From Awareness to Action: Shifting Attitudes and Behaviours for Responsible Environmental Stewardship

Prepared by Georgy Hadwen; HOPE Senior Researcher (WA) 14/01/2026

Abstract

Despite decades of scientific consensus on climate change and environmental degradation, translating evidence-based knowledge into sustained public support, behavioural change, and durable policy outcomes remains elusive. This article examines why information alone fails to generate collective environmental action and argues that behaviour change is constrained by social identity, political incentives, media dynamics, and institutional design. Drawing on behavioural science, deliberative democracy theory, influencer dynamics, and Australian and global case studies — including the failure of the Voice to Parliament referendum and other environmental policy reversals — the paper advances a framework for responsible environmental stewardship grounded in deliberative participation, credible messengers, and structural alignment between public action and policy systems. The analysis builds directly on Householders' Options to Protect the Environment (HOPE) Inc. research into embedding deliberative democracy within Australian governance regimes.

1. Introduction

Household Options to Protect the Environment (HOPE) Inc. was founded on the recognition that responsible environmental stewardship requires both individual behaviour change and collective political action. While public concern about climate change, biodiversity loss, and environmental degradation has grown steadily, the translation of concern into sustained behavioural and policy outcomes remains inconsistent and fragile.

This article addresses a core challenge confronting HOPE's mission: why do evidence-based environmental arguments fail to produce lasting change, even when scientific consensus is strong and public concern is high? This paper argues, that answers lie not in public ignorance, but in the interaction between behavioural psychology, political incentives, media systems, and institutional design.

The author situates environmental stewardship within democratic practice. This draws on deliberative democracy principles developed in *Report on Embedding Deliberative Democracy Principles and Practices into Governance Regimes in Australia* (Hadwen, 2025 [Hope 1/2025], which argues durable environmental action depends on participatory processes to foster agency, trust, and collective responsibility.

2. The Knowledge–Action Paradox in Environmental Governance

2.1 Why Scientific Consensus Is Not Enough

Environmental policy is often framed as a problem of communication: if people better understood the science, they would support stronger action. However, decades of research (Ajzen, 1991; Stern, 2000; Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Bamberg & Möser, 2007) demonstrate that knowledge is a weak predictor of behaviour when acting alone. Individuals routinely hold accurate beliefs about environmental risks while continuing behaviours that exacerbate those risks. These foundational works are widely cited in environmental psychology, behavioural economics, and policy studies and underpin contemporary critiques of information-deficit models in environmental governance.

This paradox reflects the reality that environmental decisions are embedded in everyday routines, economic constraints, and social expectations. Household energy use, transport choices, and it appears consumption patterns are shaped rather less by abstract knowledge than by habit, convenience, and perceived norms and the social need to conform.

2.2 Australian Context

Australia illustrates this contradiction clearly. Surveys consistently show high levels of concern about climate change, reinforced by lived experience of bushfires, floods, and droughts. Yet policy responses have been uneven, and public support has not translated into stable bipartisan consensus or long-term policy continuity and often led by short term economic dog whistles which throw collective doubt on human impact on climate change.

This disjunction has contributed to public cynicism: when individuals perceive that governments are unwilling or unable to act consistently, motivation for personal sacrifice or behavioural change diminishes.

3. Behavioural Drivers of Environmental Action

3.1 Identity, Values, and Moral Framing

Behavioural research shows that people are more likely to act when environmental responsibility aligns with their identity and values. aligns with their identity and values (Stern, 2000; Steg & Vlek, 2009; Whitmarsh & O’Neill, 2010). Framing stewardship in terms of care for family, community resilience, and fairness across generations… (Corner et al., 2014; Kahan et al., 2012). Framing stewardship in terms of care for family, community resilience, and fairness across generations is often more effective than abstract appeals to global responsibility.

However, identity can also act as a barrier. When environmental action is framed as associated with particular political or cultural groups, it may provoke resistance rather than engagement among those who feel excluded or threatened by that identity.

3.2 Social Norms and Collective Expectations

Perceived norms — beliefs about what others value and do — exert a powerful influence on behaviour. Individuals are more likely to adopt sustainable practices when they believe these behaviours are normal, expected, and socially rewarded.

Conversely, when environmental action is portrayed as marginal or contested, individuals may hesitate to act even when personally supportive. This dynamic has profound implications for public communication strategies.

3.3 Collective Efficacy and Responsibility

Environmental challenges are frequently framed as overwhelming, contributing to disengagement and fatalism. Behaviour change is more likely when people believe that collective action can meaningfully influence outcomes and that individual contributions are recognised within a broader system of change.

4. Deliberative Democracy as a Mechanism for Change

4.1 Deliberative Democracy in HOPE Research

HOPE's deliberative democracy research (Hadwen, 2025), positions *structured public deliberation* as a response to declining trust, polarisation, and disengagement in Australian governance; placing an emphasis on inclusive participation, evidence-informed dialogue, and collective reflection on values and trade-offs.

Rather than treating citizens as passive recipients of policy, deliberative processes recognise them as co-authors of collective decisions. This transference is particularly important for environmental policy, where long-term collective interests must be weighed against short-term costs.

4.2 Evidence from Australian and Global Practice

Australian examples such as the Victorian Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change and the ACT Citizens' Jury on insurance reform demonstrate that deliberation can generate informed, legitimate recommendations when properly resourced and institutionally supported. (see Victora.gov.au website)

Globally, countries such as Denmark have institutionalised deliberative bodies, including citizens' assemblies on climate change, to align policy ambition with public values. These processes have helped build legitimacy for difficult policy choices and reduced polarisation.

4.3 Deliberation and Behaviour Change

Deliberative participation strengthens behavioural outcomes by fostering ownership and responsibility. Participants are more likely to support and enact decisions they have helped shape, extending deliberative impacts beyond formal policy into household and

community behaviour. Citizens assemblies have been validated in referendums such as those concerning gay marriage in the Republic of Ireland. The notion of the town square as espoused by Musk could be repurposed to engage people in collective and deliberative democracy

5. Influencer Dynamics and Public Opinion

5.1 Influencers as Contemporary Opinion Leaders

In digital media environments, influencers — including activists, experts, celebrities, and content creators — play a growing role in shaping public understanding of environmental issues. Influencers can translate complex scientific information into accessible narratives, personalise abstract risks, and model pro-environmental behaviour.

- **Influencers shape attitudes and behaviour in consumer and health domains**, especially when:
    - they are *seen as credible and authentic*
    - their content aligns with *audience identity and values*
    - they engage interactively with followers

This pattern has been documented across psychology, marketing, and communication research — and *can be applied to environmental issues*, where attitudes and behaviour have similar cognitive and social antecedents.

Evidence suggests that influencers can act as agents of change when they are perceived as credible, authentic, and aligned with audience values. They are particularly effective at shaping attitudes among younger demographics and disengaged audiences (*Freberg et al., 2011; De Veirman et al., 2017; Hovland & Weiss, 1951*).

5.2 Opportunities and Risks

While influencers can amplify evidence-based messages, they can also spread misinformation. Algorithms that reward engagement may privilege emotionally charged or polarising content, undermining trust in science and institutions.

This dual role highlights the need for organisations such as HOPE to engage selectively with credible messengers while supporting media literacy and critical engagement.

5.3 Integrating Influencers with Deliberative Practice

Influencers are most effective when integrated into broader engagement strategies rather than used as substitutes for deliberation. Influencer-led awareness can act as an entry point, while deliberative forums provide depth, reflection, and collective reasoning.

6. When Behaviour Change Efforts Fail: Comparative Case Studies

6.1 The Voice to Parliament Referendum (Australia)

The failure of the 2023 Voice to Parliament referendum illustrates the limits of information-heavy campaigns without sustained deliberative engagement. Despite expert endorsement and moral appeals, many voters reported confusion, uncertainty, and distrust. Because human psychology is rooted in insecurity concerns, the counter argument sowed a climate of fear and distrust with the instruction to vote against – the default position in most societies alongside an implicit awareness of the illegality of occupation in much of Australia.

Key factors included limited opportunities for structured deliberation, widespread misinformation, lack of bipartisan leadership, and low institutional trust. The case demonstrates how complex, values-based proposals struggle without participatory processes that allow citizens to interrogate evidence and implications collectively.

6.2 Environmental Policy Reversals: Carbon Pricing

Australia's repeal of carbon pricing provides a parallel environmental case. Despite economic modelling and expert consensus, the policy became politically polarised, framed as a cost-of-living threat rather than a collective investment. Absence of durable social consensus left the policy vulnerable to electoral change weaponised against a female prime minister who was attacked along gender lines to achieve U turn to appease big business.

6.3 Lessons from Failure

These cases reveal common patterns: reliance on elite messaging, underinvestment in deliberation, susceptibility to misinformation, and misalignment between public concern and political incentives. Behaviour changes efforts fail when individuals are asked to trust systems, they do not feel part of.

7. Implications for HOPE and Environmental Stewardship

HOPE's commitment to responsible environmental stewardship is strengthened by recognising that behaviour change is a systemic and political challenge, not a deficit of knowledge or concern. The evidence reviewed above — from behavioural science, deliberative democracy practice, influencer dynamics, and failed reform efforts — points to the need for integrated strategies that reconnect individual action with collective power.

Drawing on *Report on Embedding Deliberative Democracy Principles and Practices into Governance Regimes in Australia* (Hadwen, 2025), effective stewardship strategies must combine:

- evidence-based communication;
- participatory and deliberative engagement;
- credible and trusted messengers;
- institutional pathways that convert public will into policy action.

Without this alignment, appeals to individual responsibility risk reinforcing apathy or learned helplessness rather than motivating action.

8. Addressing Apathy and Learned Helplessness: From Awareness to Civil Action

A significant barrier to environmental action is *learned helplessness*: the belief that individual or collective efforts are futile in the face of systemic problems. This condition is reinforced when citizens observe repeated policy failure, political inaction, or the reversal of hard-won reforms — as seen in both environmental policy and broader democratic initiatives. Current reversal of key policies in the USA with specific reference to scientific consensus and climate science, reinforce that progress is not 'progressive' and that reactionary positions lie just below the surface of many government policies.

To counter this, HOPE's work can explicitly frame environmental stewardship within traditions of **civil action, civil disobedience, and enlightened self-interest**. The following action-oriented strategies emerge from the analysis:

Action Plan (Indicative)

- **Reframe self-interest as collective interest**
  Position environmental action as protective of household wellbeing, economic security, health, and intergenerational fairness, rather than as sacrifice alone. This aligns stewardship with rational self-interest.

- **Normalise civic participation beyond voting**
  Emphasise that democratic responsibility includes ongoing engagement — deliberation, protest, advocacy, and community organising — not only periodic electoral participation.

- **Legitimise civil disobedience as a democratic signal**
  Situate non-violent civil disobedience within a democratic tradition that has historically accelerated social and environmental reform when formal channels proved insufficient.

- **Create visible pathways from action to impact**
  Demonstrate how participation — from household change to collective mobilisation — connects to concrete policy influence, reducing perceptions of futility.

- **Use deliberative forums to convert anger into agency**
  Structured deliberation can channel frustration into problem-solving, transforming disengagement into informed collective action.

- **Leverage influencers to model agency, not perfection**
  Encourage credible influencers to demonstrate engagement, uncertainty, and persistence rather than unattainable ideals, reinforcing efficacy over moral purity.

- **Acknowledge grief, loss, and fear explicitly**
  Environmental communication that validates emotional responses can reduce paralysis and open pathways to action.

Together, these approaches address apathy not by moralising behaviour, but by restoring a sense of agency, legitimacy, and shared responsibility.

8. Conclusion

Environmental stewardship is not simply a technical or scientific challenge; it is a democratic one. The core argument here is that durable environmental action requires participatory systems that enable citizens to engage meaningfully with evidence, values, and trade-offs.
Drawing on HOPE's deliberative democracy research and lessons from failed and successful initiatives, it demonstrates that responsible stewardship emerges where trust, agency, and collective responsibility are cultivated together.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.

Bamberg, S., & Möser, G. (2007). Twenty years after Hines, Hungerford, and Tomera: A new meta-analysis of psycho-social determinants of pro-environmental behaviour. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 27(1), 14–25.

Biesta, G. (2020). Risking ourselves in education: Qualification, socialization, and subjectification revisited. *Educational Theory*, 70(1), 89–104.

Chappell, K. (2008). *Creativity research: Diverse perspectives*. University of Exeter Press.

De Veirman, M., Cauberghe, V., & Hudders, L. (2017). Marketing through Instagram influencers: The impact of number of followers and product divergence on brand attitude. International Journal of Advertising, 36(5), 798–828.

Dietz, T., Gardner, G. T., Gilligan, J., Stern, P. C., & Vandenbergh, M. P. (2009). Household actions can provide a behavioural wedge to rapidly reduce U.S. carbon emissions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(44), 18452–18456.

Erdogan, B. Z. (1999). Celebrity endorsement: A literature review. Journal of Marketing Management, 15(4), 291–314.

Freberg, K., Graham, K., McGaughey, K., & Freberg, L. A. (2011). Who are the social media influencers? A study of public perceptions of personality. Public Relations Review, 37(1), 90–92.

Hadwen, G. (2025). *Report on Embedding Deliberative Democracy Principles and Practices into Governance Regimes in Australia*. HOPE Research Report.

Hovland, C. I., & Weiss, W. (1951). The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46(1), 70–74.

Kollmuss, A., & Agyeman, J. (2002). Mind the gap: Why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behaviour? *Environmental Education Research*, 8(3), 239–260.

Massie, J. (2025). Deliberative democracy in practice: Handbooks on commissioning, facilitating, and evaluating deliberative processes. *Journal of Deliberative Democracy*, 21(1).

Niemeyer, S. (2013). Democracy and climate change: What can deliberative democracy contribute? *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 59(3), 429–448.

OECD. (2021). *Eight ways to institutionalise deliberative democracy*. OECD Publishing.

Steg, L., & Vlek, C. (2009). Encouraging pro-environmental behaviour: An integrative review and research agenda. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 29(3), 309–317.

Stern, P. C. (2000). Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behaviour. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(3), 407–424.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Yale University Press.

Tiggemann, M., & Zaccardo, M. (2016). ‘Exercise to be fit, not skinny’: The effect of fitspiration imagery on women’s body image. Body Image, 17, 75–83.