Counteracting wildfire misinformation

Gavin M Jones[1,2*], Emily K Vraga[3], Paul F Hessburg[4], Matthew D Hurteau[2], Craig D Allen[2], Robert E Keane[5], Thomas A Spies[6], Malcolm P North[7,8], Brandon M Collins[9], Mark A Finney[5], Jamie M Lydersen[10], and A Leroy Westerling[11]

[1]USFS Rocky Mountain Research Station, Albuquerque, NM [*](gavin.jones@usda.gov); [2]University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM; [3]University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN; [4]USFS Pacific Northwest Research Station, Wenatchee, WA; [5]USFS Rocky Mountain Research Station, Missoula, MT; [6]USFS Pacific Northwest Research Station, Corvallis, OR; [7]USFS Pacific Southwest Research Station, Mammoth Lakes, CA; [8]University of California–Davis, Davis, CA; [9]University of California–Berkeley, Berkeley, CA; [10]California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Sacramento, CA; [11]University of California–Merced, Merced, CA

Front Ecol Environ 2022; 20(7): 392–393, doi:10.1002/fee.2553

Recent intense fire seasons in Australia, Borneo, South America, Africa, Siberia, and western North America have displaced large numbers of people, burned tens of millions of hectares, and generated societal urgency to address the wildfire problem (Bowman *et al.* 2020). Nearly all terrestrial ecosystems, however, burn with some degree of regularity, timing, and intensity; fire is a natural process. Wildfires are strongly influenced by climate and weather, which in turn shape the availability and flammability of fuels (Abatzoglou and Williams 2016). Yet rapid climate change is interacting with land-use legacies (eg fire suppression), transforming both wildfire and ecosystems (Coop *et al.* 2020; Hagmann *et al.* 2021). Like misinformation about climate, misinformation about wildfire has flourished in the media and in political discourse.

Misinformation is incorrect or misleading evidence or discourse that counters best available science or expert consensus on a topic (Vraga and Bode 2020). Vulnerability to misinformation is often driven by distrust in media and institutions, and exacerbated by rapid spread over social media. By obstructing solutions to public health (eg COVID-19, childhood immunizations, tobacco use) and environmental issues (eg climate change), misinformation deters effective policy responses to societal threats.

Wildfire mitigation requires accurate information about drivers of wildfire change, the impacts to society and ecosystems, and actions that alter trends. Misinformation confuses people about the causes, contexts, and impacts of wildfire and substantially hinders society's ability to proactively adapt to and plan for inevitable future fires. With limited workforces and budgets, public land managers face hard choices about implementing strategies to reduce fire risk. With strong public support and investment, rapid progress toward improving ecological and social resilience to wildfire is possible (Stephens *et al.* 2020). Yet public support is undercut by apprehension over management actions due to misinformation campaigns or past actions that led to broken trust.

Science is an imperfect, self-correcting process, relying on continuous hypothesis, method, and data development. Given imperfection and associated uncertainties, how should science inform policy and management? As knowledge accrues, facts align and holistic understanding improves, allowing for robust frameworks of evidence when more studies confirm, and fewer refute, findings over time. These robust frameworks provide vital nuance and more accurately inform management or policy debates. In active research areas with high rates of knowledge generation and exchange, some architects of misinformation might use a cloak of scientific credentials to advance their agendas via less well-supported science (Pielke 2007).

Misinformation often includes partial truths, which are central to its successful spread. An illusion of legitimacy omits critical contextual information, which is strengthened when the misinformation permeates high-profile popular press outlets. Misinformation's wide reach can mislead policy makers, further eroding public support for broad-based fire policies.

The scientific literature is not immune to misinformation (West and Bergstrom 2021), which creates a quagmire when used in litigation. Wildfire misinformation in the courts can slow or halt efforts to implement management actions, such as restoring ecologically appropriate fire activity, even when they are based on robust scientific frameworks. Creating perceptions of uncertain wildfire science imitates a misinformation tactic employed by climate-change deniers and tobacco-industry proponents, helping "false experts" sow uncertainty (Cook 2020; Lewandowsky and van der Linden 2021).

Some wildfire misinformation originates from distilling complex wildfire science into generalizations that rarely apply everywhere. Appropriate management interventions differ widely across ecosystems, but wildfire misinformation often blurs these lines too. Wildfire communication best practices include appropriate recognition of natural variability and complexity within and among ecosystems. Oversimplification of complex wildfire causes and consequences, particularly when perpetuated by public figures or scientist-advocates, muddies public perceptions of appropriate management. Yet even well-intentioned scientists, managers, or policy makers can unwittingly spread this form of wildfire misinformation.

The cyclical nature of wildfire misinformation presents opportunities to anticipate and prepare "prebunking" strategies, which can combat wildfire misinformation before it spreads. Prebunking warns of the potential for misinformation and explains why it is false. It can help the public, policy

makers, and land managers prepare for common forms of wildfire misinformation, and "debunk", or deftly respond to misinformation when it begins spreading.

Prebunking is most effective when it occurs *before* misinformation gains traction and the framing of the discourse is set (Lewandowsky and van der Linden 2021). We present and prebunk several examples of wildfire misinformation (WebTable 1) that, based on our collective experience in wildfire science, can lead to social and political inaction, increased distrust, and/or misinformed reactions – all of which can aggravate wildfire risks. These examples focus on wildfire misinformation primarily (but not exclusively) related to dry forests of western North America. Additional references can be found in WebPanel 1.

Prebunking and debunking misinformation are first steps toward ensuring that policy makers, journalists, judges, members of the public, and elected officials are skeptical of weakly supported scientific information, which can hinder effective wildfire management.

Pre- and debunking also require identifying reliable messengers. Scientific credentials are not always an indicator of neutrality. Some scientists use their credentials to advocate for specific policy outcomes that they support personally, which may or may not be driven by robust frameworks of evidence. When considering policy options, information consumers must carefully distinguish recommendations by "issue advocates" (Pielke 2007) from those derived from robust portfolios of evidence.

Reliable sources have relevant "domain expertise" (specialist knowledge) as well as the trust of many subject-matter experts *and* their audience. Predetermining trusted sources who can anticipate misinformation and relate clear messages to journalists and news media (prebunking), or activate in response to misinformation (debunking), requires partnerships between scientists, land managers, and journalists.

A continually changing media ecosystem presents challenges and opportunities to mitigating the spread of misinformation. Here, journalists and news organizations have a weighty responsibility, playing a critical and often insufficient role in reducing misinformation. During the scientific publication process, journal editors and reviewers who assess manuscripts undergoing peer review must be vigilant of wildfire misinformation, the identification of which requires adequate domain expertise; prospective authors must provide sufficient scholarly context and caveats; and all participants need to engage in respectful dialogue when corrections are necessary.

Common misinformation techniques undermine well-established scientific consensus by promoting false experts and false narratives, while often creating impossible expectations about needed evidence (Cook 2020). Journalists and editors can employ "weight-of-evidence" approaches when offering competing perspectives about the causes or consequences of wildfires, ensuring that outlying perspectives are not given equal weight to robust well-established frameworks. For example, misinformation about climate change spreads by repeated overexposure of "climate contrarians" whose media visibility far outweighs the quality of their science or scientific credentials (Petersen *et al.* 2019). Overexposure of "wildfire contrarians" in media can similarly result in public confusion and weakened support for appropriate interventions.

Social media can disseminate wildfire misinformation, but can also be employed to mitigate its influence. Journalists, scientists, and policy makers must be wary of pressures to overstate or oversimplify complicated wildfire issues to garner attention in a competitive media ecosystem (West and Bergstrom 2021). Experts and members of the public can reduce misperceptions by correcting wildfire misinformation when encountered. Social media platforms can label or demote wildfire misinformation or promote accurate information, echoing recent efforts to address public health misinformation during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Changing our relationship with fire and the risks we face in the 21st century requires understanding human behavior as much as it does managing ecosystems. We must learn to deal with misinformation about wildfire and develop strategies for limiting its impact on our ability to implement effective wildfire policies.

The findings and conclusions in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent any official USDA or US Government determination or policy.

Abatzoglou JT and Williams AP. 2016. Impact of anthropogenic climate change on wildfire across western US forests. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **113**: 11770–05.

Bowman DMJS, Kolden CA, Abatzoglou JT, *et al.* 2020. Vegetation fires in the Anthropocene. *Nat Rev Earth Environ* **1**: 500–15.

Cook J. 2020. Deconstructing climate science denial. In: Holmes D and Richardson LM (Eds). Research Handbook on Communicating Climate Change. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Coop JD, Parks SA, Stevens-Rumann CS, *et al.* 2020. Wildfire-driven forest conversion in western North American landscapes. *BioScience* **70**: 659–73.

Hagmann RK, Hessburg PF, Prichard SJ, *et al.* 2021. Evidence for widespread changes in the structure, composition, and fire regimes of western North American forests. *Ecol Appl* **31**: e02431.

Lewandowsky S and van der Linden S. 2021. Countering misinformation and fake news through inoculation and prebunking. *Eur Rev Soc Psychol* **32**: 348–84.

Petersen AM, Vincent EM, and Westerling ALR. 2019. Discrepancy in scientific authority and media visibility of climate change scientists and contrarians. *Nat Commun* **10**: 3502.

Pielke Jr. RA. 2007. The honest broker. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Stephens SL, Westerling ALR, Hurteau MD, *et al.* 2020. Fire and climate change: conserving seasonally dry forests is still possible. *Front Ecol Environ* **18**: 354–60.

Vraga EK and Bode L. 2020. Defining misinformation and understanding its bounded nature: using expertise and evidence for describing disinformation. *Polit Commun* **37**: 136–44.

West JD and Bergstrom CT. 2021. Misinformation in and about science. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **118**: e1912444117.