You can choose to not answer questions or stop your participation at any time. Will you take the survey?

### First, I'd like to ask a few questions about your daily life on campus

1. I feel that the meaning of the term "sustainability" has changed for me post-screening?
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Somewhat Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] Unsure

2. I am very concerned about environmental sustainability issues post-screening.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Somewhat Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] Unsure

3. What is the main environmental issue that directly affects your life post-screening?
   

4. I am more willing to participate in sustainability activities related to improving that environmental issue indicated in Question #3 post-screening?
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Somewhat Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] Unsure

5. I am now more informed about what I can do to make campus more sustainable post-screening.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Somewhat Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] Unsure

6. How important are the following sustainability issues to you post-screening? Please indicate your level of importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Waste (i.e. Recycling &amp; Waste Reduction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Energy (i.e. Conversation efforts, alternative energy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Water (i.e. rooftop gardens, rain gardens, clean streams)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Transportation (i.e. Biking, Transit, Alternative Fuels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Deforestation (Slash &amp; Burn, Endangered Species)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f. Climate (i.e. carbon reduction, air quality, temperature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g. Consumption (i.e. food, land entitlement, resource)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Which of the above sustainability issues was the most obvious within the film?</td>
<td>☐ Waste  ☐ Energy  ☐ Water  ☐ Transportation  ☐ Deforestation  ☐ Climate  ☐ Consumption  ☐ Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Did the film portray the sustainability issue you indicated above in a positive or negative stance?</td>
<td>☐ Positive  ☐ Negative  Why? ___________________________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am more willing to participate in sustainability activities related to improving that sustainability issue indicated in Question #8 post-screening?</td>
<td>☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Somewhat Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree  ☐ Unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My interest in learning more about sustainability issues has grown more due to campus activities, events, and/or courses offered by my institution, like this screening?</td>
<td>☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Somewhat Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree  ☐ Unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is there anything that you would like to add?</td>
<td>___________________________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Which of the following sustainability efforts are you aware of on your campus?
   a. Waste (i.e Recycling and Waste Reduction, Reduce and Reuse, etc.)
   b. Energy (i.e. Conservation efforts, alternative energy use, etc.)
   c. Dining Services (i.e. Local Food, Community Gardens, food composting etc.)
   d. Water (i.e rooftop gardens, rain gardens, clean streams, rain barrels)
   e. Transportation (i.e. Bike/Ped, Transit, Alternative Fuels, etc.)
   f. Building (i.e. Green Building, LEED, etc.)
   g. Grounds (i.e. Right Tree, Right Place, green space management, composting organics, etc.)
   h. Purchasing (i.e. Energy Star, green cleaning, recycled content, Forest Certified, etc.)
   i. Climate (i.e. carbon reduction, air quality, etc.)
   (These are the categories directly from the AASHE STARS program.)

2. Which of the three definitions of sustainability below resonate with you? Sustainability means:
   a. “Creating an economic system that provides for quality of life while renewing the environment and its resources.”
   b. “Living within the resources of the planet without damaging the environment now or in the future.”
   c. “Taking the long-term view of how our actions affect future generations and making sure we don't deplete resources or cause pollution at rates faster than the earth is able to renew them.”
   d. None of the above.

3. I fully understand the meaning of the term “sustainability”.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Agree
   d. Strongly Agree

4. My concern towards environmental issues has grown due to the events, activities and and/or courses offered by my campus.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Agree
   d. Strongly Agree
5. How concerned are you about environmental issues?
   a. Very Concerned 
   b. Somewhat Concerned 
   c. Concerned 
   d. Not Concerned 

6. Do you think environmental issues directly affect your life?
   a. YES 
   b. NO 

7. How willing are you to participate in sustainability activities on campus?
   a. Very Willing 
   b. Somewhat Willing 
   c. Willing 
   d. Not Willing 

8. If you could save money, in your department, on campus or personally would you participate in sustainability activities on campus?
   a. Very Willing 
   b. Somewhat Willing 
   c. Willing 
   d. Not Willing 
   i. If the participant answers questions numbers 7 and 8 with a,b or c then there would be an opportunity for them to give their contact information for follow-up to engage in sustainability activities. 

9. My campus is leader in sustainable practices among other universities.
   a. Strongly Disagree 
   b. Disagree 
   c. Agree 
   d. Strongly Agree 

10. My campus community is well informed about what is being done to make the campus more sustainable.
    a. Strongly Disagree 
    b. Disagree 
    c. Agree 
    d. Strongly Agree
Document 4:
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I. Demographics

Are you a student, faculty, or staff?

What is your age?

18-24  25-34  35-44  45-54  over 55

What year are you in school?

1
2
3
4
4+

Does not apply

What state are you from? __________

What county are you from in Kentucky? __________

What is your current major?________________________

What is your housing status?

Residence Hall
Apartment
House rental
House owner
Live with parents

What is your religious affiliation?

Christian (Protestant or Catholic)
Jewish
Muslim
Buddhist
Hindu
Pagan
Other
No affiliation

Politically, would you consider yourself more liberal or conservative? (scale)

Liberal
Conservative
Moderate

II. Opinions, Awareness, and Values

When you hear the word sustainability, what do you think about? (check multiple if needed)

a. The environment
b. The economy
c. Culture
d. Socioeconomic status
e. Policy
f. Agriculture
g. Other: _______________________

Where do you get most of your information on sustainability?

a. Social Media
b. News media
c. College campus
d. Family
e. Friends
f. College courses
g. I have not heard anything about sustainability
h. Other:

When you vote for local, regional, and national representatives, do you consider their stance on environmental preservation and sustainability?

Yes    No    I don’t vote.
When you chose your college major, did you consider its relation to sustainability?

Yes    No

Please mark how concerned you are with each category of sustainability? (1= not at all, 3= somewhat, 5=very concerned)

Climate change
Access to food and water
Access to space for identity expression
Use of nonrenewable resources
Overcrowded urban areas
Recycling/Reducing Consumption
Waste production
Habitat Degradation
Social Justice/ Human Rights Issues

Environmental issues affect my daily life and habits.

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
neutral
Agree
Strongly Agree
If yes, please explain how:

In the area of food sustainability, what do you value the most (1= not at all, 3= somewhat, 5=very valued)?

Vegetarianism/Veganism
Organic
Non-GMO
Locally Produced
Waste Reduction
Food Recovery

Which of the following best describes your identity in relation to the environment?

Environmentally Aware: I value environmental conservation, but it is
not a priority for me.
Environmentally Concerned: I value environmental conservation, and I try to be environmentally conscious when it’s convenient.
Environmental Proponent: Conservation is important to me, and I try to make environmentally conscious decisions on a daily basis.
Environmental Advocate: Conservation is a priority for me, and I regularly shape my decisions/actions around my value for the environment.
Environmental Activist: Conservation is a huge priority to me, and a big part of my life and identity, and I speak openly to others about my values and beliefs as an environmentalist.

Fundamentally, my sustainability related values stem from a concern / sense of responsibility toward: (check all that apply)
- Human beings (including future generations)
- Sentient beings (capable of experiencing pleasure / pain)
- All living things (plants, animals, etc.)
- Ecosystems (including non-living things)
- Religious stewardship
- My community

III. Campus Culture

Please rate the following statements (1= do not agree, 3= somewhat agree, 5= agree completely)

- I feel it is safe to express myself fully on campus.
- I believe this campus is safe for marginalized students.
- I believe this campus is safe for LGBTQ students.

Are you aware of clubs on campus that promote sustainability?
  Yes  No
If yes, please list any you are involved in:
Do you consider yourself an advocate of campus sustainability?
   Yes  No

Do you feel like it is easy to get involved in sustainability measures on campus?
   Yes  No
   If not, why?

Is your major directly or indirectly related to sustainability?
   Yes  No

Have you ever taken a class related to sustainability to fulfill another requirement?
   Yes  No

Are you aware that WKU provides the following services/products? (Yes/No)
   Campus Shuttle
   Bus Service to Shopping
   Office of Sustainability - support for ideas, projects, events
   Project Grow Community Garden
   Big Red Bikes
   Food Pantry
   Short-term on campus car rental
   Recycling options for those who live off-campus
   Campus Green Tours
   Reusable to-go containers at Fresh Food Company and Bene Pasta

Are you aware of the following sustainability practices and initiatives at WKU?
   LEED Buildings
   Food composting at Fresh
   Main campus certified as a wildlife habitat arboretum
   Green cleaning products
   Heats buildings exclusively with natural gas since 2011
   Uses LED lighting in all surface parking lots, the PBS studio, Diddle Arena, and Kentucky Museum
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My concern towards environmental issues has grown due to the events, activities and and/or courses offered by my campus (ex: Earth Day Festival, Game Day Recycling, Project Grow).

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- neutral
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Do you feel that WKU is conscientious of paper use?

- Yes
- No

How do your professors distribute the majority of your class material?

- a. online (BlackBoard, email, etc.)
- b. paper print out
- c. other

Below is a list of sustainability related courses available on campus. Please select any courses you would consider taking.

* Colonnade Class Options*
- ICSR 200 - Intro to Social Responsibility
- DCS 300 - Public Problem Solving
- IDST 399 - Contemporary Ethical Issues
- GEOG 350 - Economic Geography
- GEOG 227 - Our Vulnerable Planet
- GEOG 280 – Environmental Science and Sustainability
- GEOG 344 - Environmental Ethics
- GEOG 380 - Global Sustainability
- GEOL 315 - Energy, Climate and Carbon
- ECON 434 - Economic Poverty and Discrimination
- MKT 321 - Consumer Behavior

Would you like more classes that integrate sustainability within your major?

- Yes
- No

Would integrating sustainability problem solving topics, (waste reduction,
energy management, etc.), into core classes help you stay interested and motivated academically?

Yes  No

IV. Behaviors Questions

How frequently do you shower?

Once a week
1-2 times a week
3-4 times a week
5 or more times a week
Daily

How long is your average shower?

Less than five minutes
5-10 minutes
10-20 minutes
20+ minutes

Do you consume the majority of your water (or other beverages) through:

Reusable bottle
Plastic bottle
Fountain
Water bottle filling station
Other

Do you actively recycle (on campus or at home)? Yes  No
If no, please explain why. (lack of recycling services, takes too much time, etc.)

Do you compost your food waste  Yes  No

Do you bring reusable bags when shopping?  Yes  No

Do you seek a sustainable option when purchasing textbooks (ebooks, buying used)

Yes  No
Which of the following do you buy used?
clothing
cars
electronics
books
furniture
homegoods

When you leave your room, house, or apartment, which of the following do you do?
Turn off the lights
Turn off electronic devices (TV, Computer, Gaming Console, etc)
Turn off the air conditioner/heat
Turn off fans
Unplug unused devices (microwave, cell charger, TV, computer charger, etc).
None

Which of the following factors do you consider when making purchases? (choose all that apply)
Durability
Packaging
Labor rights/Union
Cruelty Free
Environmental degradation associated with extraction or transportation
Made in America
Locally Produced

What would you like to see most in terms of sustainability on WKU’s campus?
Solar, Wind, or other renewable energy on WKU’s campus
Zero Waste Campus
Carbon Neutral Campus
locally sourced/organic/non-gmo food on campus
A “Green” Scholarship for student research in sustainability, funded by
a Student Green Initiative Fund
other ________________
Document 5: Invoice from Filmotor Distribution Company for Screening Fee of Beautiful Things

62 F SF BT
WKU Department of English
1906 College Heights Blvd. 11086
Bowling Green, KY 42101
270-745-3044

Description: Screening fee for a screening of Beautiful Things.

Screening fee Beautiful Things: 350 EUR

TOTAL: 350 EUR

Please make the payment in no later than 2 weeks to the address below:

Filmotor s.r.o.

BANK NAME FIO BANKA
EURO ACCOUNT NUMBER: 2201349988/2010
IBAN: CZ872010000002201349988
BIC/SWIFT: FIOBCZPPXXX
ADDRESS: V CELNICI 1028/10, 117 21, PRAGUE 1, CZECH REPUBLIC

Note: any bank charges incurred by this transaction are to be covered by the licensee.
Document 6: Invoice from Filmotor Distribution Company for Library License of *Beautiful Things* at WKU for 1 years time.

74 F SF ET

WKU Department of English
1906 College Heights Blvd. 11086
Bowling Green, KY 42101
270-745-3044

Description: Fee for the university – library license of Beautiful Things for WKU.

Screening fee Impreza: 300 EUR

TOTAL: 300 EUR

Please make the payment in no later than 2 weeks to the address below:

Filmotor s.r.o.

BANK NAME FIO BANKA
EURO ACCOUNT NUMBER: 2201349988/2010
IBAN: CZ872010000000220134998
BIC/SWIFT: FIOBCZPPXXX
ADDRESS: V CELNICI 1028/10, 117 21, PRAGUE 1, CZECH REPUBLIC

Note: any bank charges incurred by this transaction are to be covered by the licensee.
1. Welcome to the Gender Images & Sustainability Fall Film Series. My name is Chelsea Faught and I am the principal investigator & student coordinator of this research project and film series. Thank you all so much for coming.

2. Upon arrival, you should have obtained a packet at the door. If you did not, please raise your hand and one will be given to you. This packet contains 3 documents.

3. Review of Packet:
   
a. The first page of the packet is the official Consent Form for participating in this research study.
b. The second page of the packet is the Pre-Screening Survey to be taken before the film begins.
c. The third page of the packet is the Post-Screening Survey to be taken after the film ends.

4. Before I go over the procedures for the rest of the night, if you wish to participate in the research study, you must be 18 years or older to participate. If you do not wish to participate, you are welcome to stay and enjoy the film.

5. At this time, if you chose to participate, you may go ahead and read over the Consent Form on page one and then sign upon completion. Upon leaving, you will receive a blank copy of the consent form to take home with you for record.

6. Your participation in this research study is completely voluntary, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty, and your confidentiality will be maintained at all times. For example, the consent form of your packet will be separated from your survey after the end of the screening.

7. After filling out your consent form, you may begin filling out your Pre-Screening survey on page 2 while I discuss tonight’s procedure.

8. Once completing filling out the consent form, you will be given 5-10 minutes to fill out the Pre-Screening survey.

9. Next, I will introduce our film for tonight, [Insert Film Title Here] for a few minutes.
10. We will then screen the film, which will last [Film Duration here].

11. Upon the conclusion of the film, we will move into filling out the Post-Screening Survey.

12. You will have 5-10 minutes to fill out the Post-Screening Survey on page three.

13. Once completed, we will begin our Post-Screening Q&A Discussion for approximately 15-30 minutes.

14. After the discussion, you will place your completed research packet on the table in the back of the room.

15. At the back of the room, will also be a blank consent form for you to take with you and you may swipe your WKUID if necessary. Afterwards, you are free to leave.

16. Now that I have explained tonight’s procedure, please go ahead and finish filling out your Consent Form and Pre-Screening Survey.

17. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE ASK.

18. Introduction of the Film

19. Begin the Screening

20. After the screening, please go ahead and take 5-10 minutes to complete your Post-Screening Survey at this time. Don’t hesitate to ask any questions.

21. Now we will move onto the Post-Screening Discussion questions. This is an informal discussion so feel free to answer openly.

22. Now that we have finished the discussion, please place your completed research packet on the table at the back of the room and pick up your blank consent form.

23. If you need to swipe your WKUID, the swiper is on the back table. Otherwise, you are free to leave.

24. Thank you for attending and participating in the [insert # of screening it is] of the Gender Images & Sustainability Fall Film Series. Our next screening will be on [insert information for the next screening here].
**Document 8: SGA Bill to “Receive Funding for a sustainability film festival”**

First Reading: September 18th  
Second Reading: September 25th  
Pass: YES  
Fail:  
Other:  

Bill 6-18-F. Funding for a sustainability film festival.

**PURPOSE:** For the Student Government Association of Western Kentucky University to allocate $450 to fund the sustainability film festival.

**WHEREAS:** $400 will come from Senate discretionary and will be used to obtain the rights to show the film and promote the event, and

$50 will come from the food budget and be used to purchase snacks, and

The film festival will be co-sponsored with Gender and Woman Studies Department and provide an educational opportunity for students to learn about sustainability, and

All funds not used will be returned to Senate discretionary.

**THEREFORE:** Be it resolved that the Student Government Association of Western Kentucky University will allocate $450.

**AUTHORS:** Chelsea Faught  
Jayden Thomas

**SPONSOR:** Sustainability Committee

**CONTACTS:** Jayden Thomas, Sustainability Chair.
Document 9: Demographic Data Results for the Pre-Screening Survey for all 129 Participants

Figure 14: Results of PreSQ1A Age - What is your age?

Figure 15: PreSQ1A Gender - What is your gender?

Figure 16: PreSQ1B – What is your ethnic identity?
Figure 17: PreSQ1C – Do you live in Warren County, Kentucky?

Figure 18: PreSQ1D – Do you live on or off of Western Kentucky University's campus?

Figure 19: PreSQ1E – Do you commute to Western Kentucky University’s campus?

Figure 20: PreSQ1F – What is your current university level?
Figure 21: PreSQ1H – Which best describes the area where you are from?

Figure 22: PreSQ11 – What is your household or your parent’s household income?

0=N/A
1=Less than $20,000
2=$20,000 to $34,999
3=$35,000 to $49,999
4=$50,000 to $74,999
5=$75,999 to $99,999
6=Over $100,000

0=N/A
1=Urban
2=Peri-Urban
3=Suburban
4=Rural