

## **From Value to Action: A Critical Examination of Barriers to Democratic Participation in Global Sustainability Agendas**

Sara Aberkan, Mohamed First University, Morocco

The Asian Conference on Education 2025  
Official Conference Proceedings

### **Abstract**

Despite growing awareness of global sustainability challenges, public engagement and democratic participation remain limited. This persistent value-action gap, where individuals possess knowledge about sustainability but do not translate it into civic or political action, raises urgent questions about the effectiveness of global frameworks such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This paper offers a critical theoretical exploration of how sustainability is framed in international policy discourse, particularly in relation to shared civil responsibility and democratic agency. Drawing on framing theory, the study examines how dominant narratives surrounding the SDGs tend to emphasize individual behavioral change while neglecting the structural and political dimensions of sustainability. Insights from critical pedagogy further highlight how education, while often positioned as central to sustainability may fall short if it promotes awareness without cultivating critical consciousness or participatory agency. Through a synthesis of interdisciplinary scholarship, the paper critiques the prevailing representations of responsibility and citizenship embedded in sustainability discourse. It argues for a reframing toward models that emphasize collective agency, democratic participation, and systemic transformation. The study concludes with theoretical reflections and conceptual recommendations for reimagining sustainability education and policy as frameworks that support active civic engagement and empower individuals as agents of change. In doing so, it contributes to wider debates on how language and discourse shape public action in the context of global challenges.

*Keywords:* value-action gap, framing theory, critical pedagogy, collective agency, sustainability education

**iafor**

The International Academic Forum  
[www.iafor.org](http://www.iafor.org)

## Introduction

The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals emphasize the importance of citizen awareness in achieving the goals related to the environment, the social, and the economic fields. While awareness of sustainability challenges is increasingly widespread, translating knowledge into meaningful civic action remains limited. This is a phenomenon widely recognized as the value-action gap (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002). This gap is a persistent challenge that hinders the achievement of sustainability governance since the active participation of people is necessary in order to achieve policy goals. Therefore, it is crucial to understand how people can become active and efficient participants and have a shared responsibility in achieving sustainability goals.

Research suggests that the persistence of the value-action gap is rooted in the interaction of structural, cognitive, and discursive factors. Institutional arrangements such as centralized governance, technocratic decision-making, and bureaucratic rigidity, often position citizens as peripheral actors signalling that responsibility lies primarily with technical experts or authorities (Fukuda-Parr, 2022). At the same time, discursive frames shape perceptions of legitimacy and appropriate behaviour as argued by Entman (1993) and Lakoff (2004). Such frames can be applied as tools for analysing global sustainability discourse and education.

Technocratic and engineerist frames privilege measurable objectives and standardized indicators and interventions led by experts, while moral frames reinforce normative hypotheses concerning accepted behaviors (Fukuda-Parr, 2022). These structural and discursive mechanisms limit individual participation, reproduce hierarchical authority, and further enhance the gap between values and actions (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002).

In light of these insights, the literature often separates out these three dimensions, structural, cognitive, and discursive, treating them in isolation. The study of ways these components interact is necessary in order to design strategies that build awareness for action; it is essential also to turn knowledge into practical methods for engaging in civic engagement. This paper bridges that gap by drawing on concepts from Critical Pedagogy and Framing Theory. Critical pedagogy provides the means by which power relations, institutional constraints, and processes of empowerment may be studied through praxis, conscientization, and dialogue (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 2005; McLaren, 2000). Framing theory, stemming from communication and cognitive linguistics (Entman, 1993; Lakoff, 2004), further enhances the interpretation when it examines how legitimacy, moral evaluation, and authority are constructed and contested in public discourse, by which perception and action are affected. The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What institutional and individual barriers sustain the value-action gap in global sustainability agendas?
2. How do framing practices in policy, communication, and education influence citizens' perceptions of legitimacy, responsibility, and efficacy?
3. How can the integration of critical pedagogy and framing strategies support more meaningful and participatory engagement in sustainability initiatives?

The paper begins with a literature review synthesizing theoretical and empirical studies on critical pedagogy, framing, and sustainability participation. This is followed by an analysis and discussion of institutional and individual barriers, concluding with a synthesis of findings and recommendations to support inclusive and participatory sustainability governance.

## Literature Review

The increasing importance of democratic participation in sustainability agendas around the world makes progress, especially meaningful and lasting progress. Although environmental and social challenges are widely acknowledged, citizens are frequently not involved in sustainability actions (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Steg & Vlek, 2009). To understand why not all knowledge leads to action we have to consider the structural and cognitive impediments that limit participation (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002). As theorised by Freire (2005), institutional arrangements, educational practices, and discursive frames exert crucial impacts on citizen agency and engagement, and these insights have been generalised to sustainability contexts, where governance arrangements and cultural practices shape collective action (Shove, 2010). This review synthesizes theoretical and empirical studies on critical pedagogy, framing theory, and participation in sustainability, identifying key insights and gaps that inform the present research.

### Critical Pedagogy

Critical pedagogy provides one interpretation for how power relations and institutions shape the agency of the citizen. At the heart of this view are thoughts on praxis, conscientization, dialogue, and the empowerment of marginalized voices (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 2005). Praxis stresses the integration of reflection and action, the proposition that mere knowledge cannot be enough to make them take action. Conscientization encourages citizens to notice the structural forces restraining their agency and thereby realize a critical consciousness that leads the community into meaningful participation. It is dialogue that brings people together through shared understanding and collective problem-solving, bringing them actively involved in decision-making processes (Freire, 2005).

In the context of sustainability, critical pedagogy explains why specific forms of institutional obstacles or barriers, such as technocratic governance, lack of transparency in decision-making, and centralization in authority, can dissuade citizen participation (Bexell & Jönsson, 2017; Fukuda-Parr, 2022). On the other hand, educational interventions (e.g., participatory workshops, community-based learning, and collaborative problem-solving exercises) which are rooted in critical pedagogy serve to create communities that promote civic involvement, increasing the potential for collective action (Wals, 2010). However, most existing texts primarily concern themselves with individual empowerment and have not sufficiently integrated the discursive means by which institutional structures remain dominant.

### Framing Theory

Framing theory complements critical pedagogy by addressing the discursive construction of reality and its impact on citizen perception and behavior. Frames are interpretive devices that shape how issues are defined, causes are attributed, moral evaluations are made, and solutions are proposed (Entman, 1993). In sustainability discourse, technocratic and engineerist frames which prioritize measurable targets, standardized indicators, and expert-led interventions, frame the authority as central to achieving sustainability while positioning citizens as peripheral actors (Sachs, 2012). In addition to this, moral and value frames embed normative assumptions about appropriate behavior which can discourage alternative interventions. This can be understood as part of how communication frames highlight certain behaviors and assign moral significance (Entman, 1993) and how cognitive frames influence individuals' moral interpretations and judgments (Lakoff, 2004). By highlighting certain behaviors as desirable

and aligning them with official or expert-sanctioned norms, these frames shape perceptions of legitimacy and acceptable action (Entman, 1993). In governance contexts, such as the use of indicators and policy metrics, these mechanisms can subtly reproduce hierarchical authority and constrain citizen agency (Broome & Quirk, 2015).

Research demonstrates that frames influence both immediate perceptions of issue importance and long-term cognitive frameworks that affect engagement and willingness to challenge existing hierarchies (Chong & Druckman, 2007; Snow & Benford, 1988). Integrating framing analysis with critical pedagogy offers tools to examine how institutional narratives shape both citizen understanding and perceived legitimacy and provide pathways to strategically reframe sustainability issues to encourage participatory engagement.

### **Bridging Evidence and Theory**

Empirical studies on citizen participation emphasize the interconnection of structural, cognitive, and discursive barriers. Institutional constraints such as centralized governance, bureaucracies, limited transparency, and standardized reporting often marginalize citizen input and reduce perceived efficacy (Bexell & Jönsson, 2017; Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002). Observing institutions as unresponsive reinforces individual-level barriers such as behavioral inertia and low civic engagement (Bexell & Jönsson, 2017). Habitual behaviors and societal norms further limit meaningful action and show how structural and cognitive factors operate in a mutually reinforcing feedback loop (Shove, 2010).

Educational initiatives demonstrate that promoting critical awareness, dialogue, and participatory skills can partially mitigate these barriers (Wals, 2010). Research on framing shows that emphasizing certain values or responsibilities can shape how people engage with issues (Chong & Druckman, 2007). In the context of sustainability, frames that stress citizen agency and social norms may enhance engagement, whereas technocratic or moralizing frames risk discouraging participation (Maibach et al., 2010). Despite these insights, research often treats structural, cognitive, and discursive factors in isolation (Shove, 2010). Few studies examine how critical pedagogy and framing theory together can explain and address persistent gaps between knowledge and action.

Institutional arrangements and discursive frames are mutually reinforcing and shape both the possibilities and perceived legitimacy of citizen engagement. Critical pedagogy addresses structural barriers by emphasizing praxis, conscientization, and empowerment. As for framing theory, it analyses how moral evaluation and authority are discursively constructed and contested. Synthesizing these perspectives provide both explanatory power and practical insight. It allows the identification of points where educational and discursive strategies can collectively enhance democratic participation. This integrated approach offers a relevant conceptual foundation for examining how participatory sustainability initiatives can overcome the value-action gap.

### **Methodology**

This paper adopts a critical theoretical approach to examine the discursive framing of sustainability within the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and their implications for democratic participation. Unlike empirical research, which relies on original data collection, this study critically engages with existing literature and scholarly analyses to explore the interplay between sustainability discourse, civic engagement, and education. The

underlying assumption of this approach is that a thorough understanding of the value-action gap and its implications requires systematic engagement with theoretical perspectives and policy narratives that shape global sustainability agendas. Critical theoretical approaches are widely recognized in the social sciences for enabling rigorous conceptual exploration and generating insights relevant to both theory and practice (Kincheloe, 2005). Reflexive engagement with literature allows researchers to examine not only the content of sources but also the assumptions, perspectives, and discursive strategies that shape them (Alvesson & Sköldbberg, 2009).

The object of critique in this study is the dominant framing of responsibility, agency, and participation within SDG discourse. Particular attention is given to how sustainability is often presented as an issue of individual behavioral change, while structural, political, and civic dimensions remain underexplored or marginalized (Dryzek, 2013). To analyze these discursive tendencies, the study draws primarily on critical pedagogy and framing theory. Critical pedagogy highlights the role of education in promoting critical consciousness and participatory agency (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 2005). As for framing theory, it examines how language and narratives influence perception and prioritization of issues (Entman, 1993; Lakoff, 2004). Together, these lenses provide a foundation for interrogating how current sustainability development goals (SDGs) narratives both reveal and reinforce barriers to democratic participation.

The methodological process unfolds in three stages. First, a purposive selection of sources was undertaken to ensure relevance, credibility, and theoretical significance. These sources include scholarly critiques of global sustainability agendas, as well as literature on framing theory, critical pedagogy, and the value-action gap. Selection criteria emphasized works that directly address civic engagement, education, and the translation of sustainability knowledge into action. This targeted approach mirrors established purposive sampling strategies in theoretical-analytical research (Patton, 2015) and enables reflexive engagement with authoritative and influential perspectives (Alvesson & Sköldbberg, 2009).

Second, the study employs critical synthesis. Key literature was examined to identify recurring discursive patterns, including the emphasis on individual responsibility and the marginalization of structural or political agency in sustainability frameworks. Third, insights from this analysis are synthesized into conceptual recommendations aimed at bridging the value-action gap. By critically integrating findings across the literature, the study identifies opportunities to reframe sustainability discourse in ways that emphasize collective agency, systemic understanding, and democratic participation. This synthesis draws on interdisciplinary scholarship to ensure that recommendations are grounded in established theory while responsive to contemporary challenges in sustainability education and policy.

Overall, this methodological approach provides a transparent and systematic framework that critically interrogates SDG discourse by synthesizing interdisciplinary insights and offering theoretically grounded recommendations. It demonstrates how conceptual exploration and reflexive engagement with literature can reveal both the limitations of current global sustainability narratives and pathways for motivating democratic participation and bridging the persistent gap between sustainability awareness and civic action.

## Analysis

### **Institutional Barriers to Democratic Participation in Sustainability Agendas**

Institutional dynamics play a central role in sustaining the value–action gap in global sustainability agendas as governance practices as well as participatory mechanisms shape citizen engagement (Bexell & Jönsson, 2017; Fukuda-Parr, 2022). These interrelated institutional factors create environments in which citizens are often positioned as peripheral actors and thus limit their agency as active participants. Such frames reinforce the perception of sustainability as primarily a technical or expert-managed challenge. A key aspect of these dynamics is the technocratic and engineerist framing of the SDGs that emphasizes measurable targets and expert-led solutions over participatory engagement. By privileging top-down implementation, this framing shapes decision-making processes and frame citizen action as secondary or optional (Sachs, 2012).

These framing choices interact closely with governance shortcomings, including mismanagement, lack of transparency, and limited participatory mechanisms (Bexell & Jönsson, 2017; Broome & Quirk, 2015). The centralized governance structures can weaken accountability, reduce trust, and limit opportunities for citizen influence (Fukuda-Parr, 2022). The combination of technocratic framing and constrained governance not only limits the formal avenues for engagement but also reinforces the perception that sustainability responsibilities lie predominantly with institutions rather than individuals.

Finally, restricted participatory mechanisms intensify these effects. While multi-stakeholder engagement is often emphasized rhetorically in SDG discourse, opportunities for meaningful citizen involvement remain limited and thus reinforces citizens' peripheral position (Bexell & Jönsson, 2017). Together, these institutional barriers create a self-reinforcing cycle where governance practices and policy framing collectively constrain democratic participation. This highlights the reason why addressing institutional factors is critical to bridging the value-action gap.

### **Individual Barriers to Democratic Participation in Sustainability Agendas**

Even when citizens are aware of sustainability challenges, their engagement is often constrained by a complex interplay of cognitive, behavioral, and motivational factors that are deeply influenced by institutional and discursive contexts (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Steg & Vlek, 2009). Awareness alone rarely translates into action because habitual routines, perceptions of limited impact, and low levels of civic involvement interact with structural conditions to limit participation (Shove, 2010). These dynamics help explain why knowledge of sustainability issues does not automatically lead to meaningful civic or political engagement, revealing persistent gaps between awareness and action.

Individual tendencies are closely shaped and reinforced by institutional environments. In contexts where governance is opaque, resources are mismanaged, and participatory mechanisms are minimal, citizens frequently perceive that their contributions will have little effect (Bexell & Jönsson, 2017; Fukuda-Parr, 2022). In addition to this, habitual behaviors further limit engagement (Steg & Vlek, 2009). When routines are reinforced by societal norms or by the lack of structured participatory channels, individuals are less likely to adopt practices that could have collective impact (Shove, 2010). This inertia is not merely a personal limitation but reflects the broader environment in which individuals operate. In the context of a lack of

meaningful opportunities for action, sustainable behaviors remain largely symbolic or private, failing to generate systemic change (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002).

Moreover, low civic engagement is both a cause and consequence of these perceptions and habits (Maibach et al., 2010). When citizens observe that institutional processes are inaccessible, their engagement declines (Steg & Vlek, 2009). This reinforces a self-perpetuating cycle where citizens are demotivated and believe that their knowledge is unlikely to produce tangible outcomes (Shove, 2010). Awareness of sustainability challenges becomes detached from participatory action when individuals struggle to find pathways to contribute effectively within constrained institutional settings (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002).

Importantly, these individual-level barriers are not isolated phenomena. They are intimately linked to institutional practices and discursive framing that form a feedback loop in which perceptions, behaviors, and structural constraints continuously reinforce one another (Shove, 2010; Steg & Vlek, 2009). Understanding this interplay is essential for explaining why the value-action gap persists despite widespread awareness and education on sustainability (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002). It also establishes a foundation for exploring how targeted interventions in discourse, pedagogy, and participatory mechanisms could help mitigate these barriers (Entman, 1993; Freire, 2005).

## Discussion

### Critical Pedagogy and Barriers in Sustainability Agendas

Institutional and individual barriers are deeply intertwined in sustaining the value-action gap in global sustainability agendas (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Shove, 2010). Critical pedagogy provides a lens to analyze how these barriers mutually reinforce one another (Freire, 1970). These structures are not neutral procedural shortcomings but manifestations of power-knowledge relations that reproduce hierarchical control and limit democratic participation (Giroux, 2005).

Critical pedagogy interprets these institutional arrangements as discursively produced mechanisms of exclusion that constrain citizen agency and shape perceptions of individual efficacy (McLaren, 2000). Emphasizing praxis, the integration of reflection and action, shows that awareness alone is insufficient for engagement. Instead, citizens must critically interrogate institutional norms, question hierarchical decision-making, and envision collective possibilities for participation (Freire, 1970). Dialogue promotes shared understanding and collective critical consciousness. As a consequence, this enables individuals to recognize structural barriers such as opaque governance and perceive their potential role in challenging them (Giroux, 2005).

Individual-level barriers such as behavioral inertia, perceived inefficacy, and low civic engagement emerge and are reinforced within these institutional contexts (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Steg & Vlek, 2009; Wals, 2010). Citizens often default to symbolic or private actions, not from ignorance, but because bureaucratic rigidity and restricted participatory opportunities normalize passivity (Friedrich et al., 2025). Observing institutions as unresponsive further diminishes perceived impact and creates a feedback loop that sustains both individual passivity and structural rigidity (Shove, 2010). While resistance exists at the individual level, institutional barriers are typically more entrenched. This highlights the importance of equipping citizens with critical awareness and collaborative approaches (Fukuda-Parr, 2022; Wals, 2010).

By situating institutional and individual barriers within a critical pedagogical framework, the value-action gap is framed not as a purely technical or behavioral problem but as a deeply political phenomenon (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002). Through conscientization, citizens develop the critical awareness needed to recognize bureaucratic inefficiencies, lack of transparency, and top-down control as contestable rather than inevitable (Freire, 1970). Educational interventions that nurture praxis, dialogue, and empowerment enable individuals and collectives to challenge hierarchical authority, hold institutions accountable, and actively shape sustainability agendas (Freire, 1970; McLaren, 2000). This integrated approach strengthens civic responsibility by linking knowledge with action and positions sustainable engagement as a shared democratic duty.

### **Framing and Barriers in Sustainability Agendas**

Many institutional frames that inform citizen engagement are identified in the literature on global sustainability agendas. Such technocratic and engineerist frames, for example, focus on quantifiable targets, standardized indicators, and expert-led solutions implying that the main authority sits with technical experts (Fukuda-Parr, 2022; Sachs, 2012). According to framing theory, these frames serve the role of more than describing the policy; they shape expectations of civic responsibility as well as which kinds of engagements are considered appropriate and effective (Chong & Druckman, 2007; Entman, 1993). By promoting technical know-how and standardized approaches, frames like this marginalize participatory or activist interventions implicitly, and thus can frame both what is understood and how people act in ways that contribute to the value-action gap.

Moral and value frames are a critical area of theoretical inquiry as they encode normative assumptions about what is expected of people, thereby configuring how citizens frame their perceptions and priorities (Lakoff, 2004). Those new perspectives can be applied in the context of sustainability discourse. Entman (1993) conceptualizes framing in terms of problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and treatment recommendation, making it quite clear how these institutional narratives construct understanding and perceived responsibility. These frames guide what kinds of action are acceptable to be acted on, and by so doing determine which interventions are successful or acceptable from a societal standpoint. These discursive constructions help to sustain the value-action divide by suggesting to citizens that meaningful intervention is limited to officially sanctioned channels even when systemic change may be crucial and needs to be achieved on a collective level (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989; Snow & Benford, 1988).

Framing theory highlights the dynamic and contestable nature of discourse. Institutional frames are not fixed; they operate through mechanisms such as emphasis and causal attribution which can be strategically analyzed, questioned, and countered (Entman, 1993). By revealing how legitimacy is discursively constructed, framing analysis identifies both barriers and potential openings for engagement. Institutional frames may constrain participation when unexamined, yet they simultaneously indicate points where critical reflection, dialogue, and counter-framing can empower citizens to reinterpret hierarchies, challenge opaque processes, and engage more actively in sustainability initiatives.

Integrating this analysis with the critical pedagogy lens emphasizes that civic empowerment requires both understanding structural barriers and engaging with the discursive mechanisms that limit agency. By highlighting the framing strategies that shape perceptions of legitimacy and authority, this perspective provides a conceptual foundation for exploring how education,

dialogue, and participatory practices can reframe sustainability discourse and enable more meaningful democratic participation (Freire, 1970).

### **Synthesis and Pathways for Enhancing Democratic Participation in Sustainability Agendas**

The analysis highlights that institutional and individual barriers are mutually reinforcing, sustaining the persistent value-action gap in global sustainability agendas. These structural features interact with cognitive and behavioral factors, including perceived inefficacy, habitual inertia, and low civic engagement that contribute collectively to self-reinforcing cycles that inhibit meaningful participation (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Steg & Vlek, 2009; Wals, 2010).

Critical pedagogy provides both an analytical lens and a framework for intervention, emphasizing praxis, dialogue, and conscientization to show that awareness alone is insufficient. Citizens must cultivate the capacity to critically interrogate institutional norms and hold authorities accountable (Apple, 2004; Freire, 1970; McLaren, 2000). Framing theory complements this perspective by highlighting how perceptions of legitimacy and responsibility are discursively constructed and can be contested, revealing opportunities to strategically reframe sustainability narratives in ways that promote participatory engagement (Entman, 1993).

Hence, it must be an integrated process in order to deepen democratic engagement in practice. Reform strategies in the forms of decentralizing decision-making, increasing transparency, and mechanisms that meaningfully incorporate citizen input are needed (Fukuda-Parr, 2022). Educational interventions can support critical awareness and collaborative problem-solving which provide individuals with techniques to address and confront structural constraints (Freire, 1970). Public discourse framing is also an essential instrument through which citizens' perceptions can be constructed in terms of agency, legitimacy, and collective responsibility, which helps to promote the active and responsible participation by citizens in sustainability (Entman, 1993). When these dimensions of structure, pedagogy, and rhetoric are considered, they should constitute a foundation for bridging the value-action gap and for enacting sustainability imperatives through participatory, inclusive, and effective processes (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002).

### **Conclusion**

This study has examined the structural, cognitive, and discursive factors sustaining the value-action gap in global sustainability agendas, emphasizing the importance of citizen engagement for inclusive and effective governance. Institutional arrangements, such as centralized decision-making, technocratic governance, and limited transparency imply that responsibility resides primarily with technical experts and authorities (Bexell & Jönsson, 2017; Fukuda-Parr, 2022; Sachs, 2012).

Discursive frames embedded in policy, public communication, and education shape perceptions of legitimacy and individual efficacy (Entman, 1993; Lakoff, 2004), reinforcing hierarchical authority and constraining meaningful civic participation. Integrating critical pedagogy and framing theory illuminates both the challenges and potential pathways to address these barriers. Critical pedagogy emphasizes praxis, conscientization, and dialogue, demonstrating that awareness alone is insufficient and that citizens must critically interrogate

institutional norms and envision collective possibilities (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 2005; McLaren, 2000). Framing theory clarifies how perceptions of legitimacy and responsibility are constructed and contested in discourse, highlighting opportunities to reframe narratives in ways that promote active engagement (Entman, 1993; Lakoff, 2004).

Bridging the value-action gap therefore requires coordinated strategies that combine structural reform, participatory education, and strategic discursive interventions (Freire, 1970; Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Wals, 2010). By promoting critical awareness, enhancing transparency, and promoting citizen agency (Freire, 1970), these approaches empower individuals and collectives to act meaningfully, translating knowledge into action. Ultimately, sustainable development depends not only on expert-led solutions but also on inclusive spaces where citizens can contribute actively, critically, and collaboratively to shared environmental, social, and economic goals which can support the development of accountable and participatory sustainability initiatives (Bexell & Jönsson, 2017; Fukuda-Parr, 2022).

### **Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process**

The author declares that an AI-assisted writing software was used in proofreading and refining the language used in the manuscript. The usage was limited to correcting grammatical and spelling errors and rephrasing statements for accuracy and clarity. The author further declares that no other AI or AI-assisted technologies have been used to generate content in writing the manuscript. The ideas, design, procedures, findings, analyses, and discussion are originally written and derived from careful and systematic conduct.

## References

- Alvesson, M., & Sköldbberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Bexell, M., & Jönsson, C. (2017). *Global governance and citizen participation: Challenges and opportunities*. Routledge.
- Broome, A., & Quirk, J. (2015). Sustainability, indicators, and governmentality. *Environmental Politics*, 24(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2014.943151>
- Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, 103–126. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.10.072805.103054>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Education for critical consciousness*. Continuum.
- Fukuda-Parr, S. (2022). *Human development and the sustainable development goals: Concepts, indicators, and policy implications*. Routledge.
- Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(1), 1–37.
- Giroux, H. A. (2005). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2005). *Critical pedagogy primer* (2nd ed.). Peter Lang.
- Kollmuss, A., & Agyeman, J. (2002). Mind the gap: Why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior? *Environmental Education Research*, 8(3), 239–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620220145401>
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Maibach, E. W., Leiserowitz, A., Roser-Renouf, C., & Mertz, C. K. (2010). Identifying like-minded audiences for global warming public engagement campaigns: An audience segmentation analysis and tool development. *PLoS ONE*, 5(3), e9698. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0009698>
- McLaren, P. (2000). *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire, and the pedagogy of revolution*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage.

- Sachs, J. D. (2012). From millennium development goals to sustainable development goals. *The Lancet*, 379(9832), 2206–2211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)60685-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60685-0)
- Shove, E. (2010). Beyond the ABC: Climate change policy and theories of social change. *Environment and Planning A*, 42(6), 1273–1285. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a42282>
- Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, 1, 197–217.
- Steg, L., & Vlek, C. (2009). Encouraging pro-environmental behaviour: An integrative review and research agenda. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 29(3), 309–317. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2008.10.004>
- Wals, A. E. J. (2010). *Learning for sustainability in times of accelerating change*. Wageningen Academic Publishers.

**Contact email:** sara.aberkan@gmail.com