

From Eco-Anxiety to Agency

A Policy Primer on Environmental Distress, Public Trust, and Community Resilience

Executive Summary · Working Draft, August 2026

Prepared by Dr. Calvin Lakhan · Contributing authors: Erica Garber, Beverly Law

Eco-anxiety — the worry, fear, grief, and distress people feel in relation to environmental degradation — has moved from the margins of environmental psychology into the centre of public health, education, and governance. This primer makes a single argument with wide application: environmental distress is shaped not only by environmental risk, but by the institutional conditions surrounding that risk. How institutions communicate, whether they act credibly, how they distribute responsibility, and whom they include all help determine whether public concern becomes constructive capacity or hardens into withdrawal and distrust.

The goal is not less concern. A population registering no concern about environmental harm would be the graver problem. The goal is to ensure that concern is met by knowledge, agency, social connection, and visible institutional action — so that it strengthens public systems rather than quietly eroding them.

The awareness–agency gap

The organizing idea of the primer is the awareness–agency gap: the distance between what people are made to know about environmental risk and what they are enabled to do about it. Public institutions have become highly effective at raising awareness and far less effective at supplying credible, visible, and equitable ways to act. Eco-anxiety intensifies when awareness outpaces agency. The same concern, met with credible pathways and visible action, becomes learning, preparedness, participation, and trust; left without them, it may develop into avoidance, cynicism, and despair.

Agency, in this report, is not willpower. It is five conditions — three held by people and communities, two supplied only by institutions:

Condition	What it means	Who holds it
Personal efficacy	Belief that one’s own actions can make a difference.	Individuals
Practical capacity	Access to the resources, infrastructure, time, and knowledge an action requires.	Individuals / communities
Collective support	Acting alongside others, and the shared belief that a group can accomplish what no individual could alone.	Communities
Meaningful participation	A genuine ability to influence the decisions that shape one’s environment.	Institutions must supply
Institutional responsiveness	Visible, credible action by the institutions responsible, so individual and collective effort is met rather than wasted.	Institutions must supply

When the report says agency is “absent,” it means that one or more of these five conditions is missing — not that people lack motivation. Appendix A of the full primer converts the five conditions into a one-page Institutional Agency Audit that any institution can apply to a communication, campaign, curriculum, or consultation before it reaches the public.

A policy issue, not only a clinical one

Eco-anxiety is not inherently a disorder, and treating it primarily as one misreads its causes. For the most part it is a reasonable response to genuine risk, perceived institutional inaction, unequal exposure, and poor communication — causes that lie outside the clinic. Counselling has its place, especially where distress becomes impairing. A response built only on individual treatment, however, manages the symptom while leaving the structural causes intact.

Two policy mistakes fail for the same reason. Dismissal treats distress as exaggerated emotion and deepens the alienation that intensified it. Medicalization converts a largely rational response into an individual symptom and forfeits the constructive forms of climate emotion — notably anger at institutional failure, which is the emotion most reliably associated with action — along with the corrosive ones. The useful question is not whether people should be concerned. It is why some forms of concern become learning, preparedness, and civic participation, while others become paralysis, distrust, or despair.

Naming the emotion changes the response

Environmental distress is a family of states, not a single feeling. Misnaming the emotion misdirects the intervention: reassurance does nothing for grief, and counselling does nothing for well-founded anger.

State	What it is about	What institutions should do
Eco-anxiety	Anticipatory worry about environmental futures.	Pair every statement of risk with credible action pathways and visible commitments.
Ecological grief / solastalgia	Mourning for what is already lost, or watching a home place degrade while still living in it.	Acknowledge loss; restore place with residents as participants, not spectators.
Eco-guilt	Distress over one’s own perceived contribution, often manufactured by individual-responsibility messaging.	Shift emphasis from personal blame to system performance and shared responsibility.
Eco-anger	Anger at institutional failure, injustice, or broken commitments — the most action-oriented climate emotion.	Treat anger as feedback. Open real participation channels and report against commitments.
Despair / paralysis	Settled hopelessness; concern so overwhelming that people disengage.	Prevent it in message design. Recover it through collective, local, visible action — not more risk information.

Where distress comes from — and where policy holds leverage

Distress is not produced by environmental facts alone. A threat signal — direct exposure to heat, smoke, flood, or fire; vicarious exposure through news and social media; or future-oriented risk about livability and children’s prospects — is filtered through institutional amplifiers: distrust, the awareness–agency gap, individualized responsibility, and poor communication. The result lands unequally. Communities

already carrying the heaviest environmental burdens often have the fewest resources to respond, so exposure and powerlessness compound. For land-connected and Indigenous communities, ecological loss can register as a loss of self and continuity, not only of resources.

Because the amplifiers are institutional, they are also where policy holds leverage. Softening or withholding information does not close the gap. Expanding agency, support, and institutional responsiveness does.

Why this is a public-policy problem

Left unaddressed, eco-anxiety imposes real strain on five systems policymakers already run. None of these can be delegated to a single department.

- **Public health.** Climate-related distress adds psychosocial demand to stretched services. Acute, event-related distress needs clinical and crisis support. Chronic background distress is better met by prevention — credible communication, visible action, participation, and social connection — that the health system cannot supply alone.
- **Education and youth development.** Climate literacy that delivers problems without pathways can leave students more informed and more frightened in equal measure. Young people in a ten-country survey of 10,000 respondents aged 16–25 reported high worry (59 percent very or extremely worried) and, more consequentially for policymakers, a strong association between distress and perceived government failure and betrayal.
- **Trust and civic participation.** Distress and institutional trust move together. Weak or symbolic action breeds distress; distress breeds distrust; distrust weakens the mandate for the policies that would address the underlying risk. Visible, verifiable action can run the loop the other way.
- **Emergency preparedness.** Concerned people are often motivated to prepare for heat, smoke, and flooding; overwhelmed people avoid planning. Every advisory a public-health agency issues lands somewhere on that spectrum.
- **Communication and policy support.** Fear without efficacy raises the salience of threat while lowering the audience's sense of being able to act. Campaigns that stop at awareness add emotional weight with nowhere to go.

How institutions make it worse

Institutions widen the awareness–agency gap in recognizable, mostly unintentional ways. They overload the awareness side, starve the agency side, and misallocate responsibility and voice.

- Fear-based messaging that raises alarm without supplying a credible way to act.
- Awareness campaigns that stop at awareness — adding knowledge without a route to use it.
- Oversimplified slogans that collapse on contact with complexity and cost credibility.
- Symbolic or performative policy: targets without implementation plans, consultations without consequences.
- Poor transparency about uncertainty, trade-offs, and what has not yet been solved.
- Offloading systemic problems onto individual household choices.

- Tokenistic engagement that invites voice without influence — a distinct harm, not a smaller version of participation.
- Uniform treatment of unequal communities, ignoring exposure, resources, and environmental injustice.

Each of these erodes the same two assets — trust and efficacy — and each falls hardest on the communities already carrying the most exposure and the fewest resources.

Six pillars for moving from eco-anxiety to agency

The response is organized into six complementary pillars. The first five help people meet distress; the sixth changes the structural conditions that produce it, and is the foundation the others rest on. They invert the failures above: the same institutional levers, used deliberately, convert concern into capacity.

1 Validate

Treat environmental distress as legitimate, not as fragility or pathology. Provide climate-aware clinical support where distress becomes impairing. Naming and accepting difficult environmental emotions is associated with better coping and sustained engagement.

2 Inform

Build literacy that pairs every problem with a pathway. Teach systems rather than slogans. Hope grounded in action — not denial, and not naïve optimism — is what lets people stay engaged.

3 Connect

Convert isolated worry into collective efficacy. Community climate groups, neighbourhood projects, and restorative contact with nature all do protective psychological work. Isolation tells people their effort is pointless; connection is the experience that disproves it.

4 Prepare

Turn forward-looking attention into practical readiness. Participatory adaptation — plans drawn up with communities, not delivered to them — restores a sense of control and is itself an intervention against eco-anxiety.

5 Participate

Create genuine influence at every scale. The design test is simple: can this participation change the result? If not, the exercise is better not run at all.

6 Transform

Change the systems that constrain individual choice: shift responsibility from households to producers where appropriate, build infrastructure that makes the sustainable choice the easy one, and align policy with the scale of the problem. Without this foundation, the first five pillars ask people to summon agency the system continues to deny them.

Five priority actions for institutions

For decision-makers who need a starting point, five actions follow directly from the argument. Local governments and education systems hold the most direct operational leverage; specialized sectors hold narrower leverage; senior governments hold the structural levers on which the rest depend.

1. Audit major communications, campaigns, and curricula for “risk without agency” — messaging that raises alarm without supplying a credible way to act.
2. Establish minimum standards for transparent institutional action and visible progress reporting, so that stated commitments can be checked.

3. Build participation pathways with documented influence, distinguishing genuine engagement from consultation that cannot change a decision.
4. Integrate psychosocial resilience into adaptation and emergency planning, treating preparedness as a mental-health intervention as well as a physical one.
5. Use equity screening to tailor interventions by exposure, resources, and community context, rather than applying a uniform template.

No-regrets first moves (first twelve months)

Not everything can happen at once. The actions that combine low cost, established or promising evidence, and an immediate horizon are where any institution should begin — they are defensible even under uncertainty.

- First 90 days. Audit major communications for risk without agency. Map existing participation channels and ask which can actually change a decision. Identify the highest-exposure, least-resourced communities. Establish baseline indicators.
- Months 3–6. Revise and pilot the highest-risk communications. Add visible progress reporting to commitments already made. Train front-line staff on climate emotions and referral. Launch one community connection or preparedness initiative in a high-exposure area.
- Months 6–12. Evaluate the pilots honestly and redirect what underperforms. Formalize cross-sector ownership and a coordinating function for the seams between health, schools, municipalities, and emergency planners. Publish public accountability results.

How to read the evidence

This publication is a research-informed policy primer, not a systematic review, a clinical guideline, or a prevalence study. It is written for North American institutions — school districts, municipalities, health agencies, emergency managers, and senior governments in Canada and the United States — though the framework is intended to transfer. Three boundaries govern every claim:

- The evidence linking institutional conditions to environmental distress is largely correlational, qualitative, or interpretive rather than experimental.
- The awareness–agency gap is offered as an analytical lens, not a demonstrated causal mechanism.
- The six pillars are design principles resting on uneven evidence — not validated interventions.

Environmental hazards, social conditions, personal experience, and pre-existing vulnerability all shape environmental distress. Institutional communication, responsiveness, participation, and infrastructure can amplify, attenuate, or redirect it. The report does not claim that institutions are the principal source of all environmental distress — only that they hold leverage over conditions that matter. Chapter 10 of the full primer maps the research that would close these gaps: better measurement, causal tests of the awareness–agency model, intervention evaluation, work with under-studied populations, Indigenous-led research, and jurisdiction-specific evidence.

What this primer is for

The primer is written for policymakers, educators, public-health officials, municipal leaders, and community organizations seeking to understand eco-anxiety as a public issue rather than a private weakness. It does not provide clinical diagnosis or therapeutic guidance, and nothing in it substitutes for professional care where care is needed. Its concern is institutional: how public bodies can reduce harmful distress by improving communication, strengthening agency, addressing inequity, and creating credible pathways for participation.

Good policy does not aim to make people less concerned about environmental harm. It aims to make sure that concern has somewhere honest and consequential to go.

Suggested citation

Lakhan, C., with Garber, E., and Law, B. (2026). From Eco-Anxiety to Agency: A Policy Primer on Environmental Distress, Public Trust, and Community Resilience. Working draft. Circular Innovation HUB, Faculty of Environmental and Urban Change, York University.

This executive summary is a standalone briefing distilled from the working draft for institutional readers. The full primer adds sector-by-sector recommendations, a twelve-month roadmap, evidence grades, and the Institutional Agency Audit.

In the full primer	Intended readers
Definitions of eco-anxiety, grief, guilt, anger, and despair; drivers and unequal distribution; how institutions unintentionally widen the gap; six-pillar strategies; recommendations for education, municipal government, public health, emergency management, communicators, employers, and senior government; implementation, measurement, research agenda; Institutional Agency Audit (Appendix A).	School-board and education leaders; city managers and municipal climate staff; public-health officials; emergency managers; public communicators and journalists; environmental organizations and employers; provincial, state, and federal policymakers and regulators.