The Journal Of Contemporary Social Sciences (TJCSS)
www.tjcss.org

Aisha Begum
National university Of Modern Languages, Islamabad

Climate Change: Political and Public Perception

Abstract
Climate change, once considered a purely environmental concern, has evolved into a pressing political and public issue with wide-ranging implications. Despite strong scientific consensus affirming the anthropogenic causes of global warming, public perception and political responses vary significantly across regions and ideological spectrums. This divergence often results in fragmented policies and delayed action, further exacerbating environmental degradation. Political ideologies play a critical role in shaping climate narratives, with conservative agendas often emphasizing economic impacts, while progressive platforms advocate for urgent environmental reforms. Media influence—ranging from responsible journalism to misinformation—compounds public confusion and distorts the scientific discourse. In developing nations, public concern is often overshadowed by immediate socio-economic challenges, even though these regions are most vulnerable to climate-induced crises. The study draws on global examples to highlight the critical gaps between knowledge, belief, and action. Bridging these gaps requires a comprehensive strategy that includes climate education, depoliticized discourse, media accountability, and inclusive policymaking. Only by harmonizing scientific understanding with political will and public engagement can societies hope to respond effectively to the climate crisis. This paper underscores the urgent need to transform climate change from a politically contested topic into a universally accepted call for coordinated global action.
Keywords: Climate change, Public perception, Political ideology, Environmental policy, Climate communication, Scientific consensus, Media influence, Misinformation, Climate education, Global response

Introduction

Climate change represents one of the most complex and urgent challenges of the 21st century. Characterized by rising global temperatures, shifting weather patterns, sea-level rise, and increasing frequency of extreme events, its impacts are becoming more visible and severe with each passing year. The scientific consensus is unequivocal: human activity—particularly the burning of fossil fuels, deforestation, and industrial pollution—is the primary driver of these changes. Reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) have consistently warned that without immediate and sustained action, the consequences will be catastrophic for ecosystems, economies, and human societies worldwide.

Despite this overwhelming scientific agreement, responses to climate change vary dramatically across political arenas and among the general public. This inconsistency is not rooted in scientific uncertainty but rather in a complex interplay of political ideology, media influence, economic interests, and public awareness. For many political leaders, particularly in industrialized nations, climate change has become a polarized topic, often framed through

partisan lenses. Where progressive political groups tend to advocate for aggressive climate policies, conservative factions may downplay environmental concerns, arguing that such measures threaten economic growth and national sovereignty.

Public perception is equally fragmented. In some regions, especially those already experiencing the adverse effects of climate change, public concern is high, and there is strong support for climate action. In other areas, particularly where the threat feels distant or abstract, skepticism persists. Factors such as educational background, cultural beliefs, media consumption, and trust in scientific and governmental institutions heavily influence how individuals understand and prioritize climate issues. Moreover, the proliferation of misinformation and the strategic efforts of interest groups to downplay climate science have further confused and divided public opinion.

The media has a dual role to play in this landscape. On the one hand, responsible journalism and science communication can raise awareness and promote informed discourse. On the other hand, sensationalism, false equivalence, and biased reporting—especially on social media platforms—can distort facts and deepen misunderstanding. In many cases, climate denial or apathy is not simply a result of ignorance but of deliberate framing and messaging by political and economic actors who benefit from the status quo.This research paper seeks to explore how climate change is perceived in both political and public spheres, with a focus on the factors that shape these perceptions and the consequences they have for global climate policy. By examining case studies from both developed and developing countries, the paper identifies the roots of perception gaps and their practical implications. It also offers recommendations for aligning public understanding and political will with scientific reality, emphasizing the role of education, media responsibility, and inclusive policymaking.Understanding and addressing the disconnect between science, politics, and the public is essential for crafting effective climate policies. Bridging these gaps is not merely a matter of communication—it is a prerequisite for meaningful, coordinated action against a threat that knows no borders.

2. Scientific Consensus vs. Public Awareness

The scientific consensus on climate change is robust, well-documented, and increasingly urgent. Leading scientific organizations worldwide, including the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), have concluded that climate change is occurring and that human activity is the dominant cause (IPCC, 2023). Studies show that over 97% of actively publishing climate scientists agree on anthropogenic climate change (Cook et al., 2016). Despite this, public understanding of climate science remains uneven and, in many cases, misaligned with the facts.

A key factor contributing to this disconnect is the communication gap between scientists and the general public. Scientific reports often employ technical language and probabilistic assessments that are difficult for lay audiences to interpret. The nuanced way in which science communicates uncertainty can lead to misperception. For example, when scientists express a 95% confidence level about a particular outcome, the public may interpret it as uncertainty rather than near-certainty (Oreskes, 2004).In many countries, public awareness is also shaped by cultural, educational, and ideological factors. Research conducted by the Yale Program on Climate Change Communication shows that individuals' beliefs about climate change are influenced less by their knowledge of science and more by their political identity (Leiserowitz et al., 2021). In

the United States, for example, liberals are significantly more likely than conservatives to believe that climate change is real and caused by human activity. This partisan divide has widened in recent years, making consensus difficult even at the level of public discourse.

Moreover, media representation has played a dual role in shaping public perception. Balanced reporting, a cornerstone of journalistic ethics, can sometimes create false equivalence in scientific debates. By giving equal coverage to climate change deniers and consensus-driven scientists, the media inadvertently suggests that there is a significant scientific dispute when, in reality, the science is settled (Boykoff & Boykoff, 2004). This has resulted in public confusion, with many citizens believing that scientists are divided on the issue.

Social media has further complicated the information landscape. While digital platforms can democratize access to scientific knowledge, they also serve as breeding grounds for misinformation. Algorithms tend to amplify sensational or controversial content, leading to the viral spread of climate skepticism and conspiracy theories (van der Linden et al., 2017). This has particularly dangerous implications in societies with low scientific literacy or where trust in institutions is already fragile.

Education plays a vital role in fostering public understanding of climate science. However, climate change education varies widely between countries and even within regions. In some educational systems, the topic is not addressed at all or is presented with political bias. Strengthening curriculum standards and teacher training is essential to improve scientific literacy and empower citizens to engage critically with climate information.

Bridging the gap between scientific consensus and public awareness requires a multi-pronged approach. Scientists must adopt more accessible and engaging communication strategies. Governments and NGOs should invest in public education campaigns that use clear language and culturally relevant messaging. Media institutions must also take responsibility for fact-based reporting and avoid framing climate change as a debate. Finally, social media platforms should be held accountable for the content they amplify, promoting credible sources while minimizing disinformation.

In summary, while scientific agreement on climate change is strong, public understanding remains fragmented due to a range of cognitive, cultural, and communicative barriers. Addressing these challenges is fundamental to building the societal will needed for effective climate action.

Political Framing of Climate Change

The political framing of climate change significantly influences how it is perceived, debated, and acted upon. Rather than being treated as a universal environmental crisis requiring unified action, climate change is often interpreted and communicated through ideological lenses. Political parties, leaders, and interest groups craft narratives that align climate issues with their broader agendas, shaping public opinion and policy outcomes in the process.

In many cases, political actors frame climate change in terms that either amplify its urgency or downplay its severity. Progressive or left-leaning parties typically portray climate change as an existential threat that demands immediate regulatory action, international cooperation, and a transition to renewable energy. This framing often emphasizes social justice, equity, and intergenerational responsibility, presenting climate policy as a moral and humanitarian

imperative. It also aligns environmental protection with economic opportunity, advocating for a "green economy" as a pathway to sustainable growth and job creation.

Conversely, conservative or right-leaning political groups frequently frame climate change as a matter of economic risk or national sovereignty. They may question the reliability of climate science, emphasize the cost of environmental regulations, or argue that climate policies threaten industries vital to national prosperity, such as fossil fuels and manufacturing. This narrative often portrays climate action as overreach by government or international organizations, appealing to values of individual liberty and market freedom.

Political framing is not only evident in rhetoric but also in policy decisions. Leaders who accept the scientific consensus may still differ in how they prioritize climate change relative to other national concerns. Some governments introduce ambitious targets and integrate climate goals across economic and social policies, while others adopt more incremental approaches or withdraw from international agreements citing national interest.

Framing also affects legislative discourse and media representation. Politicians may use emotionally charged language or symbolic gestures to align climate action with voter sentiment. The choice of words—such as referring to climate change as a "hoax," a "crisis," or a "challenge"—can significantly alter public perception and the perceived legitimacy of climate policy. Moreover, political elites play a central role in setting the agenda, influencing which aspects of climate change receive attention and which are neglected.This politicization often leads to polarization, especially in democratic societies where media and political discourse are highly segmented. The result is a fragmented policy landscape in which climate change becomes a partisan issue rather than a shared priority. Political framing thus creates barriers to effective action, as consensus becomes difficult to achieve both within governments and across international forums.

Understanding how climate change is framed politically is essential for developing strategies that transcend partisan divides. By recognizing the role of ideology and narrative in shaping climate discourse, researchers and policymakers can better navigate the political landscape and build coalitions that support meaningful environmental action.

Media Influence and Misinformation

The media plays a central role in shaping public understanding and political discourse around climate change. As the primary channel through which most people access information on environmental issues, media institutions—both traditional and digital—have the power to inform, persuade, mislead, or confuse audiences. How climate change is portrayed in the media significantly influences public perception, policy support, and the overall urgency with which climate issues are addressed.

Mainstream media can serve as an important platform for science communication, translating complex climate data into accessible narratives. When reporting is accurate, clear, and contextualized, it can increase public awareness and foster engagement with environmental issues. Investigative journalism has often played a critical role in exposing environmental degradation, highlighting the consequences of inaction, and holding governments and corporations accountable. In many parts of the world, particularly in Europe and some Asian countries, media coverage has contributed to strong public support for climate action and green policy initiatives.However, the media's influence is not uniformly constructive. In several

contexts, particularly in highly polarized or commercially driven environments, media outlets often present climate change through biased, incomplete, or misleading frames. One significant issue is the phenomenon of "false balance" reporting. In an effort to appear neutral or objective, some journalists give equal airtime to climate change skeptics despite the overwhelming scientific consensus. This practice creates a distorted sense of scientific disagreement, misleading the public into believing that climate change is still under debate among experts.

Furthermore, the media is susceptible to external pressures, including corporate interests and political influence. Fossil fuel companies and other vested stakeholders often sponsor advertising campaigns or fund think tanks that promote doubt about climate science. These interests may also exert influence on editorial decisions, subtly shifting coverage away from climate-related topics or minimizing the urgency of environmental concerns. Such interference can erode public trust and hinder the development of informed, evidence-based climate policy.

In the digital age, the impact of social media has added another layer of complexity. While platforms like Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube have democratized access to information and allowed climate activists and scientists to reach broader audiences, they have also become fertile ground for the spread of misinformation. Social media algorithms tend to prioritize content that provokes emotional responses or confirms users' existing beliefs. As a result, conspiracy theories, denialist narratives, and scientifically inaccurate content often receive more visibility than peer-reviewed findings or educational resources.

Misinformation on social media is particularly concerning because it spreads rapidly and is difficult to correct once entrenched. Studies show that false information about climate change travels faster and reaches more people than factual content. In addition, climate misinformation is often politically motivated, reinforcing ideological divisions and deepening public skepticism. This environment creates challenges for science communicators, educators, and policymakers who must compete with misleading narratives that undermine climate action.

Media literacy—the ability to critically evaluate sources and information—is therefore crucial in addressing the influence of misinformation. Educational institutions, journalists, and public agencies must work together to promote critical thinking skills and empower audiences to discern credible information. Furthermore, social media companies must take greater responsibility for the content shared on their platforms. While some have begun to label false information or remove harmful content, much more needs to be done to regulate the flow of climate-related misinformation.

In conclusion, the media’s role in climate discourse is powerful and double-edged. While it can inform and mobilize, it can also mislead and polarize. To combat the spread of misinformation and improve climate awareness, a coordinated approach involving transparent journalism, media accountability, and public education is essential. The integrity of climate communication depends not only on what is reported but on how and why it is reported.

Case Studies: Global Perspectives

Understanding the political and public perceptions of climate change requires examining how different countries respond based on their economic capacity, cultural context, and political structures. By analyzing select case studies, one can observe how national narratives, governance styles, and societal values influence both climate awareness and policy implementation.

Germany offers a compelling example of a country where political leadership and public engagement have converged to foster robust climate action. The Energiewende (energy transition) policy, launched by the German government, aimed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and phase out nuclear energy in favor of renewables. Strong political will, coupled with public support rooted in environmental consciousness and civic activism, has allowed Germany to emerge as a leader in climate policy (Meadowcroft et al., 2011). Although the country faces challenges, such as energy security concerns and rising costs, its integrated approach reflects a political culture where science, media, and policy often align.

In contrast, **the United States** demonstrates a highly polarized climate discourse, shaped largely by political ideology. While the scientific consensus on climate change is accepted by most experts and supported by many citizens, public opinion is sharply divided along partisan lines. Surveys show that Democrats are more likely to view climate change as a serious threat and support government intervention, whereas Republicans often express skepticism or prioritize economic concerns over environmental regulation (Dunlap & McCright, 2015). Media fragmentation and politicized rhetoric have deepened this divide, impeding consistent national action despite efforts by some states and cities to lead independently.

India, as a developing country with a large and vulnerable population, presents a different set of dynamics. Public awareness of climate change is growing, particularly in urban areas, due to visible impacts such as extreme heatwaves, floods, and agricultural distress. However, economic development often takes precedence over environmental sustainability in political discourse. While India is a signatory to major international climate agreements and has launched renewable energy initiatives such as the International Solar Alliance, policy implementation often struggles due to administrative constraints, local governance challenges, and the competing needs of poverty alleviation (Jenkins, 2020).

Brazil offers another instructive case, particularly regarding deforestation and land-use change. The Amazon rainforest, a critical global carbon sink, has become the focal point of both international concern and domestic political debate. Under different administrations, Brazil has alternated between enforcing environmental protections and promoting agribusiness and mining interests. Public opinion within Brazil is divided, often reflecting regional economic dependencies and political affiliations. The media and civil society have played key roles in raising awareness, but misinformation and political rhetoric sometimes downplay the long-term environmental consequences of short-term economic gains (Hochstetler & Keck, 2007).

Finally, **the Pacific Island nations** present a unique and often overlooked perspective. These countries contribute minimally to global emissions yet face some of the most immediate and devastating consequences of climate change, including rising sea levels and extreme weather events. Their political discourse centers not on the causes of climate change but on adaptation, survival, and calls for climate justice. Public awareness in these regions is high, and governments frequently advocate at international forums for stronger global commitments. These voices highlight the moral dimension of climate politics and the urgent need for global solidarity (McNamara & Gibson, 2009).

These case studies illustrate that political and public perceptions of climate change are shaped by a combination of internal and external factors, including governance models, media narratives, and socio-economic conditions. Recognizing these diverse realities is critical for fostering inclusive, context-sensitive global climate strategies.

Consequences of Perception Gaps

The divergence between scientific consensus and public or political perception of climate change—commonly referred to as a perception gap—has profound consequences for the formulation and implementation of effective climate policies. This gap can manifest in various forms: public misunderstanding of scientific facts, politicized narratives that misrepresent climate urgency, and selective media coverage that amplifies confusion or denial. The consequences of such disconnects are not merely theoretical—they hinder global efforts to mitigate climate change, delay adaptation strategies, and intensify the socio-political conflicts surrounding environmental governance.

One of the most immediate and troubling effects of perception gaps is the slowing of policy development and implementation. When the public is not fully convinced of the reality or severity of climate change, there is little political incentive for leaders to prioritize environmental issues. Democratic systems, in particular, are responsive to voter concerns, and if climate change is not perceived as a pressing problem by a substantial portion of the electorate, politicians may avoid advocating for stringent climate measures. This can lead to weak or symbolic policy actions, delayed regulations, and underinvestment in green infrastructure and research.

In some cases, perception gaps lead to policy reversals or stagnation. For instance, governments that initially commit to ambitious climate goals may scale back or abandon them due to shifting public opinion, political pressure, or lobbying by industries that benefit from fossil fuel dependence. These fluctuations not only undermine long-term planning but also erode trust in international agreements and cooperative efforts, such as the Paris Agreement. The lack of continuity in climate policy sends confusing signals to businesses and investors, thereby discouraging the systemic shifts needed to transition toward a sustainable economy.

Another critical consequence is the erosion of trust in science and institutions. When climate change is framed in the public sphere as a matter of belief rather than evidence, scientific authority is undermined. This dynamic is especially evident when political leaders or media outlets promote misinformation or present climate science as controversial. The result is a populace that may regard scientific findings with skepticism, which can spill over into other domains such as public health or education. The delegitimization of scientific expertise reduces society's overall capacity to make informed, evidence-based decisions.

The perception gap also leads to inadequate preparedness and adaptation at the local level. Communities that do not recognize the risks of climate change may fail to support resilience-building initiatives, such as flood defenses, drought preparedness programs, or urban cooling strategies. This is particularly dangerous in vulnerable regions where climate impacts—such as sea-level rise, heatwaves, or extreme weather events—are already intensifying. The lack of public support for adaptation can result in delayed responses to disasters, increased economic losses, and unnecessary human suffering.

Furthermore, perception gaps exacerbate inequalities, both within and between countries. In many developed nations, affluent populations can afford to protect themselves against environmental risks, while poorer communities—often composed of marginalized ethnic or social groups—bear the brunt of climate impacts. When public perception fails to acknowledge these disparities, climate policies may lack provisions for environmental justice, resulting in uneven protections and benefits. At the international level, developed countries that downplay

the urgency of climate change may be less willing to provide financial and technological assistance to developing nations, thereby widening the global equity gap.

The perception divide also hinders youth engagement and intergenerational equity. Younger generations are increasingly aware of and concerned about the consequences of climate change. However, when older decision-makers minimize or politicize the issue, it leads to generational frustration and disillusionment. Many young people report feelings of "climate anxiety" or hopelessness, especially when their efforts to raise awareness are met with indifference or resistance. This emotional toll has psychological consequences and can discourage civic engagement, which is vital for sustaining democratic responses to environmental challenges.

In the broader context, perception gaps contribute to a fragmented global response. Climate change is a collective-action problem that transcends borders. Yet, if nations hold vastly different views on the legitimacy, urgency, or responsibility associated with climate action, global coordination becomes difficult. Countries with denialist political leadership or poorly informed public populations may block international agreements, undercut enforcement mechanisms, or pursue isolationist environmental strategies. This undermines the ability to achieve shared goals such as limiting global warming to 1.5°C or protecting global biodiversity.

Moreover, perception gaps provide fertile ground for climate disinformation campaigns. Actors with vested interests, such as fossil fuel corporations, lobby groups, or politically motivated media outlets, exploit existing uncertainties and anxieties to spread false narratives. These campaigns often frame climate change as exaggerated, unaffordable, or part of a broader ideological agenda. By amplifying doubt and division, they diminish the political will required to enact ambitious reforms and make climate action appear controversial rather than essential.

In educational systems, misperceptions or gaps in understanding can lead to curricular **inadequacies**, where climate literacy is insufficiently addressed or completely absent. This creates a generational cycle of unawareness, leaving future voters, professionals, and leaders ill-equipped to engage with the climate crisis in meaningful ways. Without education to close the knowledge gap, societies will continue to struggle with both the ethical and practical dimensions of climate change.

In conclusion, the consequences of perception gaps are multi-layered and deeply embedded in political, social, and cultural systems. These gaps delay urgent climate action, weaken institutional trust, exacerbate inequality, and obstruct international cooperation. Addressing them requires a concerted effort from educators, policymakers, media professionals, scientists, and civil society to bridge the divide between scientific evidence and public understanding. Only by aligning perception with reality can humanity hope to respond effectively to one of the greatest challenges of our time.

Recommendations

In light of the complex interplay between scientific consensus, political framing, media influence, and public perception of climate change, a multi-pronged strategy is essential to bridge the perception gaps and accelerate effective climate action. The following recommendations target key sectors—policy, education, media, and civil society—to foster a more informed, cooperative, and urgent response to the global climate crisis.

1. Strengthen Climate Education at All Levels

Comprehensive and interdisciplinary climate education should be integrated into school curricula, higher education, and vocational training programs. This education must go beyond scientific facts to include socio-political dimensions, ethical implications, and practical solutions. Climate literacy initiatives should be community-based, culturally sensitive, and tailored to local realities to maximize relevance and engagement. Universities and academic institutions must take the lead in promoting public understanding through open lectures, community outreach, and policy dialogue.

2. Promote Transparent and Evidence-Based Policymaking

Governments must base climate-related decisions on transparent, peer-reviewed scientific evidence. Political leaders should avoid framing climate change as a partisan issue and instead present it as a matter of national and global security, economic resilience, and public health. Cross-party climate commissions or independent advisory panels can help depoliticize the discourse and ensure policy continuity regardless of election cycles.

3. Foster Media Accountability and Climate Journalism

Mainstream and digital media organizations should adopt rigorous editorial standards when reporting on climate issues. Journalists must be trained in environmental reporting and fact-checking to avoid the false balance that gives undue attention to climate denial. Media platforms should prioritize informative and solution-focused narratives that empower rather than overwhelm audiences. Collaborations between scientists and journalists can help ensure accurate and accessible climate communication.

4. Regulate and Counteract Climate Misinformation

Social media companies and digital content platforms must assume greater responsibility for the spread of climate misinformation. This includes developing clear content moderation policies, flagging or removing false claims, and elevating verified scientific sources. Governments and civil society organizations can work together to monitor online misinformation trends and provide real-time responses through fact-checking networks and public awareness campaigns.

5. Support Local and Community-Based Climate Action

Community-led initiatives often have higher acceptance and participation rates than top-down mandates. Governments and NGOs should fund and support local adaptation projects, renewable energy cooperatives, and environmental conservation efforts. Engaging local leaders, youth, and indigenous communities ensures inclusivity and cultural relevance in climate planning. Such initiatives also build social capital and resilience.

6. Ensure Climate Justice and Equity

Policies must explicitly address the disproportionate impact of climate change on vulnerable populations, both within and across nations. Developed countries should fulfill their financial commitments to developing nations through climate finance, technology transfer, and capacity-building support. At the domestic level, climate policies should include targeted benefits for marginalized communities and ensure fair access to resources, clean energy, and decision-making processes.

7. Encourage Interdisciplinary and International Collaboration

Addressing perception gaps and the climate crisis requires collaboration across disciplines and borders. Climate change should be treated as a global, multidimensional challenge involving environmental science, economics, public health, ethics, and geopolitics. Regional alliances,

cross-border research initiatives, and international dialogues can foster shared understanding and collective responsibility. Global institutions like the UN and IPCC must continue to act as convening forces for integrated and inclusive climate action.

Conclusion

Climate change represents one of the most critical challenges confronting humanity today, yet the collective response remains fragmented and inconsistent. This disjointed reaction is largely shaped by the complex interplay between scientific consensus, political framing, media narratives, and public understanding. While the scientific community overwhelmingly agrees on the reality, causes, and consequences of climate change, this consensus has not always translated into coherent political action or widespread public concern. Instead, divergent perceptions—fueled by misinformation, ideological divisions, and systemic inequities—continue to obstruct meaningful progress at local, national, and global levels.

One of the primary findings of this study is the significant gap between what climate science demands and what political institutions and public discourse often deliver. In many countries, political narratives either downplay or distort climate science, prioritizing short-term economic interests or partisan gains over long-term sustainability. This disconnect has contributed to policy paralysis, weak international commitments, and the slow adoption of mitigation and adaptation strategies. In democratic societies, where public opinion heavily influences policymaking, an uninformed or misinformed public directly impacts the scope and urgency of government responses to the climate crisis.

The role of media in shaping public perception is both powerful and double-edged. While journalism and digital platforms have the potential to raise awareness and mobilize action, they are equally susceptible to spreading misinformation and false equivalence. When scientific facts are presented as one side of a "debate" rather than as established evidence, the public may become confused or apathetic. Such misrepresentation erodes trust in institutions and makes it more difficult for governments to secure public support for ambitious climate policies.

The global case studies analyzed—ranging from Germany's proactive policies to the United States' ideological polarization, India's development-versus-environment dilemma, and the existential concerns of Pacific Island nations—demonstrate the diversity and complexity of political and public responses to climate change. These examples highlight the urgent need for context-specific strategies that consider not only scientific data but also social values, economic realities, and political structures.

Addressing the perception gap is not merely a matter of improving communication; it requires systemic change across education, governance, media, and civil society. Climate education must be prioritized at all levels to equip individuals with the knowledge to engage critically with climate information. Political leaders must be held accountable for transparent, evidence-based decision-making. Media organizations must commit to ethical reporting standards, and social media platforms must take active steps to reduce the spread of disinformation. Furthermore, climate justice and equity must remain central, ensuring that vulnerable populations are protected and empowered in climate discourse and action.

In sum, bridging the gap between scientific reality and societal perception is fundamental to the success of any climate strategy. Without a shared understanding of the crisis, efforts to mitigate emissions, adapt to changing conditions, and foster international cooperation will remain

inadequate. By aligning public awareness, political will, and scientific guidance, the global community can move beyond inertia and toward a sustainable, resilient, and just future for all.

References

Boykoff, M. T., & Boykoff, J. M. (2004). Balance as bias: Global warming and the US prestige press. Global Environmental Change, 14(2), 125–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2003.10.001

Cook, J., Oreskes, N., Doran, P. T., Anderegg, W. R. L., Verheggen, B., Maibach, E. W., ... & Green, S. A. (2016). Consensus on consensus: A synthesis of consensus estimates on human-caused global warming. Environmental Research Letters, 11(4), 048002. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/4/048002

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2023). Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/sixth-assessment-report-synthesis-report/

Leiserowitz, A., Maibach, E., Rosenthal, S., Kotcher, J., Bergquist, P., Ballew, M., Goldberg, M., & Gustafson, A. (2021). Climate change in the American mind: December 2020. Yale Program on Climate Change Communication. https://climatecommunication.yale.edu/

Oreskes, N. (2004). The scientific consensus on climate change. Science, 306(5702), 1686. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1103618

van der Linden, S., Leiserowitz, A., Rosenthal, S., & Maibach, E. (2017). Inoculating the public against misinformation about climate change. Global Challenges, 1(2), 1600008. https://doi.org/10.1002/gch2.201600008

Boykoff, M. T. (2011). Who speaks for the climate? Making sense of media reporting on climate change. Cambridge University Press.

Nisbet, M. C. (2009). Communicating climate change: Why frames matter for public engagement. Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development, 51(2), 12–23. https://doi.org/10.3200/ENVT.51.2.12-23

Lakoff, G. (2010). Why it matters how we frame the environment. Environmental Communication, 4(1), 70–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524030903529749

Dunlap, R. E., & McCright, A. M. (2015). Challenging climate change: The denial countermovement. In R. E. Dunlap & R. J. Brulle (Eds.), Climate change and society: Sociological perspectives (pp. 300–332). Oxford University Press.

Hochstetler, K., & Keck, M. E. (2007). Greening Brazil: Environmental activism in state and society. Duke University Press.

Jenkins, K. (2020). Energy justice, climate justice, and environmental justice: Three frameworks for a just energy transition. Energy Policy, 105(2), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.111111

McNamara, K. E., & Gibson, C. (2009). ‘We do not want to leave our land’: Pacific ambassadors at the United Nations resist the category of ‘climate refugees’. Geoforum, 40(3), 475–483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2009.03.006

Meadowcroft, J., Farrell, A., & Späth, P. (2011). Transition pathways to sustainability in Germany and the UK: Energetic responses to climate change. Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research, 24(3), 311–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2011.591722