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Meaningful communication with the general public around the current and future impacts of climate change is complex, challenging and politicised. Environment and climate-focused agencies have been leading the charge on climate messaging for many years. In more recent times, however, as increasing evidence demonstrates the link between the changing climate and disasters worldwide, more humanitarian actors are joining the conversation.

“The sector has struggled with what it means to connect the humanitarian agenda with the climate agenda.”

This paper analyses how humanitarian agencies are communicating on climate change, and seeks to provide guidance on how the humanitarian sector can enhance messaging on climate change to promote wider engagement and action within the general public.

**Methodology**

The infographic below shows the methodology used for this research.

- 54 documents reviewed
- 12 interviews
- Partnership with The Behavioural Architects, experts at applying the insights from the Behavioural Sciences to communications

**Applying behavioural science**

In order to change behaviour, we must understand it. Behavioural science provides us with principles and concepts that can be used to gain a better understanding of behaviour and equip us to more effectively encourage change.

Behavioural science acknowledges the inherent biases in the way humans process information to make judgements and decisions. Behavioural science concepts are fundamentally important to understanding and influencing climate change behaviours.

Individuals, organisations and politicians express sincere intentions to behave in ways that will reduce climate change, but there is insufficient follow-through. To mitigate climate change, beliefs and behaviours must shift.

**Audience**

The primary audience for this paper is humanitarian agencies that communicate with an Australian audience, but the principles of communication and the framework can be adapted and contextualised for agencies in a variety of contexts.

**Limitations**

Public perception and engagement on climate issues is diverse and context dependent. Data has been gathered from agencies that have a global focus and have applied strategies in other contexts, in order to draw lessons that can be contextualised for Australian stakeholders.
The link between human-induced climate change and increasing humanitarian needs is well recognised; data demonstrates that it is our most pressing global problem. A recent report from the International Federation of the Red Cross Red Crescent (IFRC) estimates that by 2050, without significant action to curb human-induced climate change, 200 million people could need humanitarian aid as a result of climate-related disasters and associated socio-economic shocks. This figure is almost twice the number that required assistance due to climate-related factors in 2018. In January 2020, a World Weather Attribution report found that human-induced climate change has increased the likelihood of conditions similar to those experienced during the 2019–20 Australian bushfires by 30% since 1900. That is, some elements that caused the severity of the bushfires are directly attributable to human’s impact on the global climate.

Whilst the evidence base continues to demonstrate the links, corralling public opinion to promote individual and collective action to reduce climate change remains a battleground for humanitarians.

Why not? Perceived barriers to climate communication in the humanitarian sector

1 Neutrality and the politicisation of climate change

Humanitarian agencies fear they may jeopardise relationships with their donors and supporters if they take a hard-line stance on the issues.

2 Emergency messaging is too frightening or overwhelming

Humanitarians are hesitant to add another emergency to the list of growing global priorities. Several studies have shown that alarmist fear appeals are generally not effective in stimulating climate action, and often lead people to disengage.

3 Issue fatigue and information overload

Research shows that there is increasing awareness of climate change in Australia, but this is coupled with increasing fatigue – people do not know what they can do about the issue. Additionally, inconsistent messaging can lead to information overload, because people often have trouble interpreting climate data.
WHEN?

Is the timing right?

There are four main reasons why now is the time for humanitarian agencies to improve their public messaging on climate change for action, as highlighted in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion has shifted significantly</td>
<td>In Australia, public opinion consistently shows acceptance of the importance of climate change. In addition to more awareness and acceptance, recognition of the link between extreme weather and human actions is building.</td>
<td>Australian perspectives have shifted. Acceptance of the concept of human-induced climate change in Australia increased from 64% in 2012 to 77% in 2019.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The global movement is gathering speed</td>
<td>2020 has been a year of momentous progress in the global movement against climate change.</td>
<td>The 2015 Global Climate March was attended by approximately 785,000 people worldwide; the September 2019 Climate Strike was attended by an estimated 4 million.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bushfires brought the issue home</td>
<td>A January 2020 study as part of the Climate of the Nation report found that direct experiences of bushfire and smoke increased concern about climate change and support for action on climate.</td>
<td>83% of people affected by the bushfires agreed that they were a wakeup call for the world about the impacts of climate change.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19 has made impact tangible</td>
<td>Whilst we know that COVID-19 has devastated lives and livelihoods across the globe, the lockdown has provided some positive stories about environmental regeneration and reversal of climate change impacts. This helps us to see that change is possible.</td>
<td>Global emissions could be 8% lower in 2020 than 2019.21 In Australia, our lockdowns and restricted movement have triggered an estimated fall in peak daily emissions of 28%.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the sector saying?

Whilst an increasing number of humanitarian agencies have some level of public-facing communication on climate change, few have wide-reaching campaigns, particularly in Australia.

Most Australian-based humanitarian organisations reference climate change in some way on their websites, via press releases, programming updates and (most often) links to detailed reports. Research has shown that people are already overwhelmed by the problem of climate change. As such, presenting large, detailed reports on climate issues is unlikely to motivate engagement and change behaviour. Additionally, in some cases, these resources are not highly visible amongst the plethora of other issues being communicated.

Of the 14 major international development and humanitarian agencies with a presence in Australia, only 35% have accessible public-facing communications on climate change with a clear call to action.

The messaging across organisations is extremely varied, but generally targets a specific sector audience. Agencies use four main approaches in their communications, as Table 2 shows.

Table 2: Climate change communication approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact: What is happening?</strong></td>
<td>Impact studies focus on vulnerable populations and demonstrate links between climate change and other priority issues, including forced migration, children and women’s rights, protection, food insecurity and increased conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response: What are they doing to address it?</strong></td>
<td>Most organisations profile the work they are doing to combat climate change, such as disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation programming. These projects are designed to diminish specific drivers of vulnerability and build response capacity and resilience among local communities to adapt to the impacts of changing climate and more frequent and severe disasters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy: What are the guiding frameworks, policies and dialogues?</strong></td>
<td>High-level policy analysis targets governments and politicians and offers recommendations for upcoming policy forums, including UNFCC Conference of the Parties, the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, G20 Summit, and the Pacific Island Forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy: What change needs to happen, by whom, and how?</strong></td>
<td>Some organisations call for significant policy reform, including emissions reductions and increased climate financing. Additionally, 35% of humanitarian organisations in Australia ask readers to donate, sign a petition or contact their member of parliament about climate action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tone of the communications varies. Some agencies leverage the fact they are well placed to draw on emotional appeals for their public-facing climate communications, both in terms of inciting fear and compassion. However, in efforts to remain neutral and evidence based, some agencies rely heavily on statistics and facts.

Using different tones

**Fear**

“Our country is in flames.” Drought and increased temperatures have contributed to catastrophic bushfire conditions. The scientific evidence is indisputable – there is a link between the tragedy we are now experiencing and climate change. If a country like Australia can experience this scale of disaster, what risks are faced in countries with less capacity to respond and recover? We must take collective responsibility and action.

**Compassion**

“I am from Tuvalu, the peaceful and beautiful country which the media identify as a sinking nation. We are not sinking, we are fighting for our rights to life and to remain on our islands. Today I see that our rights to our lands and seas are being destroyed. People are being displaced. It is a big challenge to our health, our wellbeing, and to our rights as humans.”

**Facts**

- In 2015, weather-related disasters displaced around 14.7 million people, almost twice the number of people (8.6 million) that fled conflict and violence.
- By one estimate, in the long term, sea-level rise resulting from 2°C of warming could submerge land that is currently home to 280 million people.
- Today, 45 million people are already estimated to be hungry because of climate change.
WHO?

Who is the audience?

Most agencies communicating on climate change are doing so with members of the public who are already on board and alarmed at the situation. This group comprises approximately 17% of the Australian population. In order to enact change, a broader range of individuals must be reached.

A study that tracked Australian household perspectives on climate change between 2011 and 2016 re-affirmed the six primary audience segments identified by the Yale Program on Climate Change Communication. These segments help understand where message receivers sit on the spectrum of acceptance vs action. A project is currently underway to update the ‘Six Australias’, and provide a simple framework to tailor communications to each of the audiences.

Six different types of believers in the Australian public

- **Dismissive**: Very sure it is not happening. Actively involved as opponents of efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- **Doubtful**: Split among believers, non-believers and those that aren’t sure. Many believe if it is happening, it is caused by natural changes in the environment, won’t harm people for many decades, and say that enough is being done to respond to the threat.
- **Disengaged**: Haven’t thought much about the issue at all, don’t know much about it, and are the most likely to say they could easily change their minds about global warming.
- **Concerned**: Convinced that global warming is happening and a serious issue, but are yet to engage with it personally.
- **Cautious**: Believe climate change is a problem, but are less certain than others. They don’t view it as a personal threat, and don’t feel a sense of urgency to deal with it.
- **Alarmed**: Fully convinced of the reality and seriousness of climate change. Already taking multiple actions to address it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dismissive</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubtful</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautious</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarmed</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Denial**  **Inaction**  **Action**  **Acceptance**
Current advice on messaging to the different groups suggests tailoring specific campaigns to each audience segment in line with the approaches identified in Table 3 below.33

Table 3: Effectively targeting different groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alarmed</th>
<th>Concerned</th>
<th>Cautious</th>
<th>Disengaged</th>
<th>Doubtful</th>
<th>Dismissive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience, hope, vision</td>
<td>Climate science efficacy (how we can solve this)</td>
<td>Climate literacy, up-to-date, localised information</td>
<td>Climate literacy plus economic benefits of energy independence</td>
<td>Non-persuasive messages, benefits of reduced pollution</td>
<td>Social welfare, economic and scientific developments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experienced agencies, particularly those from the climate and environment movements, target their efforts to individuals sitting in the middle of the spectrum (i.e. the cautious, disengaged and doubtful), rather than those who are dismissive.34 The dismissive segment is a rapidly declining group in Australia. Focusing efforts on those whose opinions are more easily influenced is likely to be more effective.35 There are also opportunities to tailor asks or suggested actions within these groups. For example, alarmed and concerned audiences may be easily motivated to reduce their personal emissions, whilst behaviour changes within doubtful audiences may resonate more when linked to personal motivations.

**Staff are members of the public, too**

’If our messaging isn’t understood internally, we can’t send it out externally.’36

Most messaging from humanitarian agencies on climate change is tailored to an external audience, inherently assuming that the internal audience both understand and agree that climate change is a humanitarian issue. However, this is not necessarily the case.37 Humanitarian agencies undertaking climate messaging campaigns should couple external communication with internal communication. It is vital to ensure that messages are understood by and resonate with leadership, management, staff and volunteers. Without internal advocates and understanding, external wins will be harder to come by.38
How can we learn from the climate and environmental movements?

Environmental organisations have been communicating publicly on climate change to change behaviours for many years. The humanitarian sector can learn a lot from environmental campaigns and research about which messages resonate with which audiences.

‘Campaigns that use stories of doom and gloom to sway behaviour are fairly common but rarely successful; people are generally good at ignoring or rationalising away inconvenient information.’

Tips and tricks from the environmental sector

- Audiences generally care about local climate change information rather than national and global information.
- Messages must be delivered by trusted sources; identified trusted messengers include not only climate scientists, but farmers, firefighters, paramedics, doctors and nurses.
- Climate change risks should be communicated in conventional language, avoiding technical terms.
- Positive framing allows the audience to see the ability of people to solve the challenge and urgency to accelerate action.
- Use facts to frame necessary action, not just describe the problem; employ explanatory chains. Start with cause, lead people through effects and end with solutions.
- It is important to emphasise outcomes over process; sell the vision, not the transition.
How can we work together?

‘[We need to] work better with the broader climate movement. We’re all kind of pushing similar messages but not always talking from the same page.’

As the environmental movement is further along the journey than most humanitarian agencies, there is an opportunity to coordinate messages and approaches. For example, the IFRC has recently succeeded in establishing a partnership with two environmental non-profit organisations to cross-post messages on social media. This helped to strengthen messages, increase followers and educate a wider audience about the human impacts of the changing climate.

‘The humanitarian voice is different from the environmental voice. Both have merit. We should align very closely.’

In Australia, the Climate Action Network Australia (CANA) is a diverse membership-based network which acts as a conduit for the climate movement to plan and strategise together. In 2019 the network had 87 member organisations, of which seven were global justice organisations. Two humanitarian agencies, Oxfam and ActionAid, are members.

Coordinating across actors that are communicating on climate change is also important to mitigate risks and negative consequences to the broader movement. Other humanitarian agencies that intend to increase their focus on climate communications should be encouraged to join and therefore strengthen the work of CANA.

Complementarity is key

‘Inconsistency [between organisations] can be really damaging - it can cause the media to focus on discrepancies and can fuel misinformation and ‘fake news’ type arguments.’

A coordinated and complementary approach to climate messaging will be more effective in motivating action amongst multiple audiences. It is vital that humanitarian actors do not undermine but rather strengthen the efforts and messages from environmental and climate actors. As well as working with environmental and climate focussed agencies, humanitarian actors can work better together to ensure that public-facing messages are consistent from the humanitarian perspective. Working through existing mechanisms, such as established ACFID working groups, can collectively strengthen climate messaging.
This section provides key considerations for humanitarian agencies in their climate communications and the relevant alignment with behavioural science principles.

Behavioural science has helped us to understand how people think, how they perceive things and, ultimately, what factors might influence their decision-making and behaviour. Further, behavioural science has defined concepts and frameworks that can significantly improve the impact of communications. Behavioural science approaches provide us with simple tools for a more systematic approach to effective communication.

**KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN AGENCIES**

1. **Positive framing**

   “[Overall all our messaging [on climate] has a positive message. It has a sense of hope – it has a better response from our audience than scare tactics.”

   Positively framed emotional appeals are likely to be more effective than alarmist strategies. Messaging that targets specific emotions and feelings can engage powerful areas of the brain that are responsible for decision-making. As such, carefully crafted, positive messages can change opinions and can promote decisions to change behaviours.

   **Behavioural science principle: Framing**

   **Definition:** Our decisions and preferences are affected by how information is presented to us. The emotional references leaked by particular words can make some features more salient.

   **Implication:** Positively framed emotional appeals are likely to be more effective. Additionally, new research suggests that linking environmentally friendly goals to people’s pre-existing values, identity and personal goals can encourage more sustainable behaviours.
2. Focus on human stories

“The human stories of how people are threatened and how their lives are impacted are all very relevant. Australians relate through personal connections – e.g. through the Pacific through their travels.”

Human stories are a central focus of communications personnel working in the humanitarian sector. Humanitarian agencies can bring this unique perspective to the climate conversation. The Communications Handbook for IPCC Scientists sets out six principles for effective communication, targeted at scientists communicating on climate change. The fourth of the six principles, ‘Tell a Human Story’, reaffirms that the vast majority of people engage with the world through stories, so ensuring that a human face and narrative leads the presentation of information is key to the message being received.

Behavioural science principle: Identifiable victim effect

Definition: We are more likely to respond and give support to relieving the plight of a single, identifiable victim suffering hardship than we are to large statistically defined groups of sufferers.

Implication: This reaffirms the importance of sharing human stories. It can be helpful to ground your narrative with profiles from affected communities to evoke a stronger emotive response and provoke action.
3. Help your audience connect global to local

‘[We can be] better at connecting global to local instead of seeing it against each other; climate change doesn’t have boundaries; what we do can’t happen in a vacuum. [It’s important to] act in solidarity and stay connected to the rest of the world.’

Humanitarians can leverage their global networks and stories from their programs in communities affected by climate change worldwide. There is, however, an important step in linking global issues with local connections and solutions, as evidence shows that all audiences care about local impacts of climate change, whereas only some care about international and global impacts. Contextualising global stories and ensuring they speak to people’s realities can optimise engagement, buy-in, and ultimately action. The Australian Climate Media Centre makes a useful distinction that can support humanitarian framing: ‘Climate change is a global problem. Climate action is a local solution.’

---

**Behavioural science principle: Chunking**

**Definition:** Sometimes we can be overwhelmed by a goal. It can seem too huge or distant or complex to know where to begin or find any motivation to start. Breaking something down into sections (chunking) helps us keep motivated because we know what and how much more we have to do to reach our goal.

**Implication:** Within a communications journey it is important to chunk down any requests of your audience for specific behaviours; ensure you are simplifying and asking only one thing at a time. Within a single communication itself, it is important to break down information into bite-size chunks to improve comprehension.
4. Communicate in line with humanitarian principles

“We can allow others to do big advocacy and activities and for us to still more closely communicate in line with our humanitarian principles.”

Humanitarian agencies are well placed to communicate around climate change in a way that retains humanitarian principles at the core. The climate change space is inherently political, but remaining neutral and apolitical in climate communications ensures that messages do not risk polarising or isolating some audience segments. There is space in the broader network of agencies seeking to shift behaviours on climate change to take tougher political stances, but this approach may not be best suited to humanitarian agencies.

**Behavioural science principle: Social norms**

**Definition:** People typically follow the behaviours they believe are commonplace. We have a tendency to adopt the opinions and follow the behaviours of the majority.

**Implication:** There is an opportunity to correlate increasing climate change mitigation behaviours and humanitarian principles. To leverage the power of social norms we need to identify the positive climate change behaviours that are the norm or show how certain climate change behavioural norms are changing, with more people taking positive steps in tackling climate change.

“It’s important for the humanitarian sector to stand on its own values; unique voices will appeal to different listeners. We need different voices of moral authority to drive the conversation.”
5. Weave evidence into your narrative

“The combination of narrative with hard scientific facts weaves a story and makes it stronger.”

Grounding a strong story in evidence is an important strategy. As the debate around climate change can be politicised with claims, attribution and speculation about the impact of climate change, ensuring audiences can ground messages and actions in evidence is vital. Whilst quantitative data resonates, it does not always need to be front and centre. Emotion is what people remember, but credibility must be maintained.

🌟 Behavioural science principle: Salience

**Definition:** Salience is the state or condition of being prominent. The salience of an item is what makes it stand out relative to its neighbours.

**Implication:** Demonstrate the tangible impact certain behaviours have on the climate change goal. It can be difficult for people to imagine how their small action will have an effect on such large goals. Grounding these targets with credible evidence allows the message to stand out as trustworthy amidst a sea of climate communications.

‘Believable, convincing stories are what’s needed, and facts allow the listener to find purchase and hold onto it. Facts are vital for justifications and as filler in the story we need to tell.’
6. Anchor messages to clear visions, simple messages, and concrete actions

‘Things that lead with a vision play better than those that just point out the problem.’

Many people are overwhelmed when thinking about the enormity of climate change issues. This is inherently disempowering, because people feel that there is nothing that they can do to fix the problem. Therefore, it is essential that agencies lead their messages with a clear, positive vision. By leading with a vision, we bring salience to the solution (empowering) rather than the problem (overwhelming). People often suffer from general information overload regarding climate change messages, leading them to disengage because it is too cognitively draining. We need clear simple messages, repeated consistently, to create new heuristics. In order to motivate behaviour change, these messages should be linked with specific actions and concrete targets.

**Behavioural science principle: Anchoring**

**Definition:** When making decisions, people look for anchors or reference points they know and can rely on and adjust from this point.

**Implication:** Be strict about what reference points you include in your communication – too much information and the audience will be overwhelmed. Include a clear anchor point for the goal, and for the precise behaviour that you want people to do to achieve that goal.

‘People will only hear one or two messages, so it needs to be succinct ... ask people to do ONE thing only – something strategic that they can understand.’
7. Figure out what not to say

‘Don’t just fit into the existing mould of public discourse. Scare tactics don’t work for us. Another mistake is myth-busting, we have a tendency to try and correct the misinformation, but that’s a waste, instead we should focus on building our message.’

As important as understanding the key strategies and approaches to climate change communications is also understanding what not to say. Several agencies and campaigns craft messaging guides that provide supplementary information on what messages to avoid saying. For example, the Climate Council of Australia’s Guide to Communicating Climate Change in Australia suggests avoiding several areas, including:

- Avoid reinforcing false debate – climate change is not a topic for debate. Avoiding engaging in a perceived ‘debate’ limits those opposed to action on the grounds of the validity of the science. Rather, focus on shifting the conversation from debate to solutions.
- Avoid the language of belief – communicating in terms such as ‘believing in climate change’ again reinforces the idea that the science comes down to personal acceptance. Rather, the guide suggests framing communications around the fact that most audiences broadly agree that climate change is happening, so focus on explaining impacts and solutions.

Other examples of framing to avoid include catastrophising and speaking in terms of trade-offs (e.g. act now because it will cost more later). Often times, emphasising an intangible and/or frightening future only encourages disengagement.

Furthermore, messages that are seen as being persuasive – that is, intending to change an opinion rather than presenting clear information consistently, have been found to be ineffective with many audience segments.

Being armed with clear guidance on what to avoid can also help individuals and agencies in communicating more confidently.

---

**Behavioural science principle: Cognitive ease**

**Definition:** A person has a natural desire to process information using their system 1 mode of thinking. Cognitive ease is when system 1 is active – intuitive, low effort and automatic.

**Implication:** If the content of the communication is not easy to process, people will disengage. Is the language you are using simple and straightforward? How are you presenting or explaining technical terms? Will your audience understand the language you are using? How might the message and the communication be simplified? How can things be communicated visually?
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