European Grandparents for Climate:
Working Group Communication and Psychology

Cognitive Dissonance and the Climate Crisis

Why do informed, well-meaning people continue behaviours that contribute to a crisis they acknowledge is real? The answer lies not in ignorance or indifference but in cognitive dissonance -- the psychological tension that arises when knowledge and action contradict each other. In the context of climate change, this tension is unusually persistent, collectively shared, and actively exploited by powerful actors. Overcoming it requires working on three levels simultaneously: psychological, structural, and communicative.

1. How Dissonance Arises

Leon Festinger's foundational insight remains central: the brain does not resolve dissonance by changing behaviour. It resolves it by whatever means are least costly -- rationalisation, selective attention, or reframing. Climate change makes this especially difficult to counter. The crisis is abstract, temporally distant, collectively caused, and demands systemic changes far beyond individual control.

Three closely related mechanisms amplify the effect. Confirmation bias leads people to preferentially seek information that supports existing behaviour. Motivated reasoning goes further: the conclusion is fixed in advance and the reasoning built around it. System justification -- documented by psychologist John Jost -- causes people to defend existing economic and social arrangements even when those arrangements harm them, because climate action feels like an attack on the system itself.

In practice, climate dissonance takes recognisable forms: minimising the threat, using small green actions to justify larger harmful ones (moral licensing), shifting blame to governments or corporations, avoiding distressing news, and indefinitely postponing change. Crucially, awareness of these mechanisms does not automatically dissolve them. Research suggests that too much meta-cognitive exposure -- knowing one is rationalising -- can itself produce paralysis rather than action.

2. Who Exploits It -- and Who Reduces It

Dissonance is not only a private psychological experience. It is systematically produced and managed by institutions.

Politics

Governments facing the gap between climate urgency and political constraints typically manage their own dissonance through symbolic commitments: signing international agreements while approving fossil fuel projects, setting distant net-zero targets that transfer responsibility to future administrations, or framing modest reforms as transformative action. Governments that genuinely reduce dissonance instead embed climate goals in economic planning -- connecting them to jobs, health, and infrastructure -- and ensure that rhetoric and policy visibly align.

Corporations

High-emission industries deploy greenwashing to maintain legitimacy without structural change. The concept of the personal carbon footprint -- popularised by the oil industry from the 1990s onwards -- is a particularly instructive case: a deliberate strategy to shift societal responsibility from producers to consumers. Genuine corporate dissonance reduction requires verifiable near-term targets and incentive structures that tie leadership compensation to actual emissions reductions.

Media

Media shapes how threatening the climate crisis feels. False balance, disaster-as-spectacle, and the reduction of climate change to individual lifestyle choices all allow audiences to remain informed without feeling compelled to act. Solutions journalism, attribution science, and system-level storytelling offer more constructive alternatives -- pairing risk with credible pathways and making shared responsibility visible.

3. Structural Conditions Matter as Much as Communication

A retiree whose pension is invested in fossil funds, or a commuter with no viable public transport alternative, faces dissonance that no communication strategy can fully resolve. Structural conditions that compel emissions-intensive behaviour institutionalise dissonance before communication begins.

Structural measures that reduce dissonance without moral pressure include:

- Opt-out defaults for renewable energy tariffs, which use inertia in favour of climate protection.
- Pricing that reflects the true costs of fossil energy, changing decision-making without condemning lifestyles.
- Investment in public infrastructure -- railways, heat pumps, cycling networks -- that makes climate-friendly choices accessible.
- Regulation of high-emission industries, shifting responsibility to the level at which it can most effectively be exercised.

A related caution: climate communication that targets identities too directly can trigger backlash. When people experience climate messaging as an attack on their values or political affiliation, they entrench rather than open up. Effective communication builds bridges; it does not deepen existing divides.

4. Overcoming Dissonance: What Works

Research consistently identifies three conditions under which dissonance is most effectively resolved:

1) **Normalising -** when action is normalised (presented as what people like us already do),
2) **Collectivism -** when change is framed as collective rather than individual,
3) **Identity Consistent -** when climate action is positioned as identity-consistent -- connected to jobs, fairness, care, resilience, and dignity rather than sacrifice and guilt.

These principles apply with particular force to older people and grandparents, who combine moral authority, high civic participation, and an acute stake in what the world will look like for their

descendants. Their dissonance is distinctive: not whether climate change is real, but how to reconcile lifelong care for family with a world partly shaped by their generation's economic choices.

What makes for effective engagement with this group:

- Avoiding generational blame entirely. Instead framing climate action as the completion of a life's values, not their correction -- emphasising legacy, stewardship, and dignity.
- Low-barrier, high-impact actions (voting, public testimony, letters, visible presence) resolve dissonance by aligning moral weight with realistic capacity.
- Peer visibility through organisations like Elders Climate Action shifts the social norm: inaction, not engagement, becomes the unusual choice.

5. The Generational Dimension

Younger and older activists bring different but complementary forms of dissonance to the climate movement.

Young people experience the tension between a threatened future and inadequate institutional response; their activism is characterised by urgency, disruption, and moral clarity.

Older people experience the tension between care for future generations and complicity in systems that harm them; their engagement tends toward reflection, moral reckoning, and the authority that comes from having lived through the system they are now questioning.

The credibility of older activists with decision-makers is not merely perceived: it rests on institutional experience, consistently high voter turnout, and the absence of material self-interest in climate policy. A 70-year-old advocating for climate action has, in the most literal sense, nothing to gain except legacy. When older and younger activists stand together, they produce a signal that is difficult to dismiss: if both those who will live longest with the consequences and those who have lived longest under the system are calling for change, the justifications for delay become untenable.

Conclusion

Cognitive dissonance around the climate crisis is not a character flaw. It is the predictable response of minds shaped by comfort, habit, identity, and economic necessity to a crisis that challenges all of these simultaneously. Resolving it requires working at all three levels: making climate action psychologically accessible, removing structural barriers that enforce high-emission behaviour, and communicating in ways that affirm rather than threaten the identities of those being addressed.

The goal is not to make people feel guilty about the past. It is to make action feel like the natural continuation of who they already are.

Godela v. Kirchbach, 7.4.2026