Obstacles and Opportunities

An Analysis of Climate Change Campaigns by Australian NGOs

by

Nina Lansbury Hall

B.Env.Sc. (Hons.) (UNSW) B.A. (UNSW)

Thesis by publication submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the Division of Environment and Life Sciences
Graduate School of the Environment
Macquarie University, Sydney NSW
Australia

Final revised version, submitted April 2009

MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY~SYDNEY

Certificate of Originality

Except where otherwise indicated in the text herein, the work described in this thesis is entirely my own, and has not been submitted, in any form, for a higher degree at any other university or institution.

Date:

Signed:

Nina Lansbury Hall
B.Env.Sc.Hons. (UNSW) B.A. (UNSW)

Copyright

This thesis is printed on Fuji Xerox Green Wrap paper, containing 60 percent post-consumer recycled content.

Preface

Background of researcher: Nina Lansbury Hall

I have worked in the Australian environment movement for over a decade. My roles in non-government organisations (NGOs) have involved research, campaigning and advocacy on issues specific to energy and climate change. Most recently, I was the chairperson of the board of the Mineral Policy Institute, an NGO promoting social and environmentally mining and energy projects. I am currently the National Coordinator of the peak non-government body on climate change in Australia, the Climate Action Network Australia. This current position enables me to apply my PhD research outcomes directly to my field of study, and to build on the experience prior to my PhD candidature.

My familiarity with the environmental NGO sector and my existing working relationships with many campaigners working within it allowed me to secure the trust and access required for this research. My research role was one of 'activist as author'.

My overriding motivation for undertaking this research was to maintain pressure on the Australian Federal Government to adequately -and quickly- address my country’s significant contribution of greenhouse gases to human-induced climate change. I hold a strong belief in the ability of civil society to influence political decisions. For this reason, my research sought to sharpen the effectiveness of NGO campaigns on climate change in Australia by identifying the obstacles and opportunities facing current campaigns. At a personal level, I also sought a broader perspective on the role of NGOs in influencing social and political change on issues of public concern, such as climate change.

Thesis by Publication: Format and examination criteria

Macquarie University requires that all postgraduate theses must 'form a distinct contribution to the knowledge of the subject and afford evidence of coherence and of originality shown either by the discovery of new facts or by the exercise of independent critical power', and present 'an integrated body of work' Macquarie University, 2006).

This thesis is presented as a 'thesis by publication' or 'journal-article-format thesis'. Under Macquarie University policy, a thesis by publication opens with the Introduction, a 'comprehensive, critical and coherent overview of the relevant literature' that sets the 'frame and sequence for each of the papers to follow'.

After the Introduction chapter, the chapters are 'each written in the format of a self-contained journal article. This need not have been submitted to any journal'. These articles may be single author or co-author. All co-authored papers must specify the PhD candidate's specific contribution. The contribution of others to the preparation of the thesis or to individual parts of the thesis must be specified. Section 5 outlines the researcher's contribution to each included journal article and lists each contributing author as a co-author in the reference material.

The closing Conclusions chapter 'provides an integrative conclusion, drawing together all the work described in the journal-article-format parts of the thesis and relating this back to the issues raised in the Introduction' (Macquarie University, 2006).

The thesis by publication is examined using the following categories for comment on the research presented:

- Makes a distinct contribution to knowledge in the area with which it deals.
- Affords evidence of originality shown either by the discovery of new facts or by the exercise of independent critical power.
- Is satisfactory as regards its literary presentation.
- Contains a substantial amount of material suitable for publication.
- Grading.

Reference:

Macquarie University (2006), *Journal-article-format thesis,* Higher Degree Research website, Macquarie University, http://www.maccs.mq.edu.au/information/student/journalformat.htm (accessed 31/8/06).

Reflections on actions to address and prevent climate change

Climate change is possibly the greatest moral question the world has ever faced.

Ashok Sinha, Stop Climate Chaos Coalition UK
(pers. comm., 27/06/2006)

The stone-age didn't end because we ran out of stones. Slavery didn't end because we ran out of slaves. And the carbon era is not going to end because we've run out of fossil fuels. It's going to end because we made a conscious decision to move away from it.

Charlie Kronick, Greenpeace UK
(pers. comm. 27/06/2006)

It is sometimes claimed that environmentalists are trying to 'spoil the party' and stop people enjoying our modern lifestyle ... I am suggesting that a new party is starting up. It is a better party because it won't run out of food and drink, it will be more satisfying because it will be based on personal fulfillment rather than gluttonous consumption, it won't damage our shared 'house' or leave us with a hangover, and it won't have envious neighbours looking on or throwing rocks on the roof. It will be a party we can all enjoy, and a party we can expect out children to enjoy as well.

Emeritus Professor Ian Lowe
(2006, p.152)

On NGO campaigning:
People don't realise how hard the ducks are paddling as they seem to glide so effortlessly across the water.

Carl Zichella, The Sierra Club, USA
(pers. comm., 03/12/2007)

Acknowledgments

The journey of this doctoral thesis has been a happy one, well-supported and filled with rich learning. This heartening experience has not only been due to selecting a topic that continues to intrigue, fascinate and concern me, but due to the input, advice and generosity of those around me.

I give my thanks to Macquarie University, and in particular the Graduate School of the Environment (GSE), for providing funding through the Australian Postgraduate Award, the Postgraduate Research Fund and the Higher Degree Research Fund. I have appreciated the provision of the research management course, formal progress support, and excellent library, administrative and office resources. In particular, I thank Peter Nelson, Gunnella Murphy and Trish Fanning at the GSE.

My principal supervisor, Dr Ros Taplin, provided time, commitment and expert guidance that far exceeded my expectations. I found that it is indeed true that the choice of supervisor can 'make or break' the entire PhD experience, and Ros' involvement absolutely 'made' it. Ros demonstrated her commitment following her move from Macquarie University when she continued to provide close supervision and support throughout the examination process.

Behind Ros, my team of supervisors provided excellent advice in the kindest manner, ensured my research stands up to scrutiny, and extended collegial friendship. Heartfelt thanks to Dr Lloyd Cox and Wendy Goldstein (Macquarie University) and Dr Sean Scalmer (University of Melbourne).

Thank you to my fellow PhD students within the GSE. Taking this journey together has been enjoyable, and working with you and learning from you has been a highlight of my experience. Thanks especially to Noim Uddin, Dimity Podger and Jeffrey McGee.

Many thanks to the knowledgeable, committed and tireless climate campaigners in environmental NGOs that I interviewed and have worked with over these years. Your efforts have made a significant impact on climate politics in Australia and overseas, and, most importantly, on the climate itself. I have been inspired to spend time with you all.

Thank you to those who provide the foundation of love and support upon which over three years of study can be taken. Thank you to my parents, Russell and Gwenda Lansbury, who were willing to undertake childcare or provide academic feedback, in either order. Thank you to my parents-in-law, John and Helen Hall, who helped to support the balance of study and parenting. Thanks and deepest love to Murray Hall, my husband, who has prioritised my study and supported my learning in every way, including helping me to 'connect the dots' when I was too deeply immersed in data.

And thank you to my beautiful children, Maya and Jarrah. This research was inspired by my concern for your future. I hope I have helped in some way to create a securer climate for you.

Table of Contents

Synopsis

For over 20 years, Australian non-government organisations (NGOs) have campaigned for recognition of the threat of climate change and for an adequate political response. Australia has the highest *per capita* greenhouse gas emissions in the world. Yet, until 2006, Australian Federal Government Ministers were still openly expressing a sceptical attitude regarding the link between human greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. These views contrasted with NGO campaign efforts and growing public concern regarding climate change. In late 2007, Federal election exit polls revealed that climate change ranked as the third most important issue to electorates in marginal seats, and the newly-elected Rudd Labor Government ratified the Kyoto Protocol. This research identified obstacles encountered by NGOs and opportunities available to NGOs to better realise their climate campaign goals. It explored the reasons for the political shift on climate change and the role played by NGOs in this shift. Forty-eight semi-structured interviews were conducted. These included interviews with campaigners from seven Australian NGOs, four UK NGOs and six Californian NGOs. Interviews were also undertaken with grassroots climate activists and 'external observers' of the NGO campaigns. The research drew upon social change theory to map the effectiveness of a campaign, or apparent lack of it. Comparative analyses found the apparent achievements by NGOs in the UK and California appeared to stem from more conducive political and policy conditions. To test the theoretical findings, the researcher undertook a participatory action research project to develop and present the grassroots-initiated Climate Protection Bill to Federal Parliamentarians in the lead-up to the Federal election. The greatest current opportunity for Australian NGOs is the recent election of the Rudd Government on a commitment to address climate change. This election result was due, in part, to the long-term, persistent campaign efforts by Australian NGOs.

1. Introduction

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) represents the world's leading climate scientists and they have published their projected impacts of climate change since 1990. With each subsequent report, the strength of the language used to describe the future impacts has increased. The certainty and severity of the risk of these impacts has also increased. In its most recent report, the IPCC (2007, pp.2-4) stated that:

> global atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide have increased markedly as a result of human activities since 1750 ... [and mean that] ... warming of the climate system is unequivocal, as is now evident from observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice, and rising global mean sea level.

According to a leading Australian scientific body, CSIRO, in Australia the projected impacts of climate change include further bleaching of the Great Barrier Reef from increased sea temperatures, increasing coastal erosion and inundation from higher sea levels, impacts on public health and infrastructure, and an increasing severity of impacts from tropical cyclones, heat waves and extreme precipitation events (Preston and Jones, 2006).

Australia's contribution of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions is 1.6 percent of the world total (DPMC, 2004, p.24). The Liberal/National Coalition Government led by John Howard (1996-2007) repeatedly declared that this amount was 'too small for Australia to make a difference on its own' (DPMC, 2004, p.24). However, the nation's annual emissions of 27 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent *per capita* are the highest in the world (CSIRO, 2005). This is due to the availability of cheap electricity, a strong reliance on brown and black coal for electricity production, a relative decline in the use of renewable energy, and a high level of land clearing (Kent and Mercer, 2006).

Most developed countries are required to decrease their emissions under the internationally-recognised Kyoto Protocol, yet the Howard Government negotiated an increase of eight percent above 1990 GHG emission levels (Kay, 1998; Yu and Taplin, 2000). Neither this concession, nor the high rate of Australian greenhouse emissions, nor the projections of the IPCC motivated the Howard Government to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. Instead, Prime Minister

Howard repeatedly declined to ratify, stating that ratification was 'not in the national interest' (DPMC, 2004, p.24). The Kyoto Protocol was only ratified after the Howard Government lost office in the Australian Federal election in November 2007 (Rudd, 2007).

The Howard Government's resistance to strong policy and action to reduce GHG emissions occurred despite twenty years of active campaigning by environmental non-government organisations (NGOs) directed towards influencing government policy and community concern (Hutton and Connors, 1999). The NGO campaign activities have been broad and varied. As Hall and Taplin (2007a) documented, NGOs have provided accessible information on climate science and projected impacts through websites, conference presentations and position papers for a variety of target audiences. This information featured both the ecological and human impacts of climate change. NGOs have actively sought media coverage of the issue through rallies, climate-focused events and attention-seeking, non-violent direct actions. NGOs have attempted to influence policy and political decisions by commissioning expert reports, undertaking polls and developing policies to engage political parties and decision-makers. They have undertaken legal challenges through the courts, and broadened the strength of their demands by building alliances with other pressure groups within civil society and the corporate sector. Despite these efforts, a coalition of environmental NGOs stated in 2005 that Australian 'governments, industry and the public have not truly engaged on this serious issue in a way that will prevent dangerous changes to the global climate system' (CANA, 2005a)

The research that is documented here focused on the role of Australian environmental NGOs seeking adequate policy development in response to climate change and their counterparts in the United Kingdom (UK) and the state of California in the United States of America (US). To a lesser extent, the research also focused on the influence of organised grassroots community groups concerned about climate change. The United Nation's Agenda 21 recommended participation by NGOs and community groups to resolve environment and development policy issues, such as climate change, given their independent role within society of 'shaping and implementing participatory democracy' (UN, 1992, p.27.1). In addition to NGO and community involvement, but not covered in this

research, Agenda 21 recommended that policy development must 'meaningfully involve' organisations, groups and individuals representing women, youth, indigenous people, local authorities, trade unions, business and industry, the scientific and technological community, and farmers (UN, 1992, p.23.2).

This research sought to determine the obstacles limiting the effectiveness of environmental NGO campaigns to influence climate change policy in Australia. Simultaneously, it sought to identify the opportunities to increase the impact or 'traction' of NGO campaigns on climate change. To achieve these aims, five research questions were formulated:

1. What social movement theories and frameworks are useful for understanding and guiding NGO climate change campaigns in Australia?
2. What campaign activities are being undertaken by NGOs, and can they be categorised as 'revolutionary' or 'reformist' strategies?
3. How have campaign outcomes been perceived by the NGOs and the intended audiences, and how can the effectiveness of these campaigns be evaluated?
4. What have been effective NGO climate campaigns in the UK and in California, and were the social and political conditions that supported these achievements similar to Australian conditions?
5. What have been the public and the policy shifts on climate change in Australia, and what is their potential for creating adequate climate policy development and adoption?

This research is presented as a 'thesis by publication', with the main body of research provided in research articles written for publication in peer-reviewed academic journals and conference proceedings. The five research questions correspond to five sections in this thesis by publication. These sections each incorporate up to two research articles. Six of the research articles have been published or accepted for publication. Of the remaining two articles, one has been presented at an academic conference and both have been submitted for consideration to academic journals. The research questions, research methods and resulting research articles are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Research questions, related methods and resulting articles

Section	Research Question	Methods	Article/s
1. Social movements focused on climate change	What social movement theories and frameworks are useful for understanding and guiding NGO climate change campaigns in Australia?	-Broad literature and document review; -Case studies of selected NGOs.	Hall and Taplin (2006)
2. The role of NGOs in the Australian climate change debate	What campaign activities are being undertaken by NGOs and can they be categorised as 'revolutionary' or 'reformist' strategies?	-Broad literature and document review; -Case studies of selected NGOs.	Hall and Taplin (2007a)
3. Are NGO campaigns on climate change effective?	How have campaign outcomes been perceived by the NGOs and the intended audiences, and how can the effectiveness of these campaigns be evaluated?	-Broad literature and document review; -Case studies of selected NGOs; -Semi-structured interviews with NGO campaigners; -Semi-structured interviews with 'external observers'; -Application of existing evaluation methods.	Hall and Star (2007) Hall and Taplin (2008a)
4. Inspiration from overseas	What have been effective NGO climate campaigns in the United Kingdom and in California, and were the social and political conditions that supported these achievements similar to Australian conditions?	-Broad literature and document review; -Case studies of selected NGOs; -Semi-structured interviews with NGO campaigners; -Application of comparative method between countries.	Hall and Taplin (2007b) Hall and Taplin (2008b) Hall (2009)
5. Shifting climate awareness and politics in Australia	What have been the public and the policy shifts on climate change in Australia, and what is their potential for creating adequate climate policy development and adoption?	-Broad literature and document review; -Application of Participatory Action Research to community group project.	Hall and McGee (2007) Hall, Taplin and Goldstein (2009)

The research findings documented here contribute to the limited academic or other literature that specifically analyses and informs NGO environmental strategies. Although there is an increasing amount of analysis of not-for-profit/non-government/'third sector' organisations (as distinct from government and industry) (Worth, 2003), Whelan (2005, p.157) stated that 'environmental literature tends to describe and decry environmental problems rather than offer a critical analysis of the role played by activists in achieving environmental objectives'. Whelan (2005) considered that the existing literature has neglected how activists, often acting in NGO campaigns, learn to effect change. The findings of this research bridge this literature gap. Additionally, this thesis highlights areas for future research to continue to inform the design, practice and effectiveness of NGO climate campaigns.

Beyond contributing to academic knowledge, this research provides practical suggestions that can be utilised to sharpen the effectiveness of NGO campaigns and assist their influence over climate policy responses from the Australian Federal Government.

The following section outlines the methods and methodological approaches employed for this research. The political and policy aspects of the Australian Government's response to climate change are presented in Section 3. The role of Australian environmental NGOs in seeking a political response to climate change is described in Section 4. This is followed in Section 5 by a summary of the research articles that form the core of this body of research. Finally, integrative conclusions drawn from the entire doctoral research project are presented in Section 6.

2. Research approach

This research was undertaken between February 2005 and January 2008, and has been documented via nine discrete but overlapping research articles, eight of which have been published or accepted for publication. Continuous output of articles throughout the research period has contributed to the academic literature. This has also allowed the findings to be made available in a timely manner to NGOs and activists interested in receiving feedback and implementing suggestions.

Each research article sought to employ the most appropriate methods and methodologies for this question-driven research, resulting in a layered methodology that incorporates a variety of research approaches. This approach is supported by Crotty (1998, p.13), who stated:

> Not too many of us embark on a piece of social research with epistemology as a starting point … We typically start out with a real-life issue that needs to be addressed…we plan our research in terms of that problem or questions … our research questions, incorporating the purposes of our research, lead us to our methodology and methods.

The selected research methods adopted are described in Sections 2.1 to 2.3. The methodology, theoretical framework and epistemology that support these methods are presented in Section 2.4.

2.1 Overarching research methods

Qualitative research methods were used to 'gain new perspectives on things about which much is already known, [and] to gain more in-depth information that may be difficult to convey quantitatively' (Hoepfl, 1997, p.49). The research began with a broad literature, document and web-based information review of climate change science and policies and NGO climate campaigns. Individual NGOs were selected as case studies for in-depth examination and analysis of their campaigns, and of the dynamics that have influenced the effectiveness of their campaigns. Seven Australian NGOs with climate campaigns were compared with four similar NGOs in the UK and six NGOs in California. This comparison was sought to determine which dynamics and influences were specific to limiting or leveraging Australian NGO campaigns, and which campaign strategies have been effective in countries with similar political and policy conditions and could potentially be

applied by Australian NGOs with similar success.

The rationale for selecting these three case studies related to political and economic systems that have both parallels and differences, as well as the status and influence of NGOs. Politically, the UK and Australia share similar parliamentary and political systems based on liberal-democratic principles and the Westminster tradition (Howes 2005, p. xx). They allow freedom of speech and have openly active NGOs, including those campaigning on climate change. Both countries have domestic sources of fossil fuels for electricity supply that are an important part of the economy—predominantly oil and natural gas in the UK, and coal in Australia (SBS 2006). Both countries are ‘‘Annex 1’’ (‘‘Western’’ countries). Australia signed to the Kyoto Protocol in 1997, and the UK in 1998, in recognition of the need to reduce GHG emissions. The UK Government agreed to stabilise emissions at 12.5% below 1990 levels, substantially more than the collective reduction target of 5.2% agreed to by Annex I Parties, and ratified the Protocol into law in 2002 (UK Parliament 2005). In contrast, the Australian Government negotiated an increase of 8% above 1990 GHG emissions (Yu and Taplin 2000), and despite securing this concession, the Howard Government continually declined to ratify as it ‘‘is not in the national interest’’ (DPMC 2004, p. 24). These decisions reflect political and economic forces that have resulted in divergent responses to climate change in the UK and Australia. Furthermore, UK climate policy responses have been well aligned with NGO demands, while Australian NGOs struggled to gain political access and media attention under the Howard Government.

In California, political motivations regarding climate change decisions took place against an historical backdrop of progressive environmental legislation, strong community awareness of environmental issues, and a high level of trust and credibility bestowed upon NGOs by Californians. In combination, these factors have provided a context conducive to nonprofits enhancing or influencing Californian climate policy processes. This context is relevant for NGOs operating in other federal or federated systems of government, including Australia and the European Union, where states and member nations have considerable authority over policymaking.

The case study NGOs were identified through mainstream media channels, campaign materials and personal connections. NGOs were selected if they had a permanent climate change campaigner and the total selection was intended to reflect a diversity of campaign goals, political access, and organisational size and budgets. However, this selection is not intended to be considered comprehensive. Where possible, organisations that had a branch in each of the three countries (Australia, the UK and the US) were selected to allow cross-comparison. To secure interview access and campaign material, preference was given to NGOs with whom the researcher had already established a personal connection. The selected NGOs are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of NGOs involved in the study

Australian NGOs	**UK NGOs**	**California NGOs**
Parallel organisations		
1. Friends of the Earth, Australia 2. The Mineral Policy Institute (member of Friends of the Earth International)	1. Friends of the Earth, England, Wales, Northern Ireland	1. Bluewater Network (member of Friends of the Earth International)
3. Greenpeace Australia-Pacific	2. Greenpeace UK	2. Greenpeace USA
4. WWF-Australia	3. WWF-UK	
5.Australian Conservation Foundation (national environmental NGO)		3. The Sierra Club (national environmental NGO)
6. Climate Action Network Australia (alliance of NGOs with climate campaigns)	4. Stop Climate Chaos (alliance of NGOs with climate campaigns)	4. The Apollo Alliance (alliance of NGOs with climate campaigns)
Other organisations		
7. Rising Tide		5. The Vote Solar Initiative
		6. The Union of Concerned Scientists

The selected Australian NGOs included Friends of the Earth Australia (FoE-Australia), the Mineral Policy Institute (MPI, a member of Friends of the Earth International), Greenpeace Australia Pacific (Greenpeace A-P) and WWF-Australia (WWF-Australia), which are all Australian branches of international organisations. The Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF), a national environmental organisation with decades of political standing was included. Rising Tide, a small issue-focused NGO, was selected. The final NGO included was the Climate Action Network Australia (CANA), the Australian branch of an

international collaboration of NGOs on climate change and to which all the selected Australian NGOs were members.

While the Australian NGOs worked together under the common CANA mission to 'tackle the planet's most challenging environmental problem - climate change' (CANA, 2005b), the research revealed that they individually undertook different approaches. For example, ACF preferred to work 'through conventional political forms rather than engaging in alternative lifestyle experiments or dramatic forms of direct action', while Greenpeace A-P was well-known for it non-violent direct action tactics, although it also approached policy change through 'carefully researched briefs presented to courts, the press and governments' (Burgmann, 1993, pp.206- 210).

The selected UK NGOs were Friends of the Earth England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FE-EWNI), Greenpeace UK, and WWF-UK (formerly the Worldwide Fund for Nature UK). Also included was Stop Climate Chaos (SCC), the umbrella network of UK NGOs to which FE-EWNI, Greenpeace-UK and WWF-UK were members. SCC was working on climate change with a mission to 'build a massive coalition that will create an irresistible public mandate for political action to stop human-induced climate change' (SCC, 2006). The 2005 formation of SCC reflected how 'collaborative campaigns are now the norm,' with climate change no longer considered a marginal issue but rather 'as the unifying frame by which [environmental NGOs] might best hope to retain influence' (Rootes, 2007, pp.33-36). Each NGO undertook a different campaigning approach. FE-EWNI was regarded as a 'campaigning organisation whose job is to raise the standards that others are charged to implement', while Greenpeace UK's role as a 'protest organisation' worked to 'exploit media attention to put pressure on governments and corporations' (Rootes, 2007, pp.27-28). WWF-UK maintained ongoing involvement with the Government, receiving such good political access that the former UK Environment Minister, Michael Meacher, described the organisation as 'his alternative civil service' (Rootes, 2007, p.19).

The six selected US environmental NGOs with active climate change campaigns in California were the Sierra Club, the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), Greenpeace USA, the Bluewater Network (a member of Friends of the Earth

International), the Vote Solar Initiative, and the Apollo Alliance. The NGOs could be divided into two groups based on their length of establishment. The Sierra Club, UCS and Greenpeace were considered 'established' organisations, having been founded respectively in 1892, 1969 and 1971. Schlosberg (2005, p.551) stated these organisations were structured 'like the interest groups of conventional pluralist thinking and design'.

Bluewater, Vote Solar and the Apollo Alliance were founded in 1996, 2001 and 2003 respectively. As Schlosberg (2005, p.550) observed, these 'newly-established' environmental NGOs had 'organised a movement in a manner quite distinct from the ... large Washington-based organisations.' They relied on networks and connections to spread their impacts, worked 'from a variety of places with a wide array of tactics' and overcame the limitations of established models of organising while also addressing 'the changing nature of the structures and practices of capital and politics' (Schlosberg, 2005, pp.550-556). These new-style NGOs were not founded to work in competition or in preference to the established organisations. Instead, as Opie (1998, p.422) proposed, they all worked together effectively in a multi-pronged approach on a common issue. Hereafter, the NGOs will be referred to by their acronyms.

2.2 Interview methods

In-depth, semi-structured, qualitative interviews were undertaken with 48 individuals. This included 21 NGO campaigners from Australia, the UK and California, as well as Australian politicians, bureaucrats, energy industry officials, journalists and grassroots citizen activists. Appendix 1 provides a list of all interview participants (from NGO, industry, media and government/political advisors), and their affiliations and Appendix 2 contains the interview questions schedule.

NGO campaigners, rather than members of NGO advisory boards, were sought as interview participants. This decision was based on the desire to examine the experience and perceptions of those carrying out the campaigns, rather than the upper management decisions of their organisations. Often, the key insights sought for the interviews were only held by those directly undertaking the NGO climate campaigns.

Trust was an important part of securing and undertaking the interviews with NGO campaigners. This trust and access was often gained through the researcher's active involvement within two of the selected NGOs, namely the Mineral Policy Institute and the Climate Action Network Australia. This role of 'activist as author', as defined by Doyle (2005, pp.4-6), helped to overcome the 'deep suspicion amongst many non-institutional social movement actors in relation to official recorders of their activities' and assisted to recruit interview participants as key informants. The initial reluctance displayed by potential participants was likely due to the low importance that many campaigners place on academic research due to the length between data collection and publication of results, which is in contrast with the short-term nature of many campaign events. As this researcher was an activist pursuing research outcomes that would be provided to the campaigners in accessible journal articles, this reluctance and mistrust was allayed, and interviews secured more easily.

Twenty-two interviews were undertaken with 'external observers' from sectors identified by the NGO campaigners as the intended audience of their campaigns. These audiences included politicians (one politician and two advisors), eight policy bureaucrats, eight representatives from the fossil fuel and renewable energy industries, the media (two journalists and one editor) and community. Interview participants were selected for their expert knowledge and extensive experience of climate politics within their field.

The remaining five interviews were undertaken with members of Climate Action Coogee, a grassroots citizen group concerned about climate change and of which the researcher was a core member.

Interviews with Australian NGO campaigners and external observers took place between September, 2005 and March, 2006. The UK interviews took place in June, 2006, and the US interviews in September and October, 2006. Interviews with members of Climate Action Coogee were undertaken in April and November, 2007. All the informants and organisations who participated in this research agreed to the inclusion of their comments and many to the disclosure of their identities. The identities of some informants were withheld at their request.

An interviewing approach with emphasis on an open-ended, semi-structured conversation between interviewer and interviewee was undertaken. While the interview participants' perspectives and insights were not necessarily representative of their sector, this approach allowed a rich and in-depth experiential account of an issue to be obtained, with greater breadth than more structured and representative forms of interviewing (Fontana and Frey, 2000, p.652). Additionally, the interviews provided data unavailable elsewhere. As Doyle (2005, pp.4-6) identified, there is rarely a 'standard repository of record' of social movement campaigns, and much information exists outside the realm of formal histories.

Interview questions covered the participants' perceptions of the influence of environmental NGO campaigns on their country's national climate policy, reasons behind the selection of campaign activities, and the socio-political and other contexts within which their campaigns operated and that influenced campaign effectiveness. This reliance on the perceptions of the interview participants as data supports the methodology of ethnographic inquiry, described in Section 2.4. The complete schedule of interview questions is provided in Appendix 2.

After verification by the interview participants, the transcripts of the interviews were analysed using descriptive analysis and methods informed by grounded theory. Grounded theory, used in its pure form, draws themes from transcripts or other data and seeks to generate a theory from such themes rather than merely testing an existing theory (Hoepfl, 1997, p.56). NVivo 2.0, a form of Computer Assisted Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS), was used to extract the recurring themes and assisted the researcher to 'remain attuned to our subjects' views of their realities [without] imposing extant theories or [her] own beliefs on the data' (Charmaz, 2000, p.515). CAQDAS provided distance from the detailed transcript to code the themes, sort and link data segments, and allow comparison of case study NGOs (van Hoven and Poelman, 2003, p.114). It was necessary, however, to return to the complete transcript throughout the fine-detail thematic coding to ensure that the 'total picture' was incorporated (Gilbert, 2002).

As the interviews could not be relied on to gauge broad community perceptions, these perceptions were obtained from the findings of two published surveys

undertaken in 2003. Both were structured, telephone-based surveys that interviewed Australians in urban, regional and rural households. The first, commissioned by the Australian Greenhouse Office and with a specific focus on climate change, undertook 1713 interviews with people with discretionary power over household expenditure from all Australian states and territories (CBSR and RA, 2003). The second was the 2003 edition of New South Wales (NSW) State Government's *Who Cares about the Environment* survey. In this survey, 1421 NSW residents aged 18–70 were interviewed about their attitudes and knowledge of a range of environmental issues, including climate change (DEC, 2003).

2.3 Methods applied to specific aspects of the research

Three additional methods were employed for aspects of the research that were documented in four research articles. Firstly, an evaluation of the effectiveness of campaign activities tested or modified three models and theories of social movements (Hall and Taplin, 2008a). This included the still-relevant Assessment of Political Effectiveness (Schumaker, 1975) that inferred causation between the NGO campaign efforts and political outcomes. It used the criteria of political 'responsiveness' to assess the achievements of a 'protest group', such as an environmental NGO. Schumaker devised five levels to assess this responsiveness:

1. *Hear concerns:* the willingness of the authority to hear the group's concerns,
2. *Consider concerns*: the willingness of the authority to place the group's concerns on the policy agenda,
3. *Adopt policies:* the willingness of the authority to adopt the group's concerns into legislation or policy,
4. *Implement policies:* the willingness of the authority to implement the policy-responsiveness actions, and
5. *Alleviate concerns:* the degree that the actions of the authority succeed in alleviating the grievances of the group (Schumaker, 1975, pp.494-495).

Each Australian NGO campaigner and external observer in this research was asked to identify the level on Schumaker's Assessment at which they considered the Australian Government to be regarding policy responses to climate change. Here, the Government was the 'authority' and the NGOs collectively were the 'group'.

Hall and Taplin (2008a) also applied the Movement Action Plan (MAP; Moyer, 2001). The MAP identified eight generic stages of a social change movement. The stages begin in 'normal times', and cycle through 'take-off' to 'success' and finally 'continuing the struggle' (Moyer, 2001, pp.44-45). Using the MAP's explicit criteria for each stage, the Australian NGO campaigns on climate change were assessed to determine at which stage the campaigns had collectively arrived.

Hall and Taplin (2008a) complemented the above approaches with a comparison of the degree of consistency between NGO policy prescriptions (through

submissions to Government policy processes) and the resulting Government policy outcomes. Three policy processes were selected to which NGOs had made submissions. These were a Productivity Commission review of energy efficiency (Productivity Commission, 2005), a Senate Inquiry into the 2004 Energy White Paper (ECITA, 2005), and a review of renewable energy targets commissioned by the Australian Greenhouse Office (Tambling *et al.*, 2003). The recommendations made in NGO submissions were compared with the recommendations in the resulting Government or Inquiry report to determine consistency, while acknowledging the large number of non-NGO submissions also made.

The second additional method employed was comparative analysis. This was applied in the two research articles that compared the effectiveness of NGO campaign activities in Australia, the UK and California (Hall and Taplin, 2007b; Hall and Taplin, 2008b). Campaign effectiveness was explained through an analysis of the socio-political contexts of the influence of the government, the 'institutional forces' that influenced the development of government policy in each country, and the level of public trust and legitimacy bestowed upon NGOs (Poole *et al.*, 2001). Tarrow (1998) described the influence of these forces and resources as external to NGOs' 'existing repertoire' of campaign activities. This complex was described by Poole *et al.* (2001) as a 'multivariate explanatory approach' and by Tarrow (1998) as a 'political opportunity structure'.

The third method was Participatory Action Research (PAR), employed in Hall *et al.*'s (2009) examination of grassroots citizen participation in climate policy development. PAR methods use a cyclical process to build on learning to guide an active and ongoing project. Each strategy is 'developed, implemented, observed in action and then reflected on … this reflection can lead to plans for further action' (Crane and Richardson, 2000, Section 1.8). In this research, PAR processes were employed to facilitate a grassroots citizen-based climate action group, in which the researcher was involved, to develop their own climate legislation and promote this legislation to Federal Members of Parliament (MPs). This group was one of over 100 similar groups established across Australia since late 2006, providing a new form of pressure groups seeking political action on climate change.

To enhance the rigour of the PAR research, data source triangulation was used. This triangulation involves the use of multiple information sources for verification of findings and ensures the research 'develops a complex picture of the phenomenon being studied, which might otherwise be unavailable [if only one data source were utilised]' (Liamputtong and Ezzy, 2005, p.41). Hall *et al.*'s (2009) data sources included a reflexive diary undertaken by the researcher, email-based interviews with each group member, and meeting minutes and email correspondence between group members throughout the data collection period. Each data source presented information from a different perspective. The reflexive diary featured the perspectives and observations of the researcher, the interviews featured the perspectives of individual group members, and the meeting minutes and email correspondence featured the groups' interactions and decisions together. By combining these sources, each perspective could be validated or contradicted.

Of particular value as both a key data source and a record of the researcher's personal narrative was the reflexive diary. The researcher maintained this diary on a daily basis with ideas, observations, emotional responses and questions during the months of the project. This diary was 'inherently connected to action and as a part of the sense-making process in which both the participants and researcher [were] engaged' (Colombo, 2003, p.4). The diary enabled the researcher to document each development in the project and match it with the emotional response of both the group and herself. This created a more complete picture of the project's progress and the participants' empowering journey toward political change.

The constant narrative recorded in the reflexive diary challenged the researcher to justify or revisit assumptions that had been developed during her former employment within NGOs. As Colombo (2003, p.9) detailed, the strength of such forced reflexivity can extract interpretations, representations and knowledge that is 'only partially systematised' in the participants' mind and 'not yet formalised into a theory that can be stated'. The narration documented through the diary reflected the 'interplay of connected constructions and the negotiation of meanings by those involved in the research' (Colombo, 2003, p.4).

2.4 Methodology, theoretical framework and epistemology

The overarching methodology of this research has close parallels with an ethnographic inquiry[1]. Such inquiry seeks to uncover meanings and perceptions held by the research participants, and to view these understandings 'against the backdrop of the participants' overall world view or culture' (Crotty, 1998, p.7). As Marcus (1998, p.17) advised, 'ethnography should not be overdetermined before it begins, that there should be something to be discovered, found out'. In keeping with ethnographic inquiry, semi-structured interviews ensured that the researcher viewed the data 'from the perspective of the participants' (Crotty, 1998, p.7) and that questions were not prompted in order to prevent 'setting up' the anticipated responses.

The theoretical framework of this research is based in phenomenology[2], within the paradigm of interpretivism. As Crotty (1998, p.78) defined, phenomenology attempts to:

> lay aside the prevailing understandings of phenomena and revisit our immediate experience of them, [where] possibilities for new meaning emerge for us or we witness at least an authentication and enhancement of former meaning.

Phenomenology is a qualitative inquiry that seeks to 'understand phenomena in context-specific settings' and acknowledges the 'complex and dynamic quality of the social world' (Hoepfl, 1997, pp.47-48). Throughout this body of research, the assumptions behind NGO strategies, politics, policy change and climate change were explored phenomenologically.

Constructivism[3] provided the most appropriate epistemology for this research as it asserts that meaning 'is not discovered, but constructed', and that this meaning 'comes into existence in and out of our engagement with the realities in our world'

[1] Ethnographic inquiry: Ethnography is the social scientific study of a people and their culture. An ethnographic inquiry is a qualitative research method that collects data through a variety of procedures, including interviews, participant observation and examination of archival documents (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003, p.708)

[2] Phenomenology: Phenomenology is a qualitative inquiry that seeks to 'understand phenomena in context-specific settings' and acknowledges the 'complex and dynamic quality of the social world' (Hoepfl, 1997, pp.47-48).

[3] Constructivism: The constructivist approach (also known as an interpretivist approach) considers that observation cannot be 'pure', and that the interested and values of individuals ensure that a single, objective reality doe not exist. Instead, multiple subjective realities exist concurrently (Maxcy, 2003, pp.58-59).

(Crotty, 1998, p.9). Constructivism acknowledges that even within an organisation, and definitely between organisations, there exists a diversity of meaningful realities (Charmaz, 2000, p.510). This was the most accurate epistemology to apply to this research as the range of interview participants, both within NGOs and those selected as ‘external observers’, all held different and subjective realities. Interviews, literature, comparative analysis and PAR were used to understand how these participants, both individually and acting as organisations, had constructed their knowledge and meaning regarding climate change politics and adequate political responses. This epistemology reflects the construction of meaningful reality, or realities, held by the interview participants in this research. Here, it is explored within an ontology of realism. Realism asserts that realities exist outside or beyond the human mind, but a 'world of meaning’ is constructed ‘only when meaning-making begins to make sense of it' (Crotty, 1998, p.10).

Prior to applying this research approach to the selected NGO climate campaigns, it is vital to consider the political and policy context within which such campaigns are conducted. Section 3 presents an overview of this context.

3. Political Context: Australian climate policy and public awareness

This section outlines the political and policy aspects of the Australian Government's response to climate change from 1996 to early 2008, which corresponds to the period of the Howard Government and the short recent period since the election of the Rudd Government. It examines climate policy developments alongside the increasing prominence of climate change as an election issue. This is provided to outline the context within which Australian NGOs have undertaken campaigns to build public awareness and precipitate political action on climate change. The role of NGOs is discussed in Section 4.

Despite the high *per capita* greenhouse emissions by Australians, the Howard Government joined the US, Croatia and Monaco as the only developed countries not to ratify the Kyoto Protocol, as described in Section 1 (UNFCCC, 2005). Australia's rejection of the Kyoto Protocol as 'not in the national interest' (DPMC, 2004, p.24) was consistent with the Howard Government's understanding that fossil fuel usage and resource exports should be maintained as a significant part of the Australian economy, earning $24 billion per year (DPMC, 2004, p.1). This stance was demonstrated in the Government's 2004 Energy White Paper, *Securing Australia's Energy Future*, where Kent and Mercer's (2006, p.2) critique found the proposed policies favoured 'a business-as-usual, fossil fuel-dominated future for the Australian energy sector'.

Given the strong business and economic interests in coal and other fossil fuel extraction, use and export, these and allied industries have had a vested interest in influencing government policies. The Howard Government financially supported the coal industry through grants, tax breaks and research and development support (Riedy, 2005), planned for new coal-fired power plants (CANA, 2005a), and set the mandatory renewable energy target so low that researchers questioned whether it could 'significantly reduce emissions and develop the Australian renewable energy industry' (MacGill *et al.*, 2006).

Many observers have considered that fossil fuel dependent industries had influenced climate-related policy decisions of successive Federal Governments, including the Howard Government, through significant political donations and active policy engagement with politicians and public servants (see Hall and Taplin, 2007a). This occurred both in domestic policy development and at international climate change negotiations. There has been a strong industry presence in the Australian delegation at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and Kyoto Protocol-related meetings and conferences. Additionally, informal social interactions 'at dinners and on the golf course' provided further opportunities for engagement (J-A. Richards, CANA and M.J, ACF, in Hall and Taplin, 2007b).

The Howard Government favoured public-private development of clean energy and energy efficiency technologies through voluntary initiatives. For example, to 'complement, but not replace, the Kyoto Protocol', Australia joined the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate (APP) in July 2005 (Howard, 2005). As an alliance with the US, China, India, Japan, South Korea and Canada, the APP had a focus on 'clean' coal technologies and emission intensities (McGee and Taplin, 2006). The Howard Government was supportive of technologically-focused responses to climate change such as Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) as a means to store carbon dioxide underground (DITR, 2006). The Government commissioned an inquiry into nuclear power in 2006 that found 'nuclear power is an option that Australia should seriously consider among the range of practical options to meet its growing energy demand and to reduce its GHG signature' (Switkowski *et al.*, 2006, p.10). Until 2007, the Howard Government opposed placing a price on emission of GHGs through an emissions trading scheme or carbon tax. Perhaps due to shifting community concern and pressure from the Australian state governments who were collaboratively developing a state-based GHG emissions trading scheme, in April 2007 the Government committed to implement a national scheme (DPMC, 2007).

An increase in public awareness and concern for climate change and an associated shift in the Howard Government's climate policy positions can be traced to a critical mass of events in the second half of 2006. These raised the profile of the issue in the mainstream media. Until this time, relative inattention

by the media on climate change was largely due to the poor level of Federal political support for climate change initiatives and policy. An environmental journalist stated:

> unlike in the UK and Europe, where it was treated seriously by politicians and the press, the Howard Government wasn't a believer ... Because the Government wasn't interested in climate change, neither were political correspondents (Frew, 2006, p.19).

Earlier scientific research had projected that reduced rainfall from climate change would produce drought conditions and impact the water supplies in many state capital cities (*eg.* CSIRO, 2005), but Prime Minister Howard only acknowledged there may be a link between the ongoing and severe drought in Australia and climate change in late 2006 (ABC, 2006). The Government's revised position created a dramatic increase in media coverage, with many front-page stories on climate change. In the final three months of 2006, media coverage of climate change increased by more than three times to over 5,000 stories, compared to 1,100 over the same period in 2005 (Hall and Taplin, 2007b).

Other concurrent events reinforced and increased the media reports. The damage caused by Hurricane Katrina in the US in August 2005 instigated discussion regarding the impact of climate change on extreme weather events (WMO, 2006). The early and extreme bushfire season in late 2006 in NSW and Victoria was linked to modeling data that projected a 25 percent increase in the risk of extreme bushfire by 2050, regardless of any measures to reduce GHG emissions (Pitman *et al.*, 2007). A documentary featuring former US Vice President Al Gore, *An Inconvenient Truth,* described the science of climate change and the failure of the US and Australia to ratify the Kyoto Protocol to reduce emissions (Guggenheim, 2006). Gore traveled to Australia to launch the documentary, and attracted strong publicity (ABC TV, 2006). The well-publicised *Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change,* a report for the UK Government on the economic impacts of climate change, projected high global economic costs of failing to reduce GHG emissions (HM Treasury, 2006). Australia's outsider status at the 12th Conference of the Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Nairobi during November 2006 highlighted Australia's failure to address climate change through the established international framework (Hall and McGee, 2007).

Due to this increased profile, community concern about climate change grew. In November 2006, 100,000 Australians joined the Walk Against Warming (WAW) around Australia, with 40,000 participants each in Sydney and Melbourne (WAW, 2006). In November 2007, the WAW took place two weeks prior to the Federal election and again attracted 100,000 participants (ABC, 2007).

Due to these activities, and possibly due to the long-term campaign activities of NGOs, climate change became a determining issue in the 2007 Australian Federal election. Seventy-three percent of voters in nine marginal electorates stated that climate change would have a strong influence on their vote (ARG, 2007, p.3). This prediction was confirmed when exit-polling in these electorates found climate change to be the equal-third priority issue influencing voters (SkyNews, 2007).

On November 24 2007, a Labor Government was elected under Kevin Rudd. In his first act of Government and on the opening day of the 13th UNFCCC Conference of the Parties in Bali, Prime Minister Rudd signed the instrument of ratification of the Kyoto Protocol (Rudd, 2007). In his media statement after the signing, Rudd committed to setting a target to reduce emissions by 60 percent on 2000 levels by 2050, establishing a national emissions trading scheme by 2010 and sourcing 20 percent of electricity from renewable energy sources by 2020 (Rudd, 2007).

Despite these commitments, it is unclear as of May 2008 whether future Australian climate policy will be limited by the Labor Party's close historical associations and large supporter base from unions, including those representing coal mining. For example, the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union (CFMEU) released a position paper prior to the UNFCCC meeting in Bali, recommending that the Government continue to produce coal-fired electricity but capture the GHG by investing in CCS. The CFMEU stated that:

> the central dilemma ... is that fossil fuels will continue to be heavily used for many decades to come, but that use is causing global warming. CCS technologies are the mechanism whereby emissions can be 'decoupled' from fossil-fuel based energy production (CFMEU, 2007, p.4).

Given this political context, the following section describes how Australian NGOs, as part of a strong social movement, have worked to draw political and public awareness to the issue of climate change. The experience of environmental NGOs in the UK and California is contrast with their Australian counterparts.

4. Social Movement Context: The role of NGOs in political action on climate change

4.1. Social movement theories and context

> Social movements are one of the principal social forms through which collectivities give voice to their grievances and concerns … by engaging in various types of collective action … that dramatise those grievances and concerns and demand that something be done about them
>
> (Snow *et al.*, 2004, p.1)

Social movements are one form of collective actions carried out by a number of actors and different organisations to 'challenge the power-holders and the whole society to redress social problems or grievances and restore social values' (Moyer, 2001, p.2). Such collective action entails ‘the pursuit of a common objective through joint action’ (Snow *et al.,* 2004, p.1). A social movement is effective only to the extent that the demands of the movement are adopted into policies (Dryzek *et al.*, 2003, p.132) or causes a shift in social values, in either order.

Social movement theories are useful for both explaining and improving environmental campaigns. In their manual on organising social justice campaigns, Castellanos and Pateriya (2003) considered that often organisations do not have ‘a theory regarding problems in society understood and shared by their members, nor do they have clearly-spelled out strategies for achieving desired social change’. They suggested prioritising the time to ‘define, discuss or update’ theories on which the campaigns are based. In Australia, Whelan (2001) observed that the environmental movement tends towards advocacy and strategies that ‘appear routine or reactive’, and that the ‘theories of how change happens remain unspoken and largely unconscious’.

The class-based theories of traditional social movements were described by Touraine (1977, p. 77) as ‘organised collective behaviour of a class actor struggling against his class adversary for the social control of historicity [cultural field] in a concrete community’, and are focused on Marxist theories (Finley and

Soifer, 2001, p. 103).

More recent social movement research finds this traditional class analysis as insufficient, and thus turns to later social movement theory, which has two major streams: American and European (also known as 'new social movement theory'). Dryzek *et al.* (2003, p.11) defined these later social movements as having self-limiting radicalism, a preoccupation with identity, an identifiable organisational style, and as using unconventional tactics, and not being explicitly class-based.

The four dominant perspectives with most relevance to collective social movements, demonstrated by current climate change campaigns by NGOs, can be classed into new social movements, resource mobilisation, political process and collective behaviour (della Porta and Diani, 1999, p.3). Below are short descriptions of these perspectives, with further information provided in Hall and Taplin (2006).

Theoreticians of new social movements place importance on individuals, and are able to capture the characteristics of movements which 'no longer define themselves principally in relation to the system of production' (della Porta and Diani, 1999, p.13). Within new social movements, values are central to the choice of individuals to become involved in a social movement. Finley and Soifer (2001, p. 103) likened the decision to become involved to a cost-benefit calculation, where activists are motivated by values of self-interest rather than the desire to further the movement's goals, such as prevent dangerous climate change. Doyle's (2001) work on the environmental movement found that many people joined networks through pre-existing social ties, but then they linked the growth of the movement as to an increase in people representing the movement's ideological beliefs or paradigms.

The Resource Mobilisation Theory (RMT), written in the 1970s (republished as McCarthy and Zald, 2003), described the variety of resources that must be 'mobilised' to enable a social movement to make an impact. The resources are varied and can be physical, such as office equipment, staff salaries, and communication materials, or intangible, such as linkages to other groups, and responses by authorities to incorporate or suppress the movement. McCarthy and

Zald considered their theory added ‘depth and realism to existing research on social movements’ (p.169). However the RMT failed to consider aspects important to climate change campaigns by NGOs, such as values, policy influences, organisational theory, and movement dynamics.

A central focus of the political process theories is ‘the relationship between institutional political actors and protest’ (della Porta dn Diani, 1999, p.9). Pressure groups play a leading role in this process as they 'seek to influence public policy without itself striving ... to take over the reins of government' (Matthews, 1997, p.270). Such groups include NGOs and are often not concerned with the whole range of government policy, but instead are 'interested in particular policy areas, and become involved in the issues, inquiries and initiatives within that specialised field' (Davis *et al.*, 1993, p.143). Many Australians financially support specific pressure groups and it has been, after voting, 'the most common form of political participation in Australia' (Marsh, 2002, p.345). Social movements incorporate such pressure groups, but go beyond the confines of interest groups in both relevance and interests to ‘beyond government and polity to other institutional spheres and authorities’ (Snow *et al.*, 2004, p.7).

Moyer (2001) analysed past social movement dynamics to describe collective behaviour, and developed the Movement Action Plan (MAP). He identified eight common stages for each movement which are (in order) normal times, proving the failure of official institutions, ripening conditions, take off, perception of failure, majority public opinion, success, and continuing the struggle (pp.44-45). The MAP achieves a number of goals that Finley and Soifer (2001) believed have not previously been achieved by other theories or research. They considered the MAP to be at once a theoretical model of social movements, a framework for understanding movement dynamics and outcomes, and a tool for movement analysis (p.111).

Collective behaviour has been observed to be ‘attempts by society to react to crisis situations through the development of shared beliefs, on which to based new foundations for collective solidarity’ (della Porta and Diani, 1999, p.4). NGOs are one form of organisation for collective behaviour. Calnan (2004, p.7) defined NGOs as:

> groups of like-minded citizens that are independent of government, which act in counterpoint to government and international institutions ... and that are non profit-making entities.

NGOs act where change cannot be achieved by citizens alone or by an unorganised movement (Princen and Finger, 1994, p.11). NGOs 'operate directly on the government of the day' and attempt to influence a variety of agencies, including parliament, the bureaucracy and the courts, and through public opinion (Rush, 1990). Often NGOs operate over the term of several governments, displaying an endurance 'in pursuit of their goals', at times 'despite public indifference' (Marsh, 2002, p.358).

4.2. The Australian environment movement

The environment movement may be defined as ‘a loose, non-institutionalised network of informal interactions’, and includes a range of participants, from formally organised NGOs to individuals and groups who have no organisational affiliation, who are together ‘engaged in collective action motivate by a shared identity or concern about environmental issues’ (Rootes, 2004, p.610). The range of environmental movement actions in Western society has shifted from highly visible protests to now also include lobbying and ‘constructive engagement with governments and corporations, much of which is publicly invisible’ that all serve to contest ‘established economic and social relationships and cultural understandings’ (Rootes, 2004, p.611).

In the early 1990s, Papadakis (1993) considered that environmental issues were the 'dominant theme' of social movements in Australia, as they challenged the dominant belief in economic growth and materialism and called for both political and social change. Doyle (2001, p.xvii) considered the Australian environmental movement the 'most powerful dissenting social movement in our society, continually challenging both politics and business-as-usual'. This movement, within which NGOs play a pivotal role, has advocated for adequate policy responses on climate change for the last twenty years (Hutton and Connors, 1999).

As key actors in the Australian environmental movement, NGOs selected for this research have all sought, through a variety of campaign activities, to influence Australian climate policy development. As Davis *et al*. (1993, p.153) observed, NGOs devote 'considerable energy and resources to demonstrating that public opinion supports their own opinions and ought therefore to be taken into account by policy makers'. However, NGOs can be - and have been - excluded from the policy-making process. As Davis *et al.* (1993, p.141) described, NGOs and other interest groups risk being 'outsiders':

> because they are not regarded as central to the economic policy concerns of government, because their interest is not highly valued by social elites or because they represent a view on a central issue which is regarded as immoderate.

In the early 1990s, Australian NGOs enjoyed the pluralism afforded to them under the Keating Labor Government. For example, environmental NGOs concerned about climate change were integrally involved in the Government's policy discussions on Environmentally Sustainable Development (ESD) that incorporated climate change among other initiatives, although the ESD Roundtable outcomes ultimately disappointed many NGO and other participants (see Bührs, 2000). Environmental NGOs were also active in the two-year development of the 1992 National Greenhouse Response Strategy, which also involved industry and labour representatives, scientists and bureaucrats. The Strategy initially appeared progressive, seeking to stabiles GHG emissions at 1998 levels by 2000, albeit through voluntary measures. Christoff stated (2005, p. 31), that ‘this perhaps still represents the high point for climate change policy in Australia to date’. By 1994, however, GHG emissions continued to grow and discussions for legislated emissions reduction targets emerged (Christoff, 2005, p.31).

By the 1990s, the Australian environment movement had become ‘more of a lobby group within a well-defined institutional framework for policy development’, with many of the national NGOs becoming increasingly bureaucratic as they were ‘incorporated into the workings of government, and [thus increased their] emphasis on research and lobbying’ (Hutton and Connors, 1999, p.264). Hutton and Connors (1999, p.264) reflected that this evolution supported a Weberian analysis where a social movement shifts from the early

phase of mass mobilisation to ‘routinisation and bureaucratisation of a mature movement’.

After the election of the Howard Government in 1996, NGO access to politicians at a federal level began to wane (Hutton and Connors, 1999). The close relationships established between the NGOs and the Labor Party during its period in Federal Government meant that when the Labor Party lost office, the NGOs saw their influence immediately decline (Doyle, 2000). From that time onwards, Maddison and Hamilton (2007, p.85) considered the Howard Government had 'a clear agenda to restrict NGOs concerned with social justice, human rights, or environmental protection'. They detailed how NGOs that focused on advocacy and that were critical of the Federal Government's policies were threatened with retraction of their tax-deductible charity status, had their Government grants reduced or terminated, and lost their representation on Government committees (Maddison and Hamilton, 2007, p.85). Phillips (2006, p.61) observed that, since coming to power in 1996, the Howard Government 'ignored or deliberately excluded' NGO input into policy development and political discussions.

Christoff (2005, p.43) was critical of the absence of clearly defined and effective groups or coalitions, such as NGOs, that could have effectively opposed the Howard Government’s policies on climate change. He also noted the ‘absence of political and cultural institutions that ensure political accountability on social/economic/political issues of major national significance and public concern’ and considered that thus led to public concern on climate change being ‘unrepresented in national policy and unrecognised in electoral outcomes’ (Christoff, 2005, p.43). In contrast with these absences, many business interests, especially those associated with fossil fuel dependent industries, were politically present and influential. Howes (2005, p.xxix) observed that the economic interests of 'business and industry are in a privileged position of power and are not just another pressure group, particularly when it comes to environmental governance'. Specifically on climate change, a former ministerial advisor under the Howard Government detailed the influence of the fossil fuel lobby's self-titled 'Greenhouse Mafia' on climate policy. He concluded that:

> there is an iron triangle of sorts operating between dominant sections of the bureaucracy, senior levels of successive federal governments, and the powerful advocates representing the resources and energy sector of the Australian economy. Voices from outside this triangle [such as environmental NGOs] have over more than a decade exerted little influence on the direction of government policy (Pearse, 2005, p.340).

Commenting more recently on the Rudd Government's swift ratification of the Kyoto Protocol, Pearse (2007) cautioned that the new Government may also be strongly influenced by fossil fuel dependent industries. He stated:

> the 'delay forces' [on climate policy] who captured John Howard [have] a big foot in the door. And they are already deeply embedded in sections of business, the media, and the Canberra bureaucratic and lobbying establishment. They have plenty of good links into the Labor Party at the state and federal level, too (Pearse, 2007).

With NGO political access relatively blocked under the Howard Government, existing weaknesses in the already-fragmented environment movement were exacerbated. Burgmann (1993, p.230) described the environment movement in Australia as:

> highly fragmented, due to very different ideas about the causes of ecological damage ... Flowing from these contrasting beliefs about causes, and therefore culpability, are wildly divergent streams of thought about how best to prevent environmental degradation.

A further impact on the strength of the movement was the division of both resources and campaign focus between state/territory- and federal level climate policies, given that Australia is a federation of six states and two territories. Bührs (2000, p.115) observed that in Australia:

> environmental policy development is complicated by the division of responsibilities between the Federal Government on the one hand, and states on the other. ... there is uncertainty about the boundaries of their respective mandates.

This dual focus has increased the competitiveness among Australian NGOs for scarce government and philanthropic funds and member donations for campaign and organisational support. There has also been competition among NGOs for media attention.

These obstacles all contributed to eroding the advocacy potential of environmental NGOs on climate policy under the Howard Government. Several

interview participants suggested that, given these obstacles, the pressure required for action on climate change would have to come from the collective 'citizen voice' of the electorate. One campaigner stated:

> in the past ... not many people in the community in Australia have known much about climate change and even less have been doing anything about it. And I think that that's why Australian politicians are such global laggards on the issue ... Once there's a build up of community pressure then there'll certainly be a lot more impetus on government (S.Phillips, in Hall and Taplin, 2007b).

4.3. Environmental NGOs on climate change: Australia, the UK and California

Until the recent political interest in climate change in Australia, Australian NGOs experiences lay in apparent contrast with the situation in the UK and California. The UK's Blair Government created political and policy conditions that were conducive to NGO climate campaigns over the last decade. As Hall and Taplin (2007b) detailed, there was very strong political posturing on climate change by the Blair Government, and the fossil fuel lobby did not have predominant influence. The UK is a highly centralised polity with relatively centralised environmental NGOs. NGOs appeared to be highly regarded by the UK Government and community, and had millions of supporters from whom to draw financial support. Membership of UK NGOs increased fourfold in the 1970s, doubled in the 1980s and peaked in the 1990s (Rootes, 2004, p.627). In 2000, the combined membership of the eleven major environmental organisations totaled 5.5 million (Rootes, 2007, p.11). The UK NGOs enjoy diversity and collaboration. Rootes (2004, p.611) stated that the UK had ‘perhaps the most organisationally specialised and diverse environmental movement in Europe … [where NGOs] practice a division of labour that recognised the particular competencies and styles of the various organisations’.

Across the Atlantic, US NGOs working on climate change have been ‘constrained by their limited resources, their anxiety to preserve their privileged political access, and their socially circumscribed interests … very openness of national institutions to established [environmental NGOs] had the effect of co-opting them (Rootes, 2004, p.629). However, NGOs undertaking climate campaigns in California benefited from supportive political conditions. Hall and Taplin (2008b) observed that NGO campaign goals were able to leverage off competition among

US states for political and economic development opportunities associated with early responses to climate change. In California, these opportunities involved introducing climate policies to create jobs and markets in renewable energy. California's Republican Governor, Arnold Schwarzenegger, prioritised climate change to differentiate his leadership from the Federal Government and lessen the contrast in environmental commitments between himself and his Democrat opponent in the 2006 state election. These political motivations took place against an historical backdrop of progressive environmental legislation, strong community awareness of environmental issues, and a high level of trust and credibility bestowed upon NGOs by Californians.

Recently, the Australian political climate shifted with regard to climate change. As Hall *et al.* (2009) described, the events of late 2006 stimulated the growth of pressure groups in the form of grassroots citizen-based 'climate action groups', and this further increased public awareness, political pressure and policy development regarding climate change. These shifts, and other aspects that saw NGOs involved in the politicisation of climate change in Australia and overseas, are outlined in-depth in the research articles presented in the following section.

5. Research Articles

This section contains nine research articles that elaborate on the preliminary discussion in the previous sections and form the core of this body of research. Each section addresses a research question posed in Section 1, and provides an analysis of the activities and effectiveness of the campaigns by environmental NGOs advocating for political action on climate change.

5.1. Social movements focused on climate change

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2006), 'Confronting Climate Change: A review of theoretical perspectives on environmental NGOs and their campaign effectiveness', *Griffith Journal of the Environment* (2) (Online journal), http://www.griffith.edu.au/faculty/ens/gje.
Hall's contribution to the article: 95% conception, 100% data collection, 95% analysis, 80% writing.

Hall and Taplin (2006) provide a theoretical framework on social movements to inform this body of research by reviewing several social movement theories relevant to climate campaigns by selected Australian NGOs. This article briefly examines the limitations of traditional social movement theories, and turns to new social movement theories as more relevant to the current Australian NGO experience. New social movement theories based on values and paradigms, incrementalism, pressure groups, discourse, organisational structures and dynamics are presented. In particular, understanding dominant paradigms can enable NGOs to communicate to specific audiences with messages that resonate with their values. Politicians and other power-holders maintain a paradigm that emphasises materialism 'associated with economic growth' (Papadakis, 1993, p.21). By contrast, environmental NGOs work from a position strongly associated with post-materialism, which Papadakis (1993, p.21) defined as 'oriented towards self-fulfillment and self-actualisation'. Despite this positioning, Hutton and Connors (1999, p.265) reflected that post-materialist values are ‘unlikely to provide the basis for a struggle with a state focused on short term political survival and industry focused on short-term economic viability’

In this article, Hall and Taplin (2006) outline the relevance of the 'SPIN' organisational structure that forms a 'segmentary, polycentric, integrated network'. Such a structure allows an NGO to undertake diverse activities, access different segments of the population and even support ideological differences while

maintaining a strong environment movement (Gerlach, 2001). Also examined is the Movement Action Plan (Moyer, 2001), a campaign map that explains the stages involved in a collective movement, such as seeking political action on climate change in Australia. These theories provide the foundation for the subsequent analysis of campaign approaches.

Published journal article

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2006), 'Confronting Climate Change: A review of theoretical perspectives on environmental NGOs and their campaign effectiveness', *Griffith Journal of the Environment* (2) (Online journal), http://www.griffith.edu.au/faculty/ens/gje.

5.2. The role of NGOs in the Australian climate change debate

Hall, N., and Taplin, R. (2007a), 'Revolution or Inch-By-Inch? Campaign approaches on climate change by environmental groups', *The Environmentalist* (27) pp.95-107.
Hall's contribution to the article: 95% conception, 100% data collection, 95% analysis, 80% writing.

To introduce the seven selected Australian NGOs and their campaigns, Hall and Taplin (2007a) examine the breadth of campaign strategies and activities that the NGOs have used to attract public and political attention to the issue of climate change. A dichotomy of 'revolutionary versus reformist' is tested to determine the NGOs' preferred strategies. ‘Revolutionary strategies’ can de derived from Beder’s (1991, p.56) description of ‘good activism’ that is ‘designed to foster a sense of urgency and crisis so that people will cry out for change'. In contrast, reform-focused strategies based on negotiation with the powerholders can 'diffuse that sense of crisis … [and provide a] false sense of confidence given the lack of power of negotiating environmentalists' (Beder, 1991, p.56). These different approaches, according to Beder (1991, p.55), can create a tension for environmental groups due to 'the differing ideologies, but also from the practical effects of differing strategies'. However, contrasting strategies have the potential to create a useful political space to effect change. As Maddison and Scalmer (2006, p.101) identified:

> Radicals demand attention and provoke antipathy ... In contrast, reformists offer a sane, rational alternative ... [and] seek the practical compromise. In this way, the revolutionary creates a space for the moderate to bargain. Governments fear the extremists and meet with the reformists. Strategic divisions within the movement can become, briefly, a kind of political resource.

To test this theoretical dichotomy, four campaign themes are derived from Richards and Heard's (2005) earlier analysis of NGO strategies and divided by Hall and Taplin (2007a) into ‘revolutionary’ and reformist’ strategies. These are:

- Revolutionary A: *Information, education and awareness raising* (to improve public understanding).
- Revolutionary B: *Direct and legal action* (confrontational approaches).
- Reformist A: *Political lobbying* (involved with a participative, persuasive approach).

- Reformist B: *Working together* (to incorporate the additional activities identified of corporate engagement, formal networks and building solidarity).

These four themes incorporate the fifteen NGO activities that are identified.

Hall and Taplin (2007a) determine, however, that the selected NGOs have drawn on both reformist and revolutionary strategies, and all themes have been considered and utilised towards achieving campaign goals. This finding echoes Maddison and Scalmer (2006)'s finding that the theoretical tension of this dichotomy can often be overstated or even irrelevant if a revolution is not likely. They stated, 'if the revolution cannot be made, then the stark difference with 'reform' drops away. Tensions evaporate' (Maddison and Scalmer, 2006, p.102). Instead, the NGOs have preferred a 'multi-strategic' approach, and this finding raises the question of whether such an approach has been effective. This question instigated the articles in Section 5.3 that explore evaluation methods.

Published journal article

Hall, N., and Taplin, R. (2007a), 'Revolution or Inch-By-Inch? Campaign approaches on climate change by environmental groups', *The Environmentalist* (27) pp.95-107.

5.3. Are NGO campaigns on climate change effective?

Hall, N. and Star, C. (2007), 'Climate change messages and strategies by Australian NGOs', in J. Ensor, I. Polak and P. van de Merwe (ed.s), *Other Contact Zones*, Network Books, Perth, *New Talents 21C* (7) pp.137- 147.
Hall's contribution to the article: 95% conception, 70% data collection, 70% analysis, 70% writing.

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2008a), 'Room for Climate Advocates in a Coal-focused Economy? NGO influence on Australian climate policy', *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 43 (3), pp.359-379.
Hall's contribution to the article: 95% conception, 100% data collection, 95% analysis, 80% writing.

To evaluate the effectiveness of climate campaigns by the selected Australian NGOs, Hall and Star (2007) begin by comparing the perceptions of NGO climate campaign achievements held by NGO campaigners with those of the 'external observers' of the campaigns. These observers were identified by the campaigners as politicians, bureaucrats, the energy industry, the media and the general community. This comparison was presented in recognition that, as Giugni (1999, p.xxi) identified, '[social movement success] is in large part subjectively assessed. Movement participants and external observers may have different perceptions of the success of a given action'. Hall and Star's (2007) research indicates that NGOs have communicated their concerns to a range of specific audiences, and these audiences have displayed different levels of receptiveness to the campaign messages. However, although NGOs have been effective at raising general awareness and 'agenda creation', their desired social and policy change appears to not be happening, or happening very slowly.

The contrasting views held on the effectiveness of campaigns between the NGO campaigners and the external observers, matched with the apparent lack of social and policy outcomes from the campaigns, led Hall and Taplin (2008a) to evaluate the NGO campaigns using three methods with explicit criteria. The first is derived from Schumaker's (1975) Assessment of Political Effectiveness. The second is Moyer's (2001) Movement Action Plan. The third is a direct comparison of the degree of consistency between NGO policy prescriptions (through submissions) and the resulting Federal Government policy outcomes.

Hall and Taplin's (2008a) article focuses on improving the *internal* evaluation of NGO climate campaigns, supporting an assumption that improved evaluation leads to the planning and execution of more effective campaigns. However, a significant finding in this article is that campaigns do not operate in isolation of external factors. Indeed, the political, policy, economic and social contexts in which these campaigns are undertaken heavily influence the outcomes of even the most well-planned and evaluated campaigns. For this reason, Section 5.4 evaluates the *external* socio-political environment in which campaigns are undertaken through a multi-country comparative study of NGO campaign effectiveness in Australia, the UK and the US.

Published journal article

Hall, N. and Star, C. (2007), 'Climate change messages and strategies by Australian NGOs', in J. Ensor, I. Polak and P. van de Merwe (ed.s), *Other Contact Zones,* Network Books, Perth, *New Talents 21C* (7) pp.137- 147.

Published journal article

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2008a), 'Room for Climate Advocates in a Coal-focused Economy? NGO influence on Australian climate policy', *Australian Journal of Social Issues 43* (3), pp.359-379.

5.4. Inspiration from overseas

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2007b), 'Solar Festivals and Climate Bills: Comparing NGO climate change campaigns in the UK and Australia', *Voluntas* 18(4) pp.317-338.
Hall's contribution to the article: 95% conception, 100% data collection, 95% analysis, 80% writing.

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2008b), 'Nonprofit campaigns and state competition: Influences on climate policy in California', submitted for publication to *Voluntas* (October 28, 2008; currently under review).
Hall's contribution to the article: 95% conception, 100% data collection, 95% analysis, 80% writing.

Hall, N. (2009), 'CMOs in USA: Burgeoning grassroots power' in Diesendorf, M. (ed.) (2009), *Climate Action: A Campaign Manual for Greenhouse Solutions*, UNSW Press (in press).
Hall's contribution to the article: 95% conception, 100% data collection, 95% analysis, 100% writing.

The achievements and 'traction' of NGO climate change campaigns by selected NGOs in Australia, the UK and California are compared and contrasted in three articles (Hall and Taplin 2007b; Hall and Taplin 2008b, and Hall 2009).

As described in Section 2.1, the comparative approach was applied to identify the dynamics and influences specific to limiting or leveraging Australian NGO campaigns, and to find effective campaign strategies from countries with similar political and policy conditions that could potentially be applied by Australian NGOs with similar success. The three case study countries support political and economic systems that have both parallels and differences, and provide differing status and influence of NGOs.

Politically, the UK and Australia share similar parliamentary and political systems based on liberal-democratic principles and the Westminster tradition (Howes 2005, p. xx). They allow freedom of speech and have openly active NGOs, including those campaigning on climate change. Both countries have domestic sources of fossil fuels for electricity supply that are an important part of the economy. Both countries are ‘‘Annex 1’’ (‘‘Western’’ countries). Australia signed to the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 and the UK in 1998 in recognition of the need to reduce GHG emissions. The UK Government agreed to stabilise emissions at 12.5% below 1990 levels, substantially more than the collective reduction target of 5.2% agreed to by Annex I Parties, and ratified the Protocol

into law in 2002 (UK Parliament 2005). In contrast, the Australian Government negotiated an increase of 8% above 1990 GHG emissions (Yu and Taplin 2000), and despite securing this concession, the Howard Government continually declined to ratify as it ‘‘is not in the national interest’’ (DPMC 2004, p. 24). These decisions reflect political and economic forces that have resulted in divergent responses to climate change in the UK and Australia. Furthermore, UK climate policy responses have been well aligned with NGO demands; while Australian NGOs struggled to gain political access and media attention under the Howard Government.

Hall and Taplin (2007b) examine three climate campaign activities common to both UK and Australian NGOs for their effectiveness. The Blair Government's climate policy responses are well aligned with NGO demands while Australian NGOs struggled to gain political access and media attention, initially suggesting the UK campaigns achieved greater effectiveness. However, Poole *et al.*'s (2001) 'multivariate explanatory approach' suggested that campaign effectiveness was due to the 'embeddedness' of NGOs within their country's legal system, economy, culture, history, technology and geography. Given this, the article then explores the socio-political contexts within which the UK and Australian campaigns were undertaken. This found that campaigns have greatest effectiveness when undertaken within favourable conditions. In the UK, inter-party competition on climate policy, the creation of a Ministerial portfolio on Climate Change, strong public trust and membership, and Prime Minister Blair's public support for climate issues all contributed to leveraging NGO input on climate issues. This success includes the involvement of NGOs in promoting the UK's Climate Change Bill (WWF-UK and FE-EWNI, 2005), a campaign with potential application in Australia.

In contrast to the UK, climate change has only recently appeared as a political priority in Australia as fossil fuel dependent industries have been financially and politically powerful. Australian NGOs have not enjoyed strong political legitimacy and have been limited by resources of all types from making a substantial and continuous impact in political climate debates.

A second comparative study in Hall and Taplin (2008b) and Hall (2009) draws on the experience of NGO climate campaigns in the US, specifically California. The US Federal Government has been considered by commentators and environmental NGOs to be intransigent in its response to climate change under President George W. Bush's Administration (Newell, 2000, p.15). By contrast, the Californian State Legislature has passed progressive climate-related legislation under Governors Davis and Schwarzenegger (Roberts, 2007). Californian political motivations regarding climate change decisions took place against an historical backdrop of progressive environmental legislation, strong community awareness of environmental issues, and a high level of trust and credibility bestowed upon NGOs by Californians. In combination, these factors have provided a context conducive to nonprofits enhancing or influencing Californian climate policy processes.

All six selected US NGOs chose to focus their all or part of their campaigns on the Californian State Government using a state intervention approach to 'create the interest and involvement that presage needed political change' at a Federal level (Kates and Wilbanks, 2003 p.22). This context is relevant for NGOs operating in other federal or federated systems of government, including Australia and the European Union, where states and member nations have considerable authority over policymaking.

Similar to the UK-Australian comparative study, the socio-political conditions in California were found to significantly affect NGO campaign effectiveness. Californian campaign goals have been advanced by operating upon an historical context of progressive environmental legislation, strong environmental awareness in the community, high public trust of NGOs, and Governor Schwarzenegger's use of the issue of climate change to differentiate his political leadership. One campaign approach with potential for application in Australia is the UCS's 'Sound Science Initiative' (SSI). The SSI trains scientists, who are also UCS members, in media and communication skills. These members then communicate the findings of UCS-commissioned research reports on climate change, among other issues, at press conferences, while UCS campaigners propose policy recommendations. With this approach, climate campaign messages gain a greater credibility and uptake with specific audiences and the media (UCS, 2008).

Published journal article

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2007b), 'Solar Festivals and Climate Bills: Comparing NGO climate change campaigns in the UK and Australia', *Voluntas* 18(4) pp.317-338.

Corrigendum

to Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2007b), 'Solar Festivals and Climate Bills: Comparing NGO climate change campaigns in the UK and Australia', *Voluntas* 18(4) pp.317-338.

The authors would like to offer two factual corrections to this article on p.319:

- replace ‘Both countries are ‘‘Annex 1’’ (‘‘Western’’ countries) and signed the Kyoto Protocol in 1998…’
  with ‘Both countries are ‘‘Annex 1’’ (‘‘Western’’ countries). Australia signed to the Kyoto Protocol in 1997, and the UK in 1998 …’
- replace ‘... more than 5% generally agreed to by the Kyoto parties’
  with ‘… more than the collective reduction target of 5.2% agreed to by Annex I Parties’.

Journal article (currently under review)

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2008b), 'Nonprofit campaigns and state competition: Influences on climate policy in California', submitted for publication to *Voluntas* (October 28, 2008; currently under review).

Nonprofit campaigns and state competition: Influences on climate policy in California

Submitted to *Voluntas,* October 28, 2008 (currently under review)

Nina L. Hall* and Ros Taplin

Graduate School of the Environment, Macquarie University NSW 2109, Australia

Abstract

Over the past 20 years, the US Federal Government has been considered to be intransigent in its response to climate change by many commentators and not-for-profit environmental advocacy organisations (nonprofits). An enduring source of pressure on the US Government has been nonprofit campaigns operating at both a state and federal level. Six US nonprofits representing a diversity of resources and prominence were selected for an in-depth examination of their climate-focused campaigns. Given the resistance at the federal level, these nonprofits have undertaken state-focused campaigns to achieve adequate climate policy development. This research examines climate campaigns in California by the selected nonprofits that have supported, enhanced, and influenced the Californian Government's efforts to address climate change. The nonprofit campaigns have gained leverage from existing state competition for economic advancement and political leadership on issues of public concern. In addition, these campaigns have benefited from a high level of environmental awareness in the community, a history of progressive environmental legislation, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger's use of climate change to differentiate his political leadership, and strong public trust of nonprofits. Recent climate-related political pledges and legislative changes at a federal level are convergent with the nonprofit-influenced, state-level developments.

Keywords

California, climate change, global warming, not-for-profit organisations (nonprofits), United States (US).

Introduction

> When a threatened Republican incumbent in the state turns to mandatory global warming regulations to fend off a challenge, you know the times they are a-changin' (Little 2006, on Governor Schwarzenegger's policies in California).

The United States (US) produces the greatest amount of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of all countries (UNFCCC 2007, p.24). Despite this, over the past 20 years the US Federal Government has resisted introducing strong policies to combat climate change (see Newell 2000; Rosencranz 2002; Grundmann 2007). One researcher considered that:

> as Americans, ... we remain far short of undertaking the emissions reductions that scientists say are required if we are to forestall dangerous interference in the climate system on which civilisation depends (Abbasi 2006, p.9).

Shortly after President George W. Bush took office in 2001, the US withdrew their commitment to the Kyoto Protocol (Rosencranz 2002, p.221). In the absence of an adequate federal response, a range of initiatives to address climate change have been undertaken in the US at the level of state and municipal governments (Pizer and Tamura 2005, p.1). The Californian Governor, Arnold Schwarzenegger, stated, 'California will not wait for our Federal Government to take strong action on global warming' (Office of the Governor 2006). His actions on climate change has seen California described as 'the most visible of the US states addressing climate change, given its ambitious policy agenda' (Rabe *et al.* 2005, p.9).

Not-for-profit environmental advocacy organisations (referred to hereafter as 'nonprofits') have sought to reduce the threat of climate change for over 20 years through campaigns designed to influence US climate policy (Shellenberger and Nordhaus 2004). Given the difficulty of influencing climate policy at the federal level, the research reported here was on based on the hypothesis that nonprofits have preferred a state-level intervention approach. It is proposed that the nonprofit campaigns have gained leverage from existing state competition for economic advancement and political leadership on issues of public concern.

Using California as a case study, the research explored the role of nonprofits in attempting to influence US federal climate policy within this context of state competition.

This paper contributes to a larger comparative research project examining the influence and strategies of nonprofit campaigns on climate change in Australia, the United Kingdom and the US (see Hall and Taplin 2007; Hall and Taplin 2008). Although there is an increasing amount of analysis of the role of nonprofit/ non-government/ third sector organisations in social movements (Worth 2003), research that specifically analyses and informs nonprofit campaign strategies is limited in academic and nonprofit literature. The available environmental literature 'tends to describe and decry environmental problems rather than offer a critical analysis of the role played by [nonprofits] in achieving environmental objectives' (Whelan 2005, p.157). The analysis presented here begins to bridge such a gap in the literature by documenting the role of nonprofits advocating for government action on climate change.

This research began with a broad literature, document and web-based information review of US and Californian climate change policies, regional climate change science projections, and nonprofit climate campaigns. Six environmental nonprofits with active climate change campaigns in California were selected as case study examples. This allowed an in-depth examination and analysis of their campaigns, and of the dynamics that have influenced their campaigns. The nonprofits were identified through mainstream media channels, campaign materials and personal connections.

The six selected nonprofits were Sierra Club, the Union of Concerned Scientists, Greenpeace USA, the Bluewater Network, the Vote Solar Initiative, and the Apollo Alliance. The main features of these nonprofits are described in Table I. At the time of this research, these organisations represented a diversity of nonprofit political access, financial resources, organisational size, state/federal/international political focus, and international connections. The nonprofits worked both individually and in coalitions, using a multiple range of campaign approaches (Mahoney 2007). All six nonprofits agreed to the disclosure of their organisation's identity and the inclusion of their comments in this research

documentation.

Semi-structured interviews were undertaken with an emphasis on an open-ended, semi-structured conversation between climate campaigners from the selected nonprofits and the researcher between September and October 2006. The interviews lasted approximately one hour and the questions covered the campaigners' perceptions of the influence of environmental nonprofits campaigns on US and Californian climate policy and the political context within which the campaigns operated. After verification by the interview participants, the transcripts of the interviews were analysed using descriptive analysis. The perspectives of nonprofit campaigners that were sourced as data were not necessarily representative of the nonprofit sector. However, this approach allowed a rich and in-depth experiential account of the issue to be obtained with greater breadth than more structured and representative forms of data gathering (Fontana and Frey 2000, p.652). Additionally, the interviews provided data unavailable elsewhere. As Doyle (2005, pp.4-6) identified, there is rarely a 'standard repository of record' of social movement campaigns, and much information exists outside the realm of formal histories. This documented analysis of nonprofit campaigns contributes such information to the academic literature.

Nonprofits that work as pressure groups on US climate policy

Social movements are the result of actions taken collectively by a number of actors and different organisations to 'challenge the power-holders and the whole society to redress social problems or grievances and restore social values' (Moyer, 2001, p.2). Social movements 'emerge as reactions to particular historical conjectures' (McNair 1998, p.8, 148). Pressure groups within these movements tend to campaign on 'a particular issue of special importance' and be 'overtly political in their objectives' (McNair 1998, p.148).

The nonprofits in this research form one type of organised pressure group. Nonprofits act where change cannot be achieved by citizens alone or by an unorganised movement (Princen and Finger 1994, p.11). Nonprofits 'operate directly on the government of the day' and attempt to influence a variety of agencies, including the elected government, the bureaucracy, the courts, and through public opinion (Rush 1990). Often nonprofits are poorly resourced when

compared with lobby groups from the business sector. This compels them to 'find ways of participating in, and contributing to, public debates which do not require material or cultural capital', such as 'symbolic forms of protest' (McNair 1998, pp.9, 148).

The nonprofits selected for this research all sought, through a variety of campaign activities, to influence US federal and state climate policy development, including in California. They considered that fossil fuel and related industry interests have had a dominant influence on federal climate policy decisions, particularly under the Bush Administration. They stated:

> our President has a lot of ties with oil and big industry ... essentially I think industry is controlling the debate (D.Fugere, the Bluewater Network, 10/11/06).

> the Bush Administration is essentially a subsidiary of the oil industry and coal industry and their policies are a direct reflection of the wishes of those industries (C.Zichella, Sierra Club, 10/12/06).

Strong business influence in political decision-making is also enabled by the focus of federal politicians on political campaign fundraising. Mahoney (2007, p.380) stated:

> while American policymakers are very much driven by the re-election motive, they are not driven to be equally responsive to all constituents ... a great deal of evidence exists to suggest that policymakers are more responsive to wealthy interests that are able to aid in funding the re-election campaign.

One campaigner commented on this situation:

> elected officials in Washington … are not thinking about what is the right answer for the country, they're thinking politically about how they're going to get re-elected, how they're going to raise the millions of dollars it takes to run for a US Senate seat. They're unable to put the wellbeing of the country and the American people ahead of their personal interests (C.Miller, Greenpeace, 9/29/06).

The US political structure as a federation of states is based on historical political divisions (Riker 1964). In joining the federated system, the US states retained their sovereignty, freedom and independence under the Articles of Confederation (Gibbins 1987, p.17). However, Riker (1964, p.81) noted that since Confederation the 'Federal Government has acquired more duties in relation to the states over the years', including in environmental regulation. As Rabe *et al.* (2005, p.43) observed:

> federal regulation provides the backdrop for state competition, as states base their policy decisions in part on the parameters and rules by which they must abide. But these complex interactions are brought to the foreground as states and local interests attempt to manipulate or change the federal regulatory system as a competitive strategy.

The state competition created by the federal system offers 'access points' for pressure groups, such as the nonprofits featured here, to 'bring pressure to bear on decision-makers' (Coleman 1987, p.172). Indeed, pressure groups often decide to 'uphold and sustain the federal division of powers, using it as a shield to ward off the regulatory ambitions of the national government' (Gibbins 1987, p.19). Given the limited political access for nonprofits at the federal level and the existing state competition, many nonprofits, including those included in this research, have chosen to employ an approach of state-level intervention.

Historically, state competition has aided environmental protection via states enacting legislation beyond federal requirements. California, in particular, has a history of enacting progressive state-level environmental protection legislation. In the 1960s, California set a state-based vehicle-emission standard that precipitated its federal equivalent in 1970. To manage this state/federal difference, the Federal Clean Air Act 1970 allowed California to set more stringent air quality laws than the federal legislation. Since this time, other states can choose to adopt either the federal laws or the more progressive Californian air pollution laws (Adler 2007).

Many nonprofits have focused their campaigns on influencing municipal and state politics with the intention that these efforts may flow upwards to influence federal-level decisions. Terry Tamminen, a former adviser to California's Governor Schwarzenegger, recommended this approach to climate change policy:

> in the United States, we're so big - the way we use energy and emit GHGs is so different from one part of the country to another - to come up with a national solution right out of the box is going to be very hard and very complex. If you let some of these state and regional solutions percolate up and get some success, you can build on them and allow for some flexibility and adaptation (Tamminen, cited in Roberts 2007).

Governor Schwarzenegger similarly stated:

> sometimes, if the Federal Government is a little slower than the states are, we have to step up to the plate and we have to create the leadership. It is common that a lot of times the states provide the leadership and then eventually the Federal Government picks up with it and carries it on (in Hannan 2007).

Many researchers support a state-level intervention approach to policy development. Kates and Wilbanks (2003, p.22) considered that initiatives by US municipalities and states 'create the interest and involvement that presage much-needed political change' at a federal level. Radin and Boase (2000, p.71) commented that states can:

> incubate or experiment with new ways of doing the government's business. It is in this sense that states are ... 'laboratories of democracy'. These experiments might be used as the demonstration sites for national policies or serve as examples for other states to adopt as they see fit.

Specifically on climate change, Peterson and Rose (2006, p.619) noted that:

> the absence of US national action on global climate change policy has prompted initiatives by the US Congress, cities, states and regions toward what is likely to become a long-term, collaborative effort to harmonise national energy and climate policies.

One campaigner considered his organisation's state-level intervention approach in Californian had already had an impact of federal climate policy as the influence 'percolated' upwards. He said:

> I think because of the paralysis at the national level, the things that have been done in California in particular on global warming have helped drive national global warming policy (C.Zichella, Sierra Club, 10/12/06).

Nonprofit campaigns seeking to influence climate policy at a state-level can leverage from the existing state competition between US states. Rabe *et al.* (2005, p.3) described how states 'compete on numerous issues'. In relation to climate change, they noted:

> five policy areas that seem particularly relevant to climate-related issues [are] natural resource base protection, energy security and reliability, local industry protection, innovation and technology development, and operational efficiencies for state government. In each case, strategic factors ... interact to create an opportunity, or perceived opportunity, for a state to gain a competitive advantage (Rabe *et al.* 2005, p.22).

By late 2006, 'more than half of American states could be ... characterised as actively involved in climate change, with one or more policies that promise to significantly reduce their GHG emissions' (Rabe 2006, p.1). These state-level climate policy developments have occurred despite the constitutional limitations, including 'prohibitions against the negotiation of international treaties [such as the Kyoto Protocol] and restrictions on commercial interstate transactions' (Rabe 2006, p.2).

Californian climate policy: Stirring the Feds from below

California is the world's sixth largest economy, ninth largest emitter of total global GHGs, and has a population projected to grow from the current 35 million to 55 million by 2050 (Petit 2005, p.410; Luers *et al*, 2006, p.2). Given this situation, it has been both important and possible for this state to lead a strong policy response to climate change. California's climate-related policies have set GHG emission reduction targets and developed alternative energy sources. These initiatives have reduced Californian electricity consumption to one of the lowest rates of GHG emissions *per capita* among the American states and almost half that of the national *per capita* average in 2005 (Petit 2005, p.410; Rabe *et al*, 2005, p.9).

In 2002, the Californian Government revisited its ability to develop regulatory air quality standards more stringent than those of the Federal Government and 'went to considerable lengths to characterise carbon dioxide as an air pollutant that fell within the purview of its regulatory powers' (Rabe 2006, p.7). This resulted in Assembly Bill 1493 (AB1493), known as the 'tail pipe law', that saw California become the first government in the world to mandate carbon dioxide caps for motor vehicles (NRDC 2002). One of the reasons cited for the law's introduction was that passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks contribute 40 percent of the total GHG pollution in California (AB1493 2002). The AB1493 was signed by Governor Davis in 2002 and required reduced emissions from vehicles manufactured after 2009.

By late 2007, in anticipation of a waiver being granted to California by the US Environmental Protection Agency, laws similar to AB1493 had been passed in 11 other states including Arizona, Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont and Washington, and were being considered by a further five states (CCC 2008). In December 2007, however, the Administrator of the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) denied California a waiver, citing precedence of the Federal Energy Independence and Security Act 2007 as a 'clear national solution, not a confusing patchwork of state rules, to reduce America's climate footprint from vehicles imposing tailpipe rules in individual states' (Johnson, in Eilperin 2007, p.A01). The 2007 Federal Act proposed to comprehensively improve vehicle fuel economy and help reduce

US dependence on oil at a federal level (White House 2007). US Senator Barbara Boxer introduced legislation S2555 in an attempt to direct the US EPA to reverse its decisions on the AB1493 waiver in February 2008. Fourteen environmental nonprofits, including Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth (incorporating the Bluewater Network), UCS and Sierra Club, urged Senators of states that had adopted or were considering adopting the AB1493 to co-sponsor Boxer's legislation (CCC 2008).

Low emission, renewable, and non-nuclear energy sources have been encouraged by the Californian Government. Although nuclear energy provides approximately 13 percent of California's power needs, the construction of new nuclear plants has been prohibited by law since 1978 until long term storage of radioactive waste can be sustainably managed (CEC 2007). This decision facilitated the adoption of an Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) in California. An RPS is a state-based policy facilitated by the US Department of Energy that requires energy providers to obtain a minimum proportion of power from renewable energy resources (EERE 2007). Twenty-four states have adopted an RPS, with California setting the strongest target of 20 percent by 2010, with the intention of increasing to 33 percent by 2020 (Petit 2005, p.412).

Initiatives that will assist California to achieve its RPS include the joint California Energy Commission and California Public Utilities Commission's 'Go Solar California' project. US$3.2 billion has been allocated through this project for 'one million solar roofs', involving the installation of solar panel systems onto both existing and new homes (CEC and CPUC 2007). In 2006, this constituted the biggest solar program in the US and, after Germany, the largest in the world (Vote Solar Initiative 2006). California's Senate Bill 1 (SB1) legislated this commitment in August 2006 (SB1 2007). SB1 allowed excess solar electricity to be fed back into the grid, ensured solar electricity panels on roofs were offered as a standard option to new home developments, and directed municipal council funding to solar rebates (Browning 2006).

In September 2006 Governor Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill 32 (AB32), known as the Global Warming Solutions Act 2006. It required reductions in GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 through a statewide cap on emissions beginning

in 2012 (AB32 2006). UCS considered this 'the nation's most comprehensive, economy-wide global warming emissions reduction program' (UCS 2006b). A cross-departmental 'Climate Action Team' was formed to achieve the GHG reductions through specific programs by the Californian EPA, Resources Agency, Air Resources Board, Energy Commission and the Public Utilities Commission, among others (State of California 2008). To implement AB32, Schwarzenegger introduced Senate Bill 1368. This required all electricity produced or purchased for use in California to have emissions equivalent to the most efficient combined-cycle natural gas power plant (SB1368 2006). This legislation was anticipated to have cross-border effects on producers outside California that intended to maintain their Californian business (Moran 2007).

Nonprofit climate campaign approaches in California

An analysis of the dominant climate change campaign activities in California of the six selected nonprofits found that nonprofits have played an active role in lobbying for, and publicly supporting, the Californian Government's decisions to develop the climate-related policies described above. In 1999, UCS published *Confronting climate change in California* (Field *et al.* 1999), the first in its series of regional climate change impact reports. The Californian Secretary for Resources stated the report presented 'solid science to confirm the existence of climate change and establish its relevancy to the state' (Nichols, in Cole and Watrous 2007, p.184). A crucial role in the development of AB1493 was played by the Bluewater Network, who 'conceived, drafted and championed' the Bill and worked closely with Assembly Member Fran Pavley to introduce it (Bluewater Network 2007). The Bluewater Network's campaign for AB1493 involved a collaboration of nonprofits, where:

> a few key groups [including the Bluewater Network] initially moved the legislation, then bigger environmental groups came on board. It was a huge coalition effort. Without the participation of everybody it probably would not have passed (D.Fugere, the Bluewater Network, 10/11/06).

A similar legislation-focused campaign was undertaken by Vote Solar. It engaged with governments and utilities to increase the 'net metering cap'. Net metering is a solar power subsidy, allowing Californian households to receive full retail value

for the eligible solar and wind-generated electricity that they produce and export to the electricity grid and was originally capped at 0.5 percent (Krauss 2006). Vote Solar facilitated 50,000 emails from the general public to political decision-makers to raise the net metering cap to 2.5 percent, which was subsequently achieved (Vote Solar Initiative 2006; J.P.Ross, Vote Solar, 10/11/06). The net metering cap was adopted as part of the 'one million solar roofs' program and legislated in SB1 (SB1 2007).

Overt political pressure has been exerted by Sierra Club via encouraging its large supporter base to actively lobby their political representatives for specific efforts, such as voting for the AB32 in 2005 (*Yodeler* 2005; *Sierra Club Insider* 2006). In 2006, Sierra Club assessed the climate and other environmental policies pledges of the candidates for Governor, and publicly endorsed the Democrat candidate, Phil Angelides, over the incumbent Governor Schwarzenegger (Magavern 2006). A Sierra Club campaigner stated:

> we are one of the few environmental groups that has an active political program. We have a political action committee. We make political contributions. We mobilise our members in elections. And we're very engaged here in California (C.Zichella Sierra Club, 10/12/06).

The above lobbying pressure has been built through messages targeted at specific audiences. Moser and Dilling (2007, p.496) cautioned against fear-based messages that emphasise 'the scary aspects' of climate change and can result in 'maladaptive behaviors' and do not promote a long-term response to climate change. Interviews with nonprofit campaigners revealed that they were aware of these issues. According to one campaigner, fear can be useful, but should only be used in moderation:

> I don't think that we play to people's fears but we want people to honestly understand the consequences of what is happening. So there is urgency often to our messages. But what people are really hungry for in this country are solutions (C.Zichella, Sierra Club, 10/12/06).

Greenpeace's campaigner agreed with the focus on solutions, stating that if fear-based messages were employed:

> you have to then quickly move people into a hopeful place where we can highlight the progress that has been made, point to solutions that we can deploy and suggest that while scientists tell us that time is short, there is still time (C.Miller, Greenpeace, 9/29/06).

A further communication approach described by Moser and Dilling (2007, p.501) was 'tapping into culturally resonant, positive, empowering values and personal aspirations' when communicating climate change through a broad range of 'messengers'. One such approach was UCS's 'Sound Science Initiative' (SSI). The SSI trains scientists, who are also UCS members, in media and communication skills. On climate change, these members communicate the findings of UCS-commissioned climate-related research reports at press conferences, where UCS campaigners then propose policy recommendations. With this approach, climate campaign messages resonate with specific audiences and the media while maintaining the scientists' impartiality (UCS 2008).

To broaden the political influence of their campaign messages, some nonprofits created coalitions with diverse organisations. Mahoney (2007, p.368) observed that these coalitions:

> signal to policy-makers that a policy position has the support of a large and varied group of interests ... [and] where the bulk of support lies. Coalitions can also indicate that advocates have worked out differences among themselves before approaching government officials and thus their final position is one that can be supported by the majority of the legislature and the public.

Following this approach, Sierra Club published a report as a 'blue-green alliance' with workers and unions that described the potential for 1.4 million new jobs to be created if renewable energy policies were implemented (Sierra Club 2006b). Similarly, the Apollo Alliance formed as a coalition of environmental, labor, business, and community allies who 'share a common vision for the future and a common set of values' and that seeks to align economic development with 'strong

action on global warming' (Shellenberger and Nordhaus 2004). The Apollo Alliance's campaigner stated:

> even though the people at the [the Apollo Alliance] table may disagree on other issues or on strategies, there is some place where both our issues overlap and we have real common interests. That is often described as a Venn diagram - it's that little bit in the middle. That's where we want to work right now (J. Hays, the Apollo Alliance, 9/12/06).

Campaigners' reflections on their campaign achievements are given below.

Nonprofit reflections on campaign achievements

Determination of campaign *success* or *effectiveness* involves complex and subjective judgment employing a variety of criteria, as described by Hall and Taplin (2008). Given this difficulty and the brevity of this article, this paper presents campaign achievements, rather than effectiveness, from the perspective of nonprofit campaigners. This documentation is an effort to increase the repository of record of social movement campaigns, while being conscious that external observers often hold views of campaign achievements that differ with those held by nonprofit campaigners (Hall and Star 2007).

In both this US-focused research and Hall and Taplin's (2008) Australian research, nonprofit campaigners were willing to share their perceptions of campaign success without applying explicit evaluation criteria. Campaigners perceived that nonprofits and the broader environment movement have facilitated greater public understanding of climate change and transformed this understanding into pressure on governments to respond. One campaigner stated that climate change as an issue is 'not consumable so someone [must] take it and make it consumable ... that's certainly the role that the environment groups have played' (J.P.Ross, Vote Solar, 10/11/06). Another said:

> had the environmental community not been there to help move people from awareness towards action ... it would be very easy for people to go from awareness to despair (C.Miller, Greenpeace, 9/29/06).

The nonprofit campaigners interviewed considered their campaign goals had been more achievable due to their decision to focus at the state, rather than federal, level. One campaigner stated:

> where I do think we have been more successful is at the local, state and regional level. And I think what we're seeing is, in lieu of action at the federal level, the environmental community working at the more grassroots level to push solutions forward (C.Miller, Greenpeace, 9/29/06).

Many of the nonprofit campaigns focused on policy and legislative decisions that resulted in the outcomes legislated in AB32, AB1493, and the 'million solar roofs' policy decision. One campaigner stated, 'here in California ... the nonprofit community has been very important as one of the major players in influencing policies' (A.Luers, UCS, 10/12/06). Another stated:

> probably the most important issue that we've had traction on with regard to global warming is ... AB1493. That's the first law to regulate GHG emissions from vehicles. It took two years but we were eventually successful (D.Fugere, the Bluewater Network, 10/11/06).

Factors supporting nonprofit campaigns in California

The above perspectives suggest that the nonprofit approaches have had some significant achievements. However, it would be inaccurate to conclude that the progressive Californian policy and initiatives on climate change are the result of the nonprofits' efforts alone. Jänicke and Jörgens (1998) identified some of the many actors, including nonprofits, and other factors that contribute to environmental policy decisions in developed countries. They stated:

> cases of success in environmental policy hardly ever depend on a single instrument ... [but are] a highly dynamic interaction of a wide range of influential factors and learning processes: the strength, configuration or competence of actors, the structural framework conditions and the situational context in which the policy is implemented, its strategic long-term orientation as well as the structure of the problem (Jänicke and Jörgens 1998, pp.27-28).

Cole and Watrous (2007, p.184) focused specifically on climate policy and the approach of the UCS, and concluded, 'certainly, no lone piece of evidence, nor the isolated action of one advocacy group, pushes through legislation'.

This perspective appears to hold true in relation to this research. Analysis of the interviews with campaigners and the literature and document review suggested that supportive contextual aspects have provided 'traction' for nonprofit campaigns in California. These include Republican Governor Schwarzenegger's reasons for distinguishing his policies from those of the Republican Federal Government, the high level of community awareness about the regional impacts of climate change within a history of progressive environmental legislation, and strong public trust of nonprofits.

Governor Schwarzenegger surprised political commentators with his successful election and his subsequent progressive climate policies that were supported by a Democratic legislature (Little 2006). One nonprofit campaigner considered that Schwarzenegger's celebrity image as a former 'fighter movie star' has emphasised his actions on climate change, and stated, 'the fact that he has an international reputation gives international recognition for the importance of the action [on climate change]' (A.Luers, UCS, 10/12/06). Another campaigner considered that, while 'there's a lot of contradictions in this guy - he drives a Hummer [SUV]!', his motivations for progressive climate policies appear to have been influenced by his wife, Maria Shriver, a member of the Democrat Kennedy family, and her cousin, Robert F. Kennedy Junior, a prominent US environmentalist (C.Zichella, Sierra Club, 10/12/06).

According to several campaigners, Schwarzenegger's engagement of environmental activist, Terry Tamminen, as his environmental adviser in 2003, as Secretary of the Californian EPA and then as a senior Cabinet adviser in 2004, was a crucial influence that resulted in the passing of progressive climate-related laws in his first term. One campaigner said:unlike any other Republican, Schwarzenegger was willing to listen to advisers who disagreed with him and listen to advisers who were Democrats. He ended up getting a much wider diversity of viewpoints and being able to choose from them, as opposed to going

in with his eyes wide shut (J.P.Ross, Vote Solar, 10/11/06).

Schwarzenegger's support for climate change policies appeared to strengthen after his referendum defeat in 2005 and during his bid for re-election the following year. Schwarzenegger initiated a special election in 2005 with four propositions, all of which failed (AFX News Ltd 2005). To rebuild his political strength and ultimately succeed in the 2006 State election, Schwarzenegger 'embraced a more moderate agenda', backed a series of bipartisan Bills, and distanced himself from President Bush by criticising the White House on issues such as global warming (Tanner 2006). The broad public concern for climate change that nonprofits had incubated over the past 20 years was perceived by Schwarzenegger's advisors as an issue that would secure votes. For example, a national survey found Californians were more likely than other Americans to 'believe climate change has already begun' and that 'two-thirds actually want the state to address this issue – completely independent of the Federal Government' (Baldassare 2006, p. v, 7). In response, Schwarzenegger supported a bipartisan Bill that evolved into AB32, despite reported attempts that he attempted to weaken the Bill in its development (Little, 2006). The Governor's support of AB32 appealed to moderate voters and lessened the contrast in environmental commitments between the Governor and his Democrat opponent, Phil Angelides (Little 2006).

Schwarzenegger's political motivations on climate policy may have also been based on economic opportunities and risk management. Rabe (2006, p.3) considered that California and other states have enacted policies to reduce GHGs in part to foster economic opportunities (including employment) created through developing 'home-grown sources of energy'. This view was supported by nonprofit campaigners. According to one campaigner, Schwarzenegger signed the AB32 law to set GHG emission targets despite 'the fierce objections of industry' because he was aware of the threat to California from reduced water supplies for drinking and irrigation from snowmelt, inundation of coastal real estate and heatwaves (C.Zichella, Sierra Club, 10/12/06). Another campaigner stated that Schwarzenegger recognised the economic benefits from acting on climate change:

> he sees it as a win-win [situation]: you can have jobs and reduce GHG emissions. And if the environment is better off, everybody is better off ... [but] if he sees something as being a drag on business or the economy he is not likely to sign it (D.Fugere, the Bluewater Network, 10/11/06).

Beyond political motivations, California boasts a history of progressive environmental legislation and strong public awareness of environmental issues, demonstrated by the introduction of the vehicle-emissions standard several years prior to the federal Clean Air Act 1970. Cole and Watrous (2007, p.188) stated that California has 'historically been a bellwether for national environmental, public health, and safety standards'. One campaigner considered that this history has ensured 'the Californian electorate is not as afraid of environmental laws as are other constituencies', as they have experienced the benefits of these laws when implemented (D.Fugere, the Bluewater Network, 10/11/06).

A final contextual influence identified in this research was the strong public trust and credibility bestowed upon nonprofits by Californians. One campaigner observed that:

> nonprofits are looked on as a voice of some segment of the population. In California, legislators and regulatory agencies take us [nonprofits] more seriously because we work with them, we create policies and we're solution-oriented. So I think that at a state level ... we environmental groups tend to have more success than we do at the national level (D.Fugere, the Bluewater Network, 10/11/06).

An expected indicator of successful state-level intervention by nonprofit campaigns that influenced federal climate decisions would be a national decrease in GHG emissions and uptake of climate policy initiatives at the federal level. Both of these appear to be occurring, although to link these changes to nonprofit campaigns at the state level is tenuous without further research. In 2006, US GHG emissions decreased 1.5 percent below the 2005 total, the first decrease since 2001 (EIA 2007). Federal Government sources stated that this was due to higher energy prices, increased use of natural gas and renewable energy sources, and

favorable weather conditions (EIA 2007). Political changes have allowed further developments on climate change. In 2006, the US Senate obtained a Democrat majority that enabled the introduction of progressive energy legislation, the Federal Energy Independence and Security Act 2007 (ABC 2006). This legislation was endorsed by the Apollo Alliance as 'the most important energy legislation in a generation', although the Alliance acknowledged that 'much work lies ahead' in further developing the US renewable energy industry (Apollo Alliance 2007).

Also at the federal level, climate change has emerged as one of the issues of the 2008 Presidential election. A significant shift is the 'near-unanimous recognition among the [Republican] leaders of the threat posed by global warming', where debates are no longer about 'whether people are warming the planet, but about how to deal with it' (Santora 2007). As of May 2008, the two Democrat Presidential candidates, Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton, are 'offering far stronger measures to limit emissions of GHGs than anyone would have expected to see on the table not long ago' (Krugman 2008). Obama is proposing to reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent of 1990 levels by 2050, to move towards 'oil independence', and to improve energy efficiency to 50 percent by 2030 (Obama '08 2008). Similarly, Clinton is proposing a cap-and-trade program for GHG gases, a $50 billion investment in alternative energy, and an increase in automobile fuel efficiency standards (Hillary for President 2008).

Conclusions

The research discussed in this paper explored the approaches and influence of nonprofit campaigns on Californian and US climate policy, within the context of state competition. The Californian Government has introduced arguably the most progressive climate policies in the US. These include AB1493 to reduce automobile emissions, AB32 to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, an RPS to provide 20 percent of power from renewable energy resources by 2010, and the funding of 'one million solar roofs'.

Six US environmental nonprofits, including Sierra Club, UCS, Greenpeace, the Bluewater Network, Vote Solar and the Apollo Alliance, were selected for in-depth investigation via interviews with campaigners and a literature and

document review. Nonprofit representatives perceived the intransigence of the US Federal Government on climate policies as being driven by fossil fuel industry and business interests. The nonprofit campaigns responded to this situation by undertaking state-level intervention with campaigns focused on influencing state policies.

In contrast to the limited political access that nonprofits have experienced at the US federal level, nonprofit campaigns have been well-received in California. Campaigners perceived that their nonprofits and the broader environment movement have facilitated a greater public understanding of climate change and moved this understanding towards political action. They considered that the policy outcomes have been closely linked to their campaign goals, and that this success has been in part due to their decision to focus on the state, rather than the federal level of politics. Among other nonprofit campaign approaches in California, UCS heightened public concern through the release of regional impact reports, the Bluewater Network conceived, drafted and championed AB1493 among political representatives, Vote Solar facilitated public support of the 'one million solar roofs' project, and Sierra Club lobbied politicians to vote in support of AB32.

Additional contextual factors have strengthened nonprofits' climate campaigns in California. Of greatest consideration is the leverage provided from competition among states for economic advancement and political leadership on issues of public concern. This has resulted in the promotion of progressive climate change policies and measures. Governor Schwarzenegger's support for climate policies appeared to strengthen during his bid for re-election in 2006. Responding to climate change differentiated his leadership from the US Federal Government and lessened the contrast in environmental commitments between himself and his Democrat opponent. These political motivations took place against an historical backdrop of progressive environmental legislation, strong community awareness of environmental issues, and a high level of trust and credibility bestowed upon nonprofits by Californians. In combination, these factors have provided a context conducive to nonprofits enhancing or influencing Californian climate policy processes. These research findings may be relevant for nonprofits operating in other federal or federated systems of government, including Australia and the

European Union, where states and member nations have considerable authority over policymaking.

Initial indicators suggest that the responses by many US states on climate change are now influencing the recent changes emerging at a federal level. US GHG emissions have decreased slightly, recent federal climate-related legislation appears to be more progressive, and the candidates from both major parties in the 2008 Presidential race are promoting climate change initiatives as part of their election pledges. Given that the ultimate goal of many nonprofit campaigns has been to initiate a decrease in total US GHG emissions, then their actions, in combination with a complex variety of factors, are beginning to see this achieved.

References

AB1493 (2002). *Californian Assembly Bill No. 1493*, Chapter 200: An Act to amend Section 42823 of, and to add Section 43018.5 to, the Health and Safety Code, relating to air quality. Sacramento: Approved by Governor, July 22.

AB32 (2006). *Assembly Bill No. 32*, Chapter 488: An Act to add Division 25.5 to the Health and Safety Code, relating to air pollution. Sacramento: Approved by Governor, September 27.

Abbasi, D. (2006). Americans and climate change- closing the gap between science and action: A synthesis of insights and recommendations from the 2005 Yale conference. *Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies Conference on Climate Change*, 6-8 October. Online: http://environment.yale.edu/climate/americans_and_climate_change.pdf, accessed 8/9/06.

Adler, J. (2007). Can California catch a waiver? The golden state wants to make its own global-warming policy. *National Review Online*, May 24. Online: http://article.nationalreview.com. accessed 20/07/07.

AFX News Ltd (2005). California voters reject Schwarzenegger measures in key referendum. *Forbes online*, November 9. Online: www.forbes.com (accessed 6/03/08.

Apollo Alliance (2006). *Apollo Alliance website.* Online: http://www.apolloalliance.org, accessed 25/8/06.

Apollo Alliance (2007). Congress spurs growth of America's clean energy economy. *Apollo Alliance*, December 19. Online: http://www.apolloalliance.org/downloads/State_and_local_Energy_Bill_Backgrounder.pdf, accessed 13/03/08.

Baldassare, M. (2006). *PPIC statewide survey.* San Francisco CA: Public Policy Institute of California. Online: http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/documents/2006-07_ppic.org_statewide_survey.pdf, accessed 18/09/07.

Bluewater Network (2007). Global warming solutions. *Bluewater Network website.* Online: http://www.bluewaternetwork.org/campaign_gw_transportation.shtml, accessed 24/07/07.

Browning, A. (2006). California's million solar roofs bill signed into law. *Gristmill*, August 22. Online: http://gristmill.grist.org/story/2006/8/22/134533/899, accessed 20/07/07.

CCC (2008). Clean Air Act: California waiver. *Clean Cars Campaign.* Online: www.cleancarscampaign.org, accessed 5/03/08.

CEC (2007). *Nuclear energy in California.* California Energy Commission website. Online: http://www.energy.ca.gov/nuclear/california.html, accessed 08/04/08.

CEC and CPUC (2007). *The big picture- Go Solar California,* Sacramento CA: California Energy Commission and California Public Utilities Commission. Online: http://www.gosolarcalifornia.ca.gov/about.html, accessed 03/08/07.

Cole, N. and Watrous, S. (2007). Across the great divide: Supporting scientists as effective messengers in the public sphere. In S. Moser, and L. Dilling (Eds.), *Creating a climate for change: Communicating climate change and facilitating social change* (pp.180-199). Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

Coleman, W. (1987). Federalism and interest group organization. In H. Bakvis and W. Chandler (Eds.), *Federalism and the role of the state* (pp. 171-187). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Doyle, T. (2005). *Environmental movements in minority and majority worlds: A global perspective.* New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press.

EERE (2007). *States with Renewable Portfolio Standards*. Washington DC: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, US Department of Energy. Online: http://www.eere.energy.gov/States/maps/renewable_portfolio_States.cfm#map, accessed 20/07/07.

EIA (2007). *Emissions of greenhouse gases report DOE/EIA-0573(2006),* Washington DC: Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy. Online: http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/1605/ggrpt/#total, accessed 13/03/08.

Eilperin, J. (2007). EPA chief denies Calif. limit on auto emissions: Rules would target greenhouse gases. *Washington Post,* Washington DC, p.A01.

Field, C., Daily, G, Davis, F., Gaines, S., Matson, P., Melack, J. and Miller, N. (1999). *Confronting climate change in California: Ecological impacts on the golden state,* Washington DC and Berkeley: Union of Concerned Scientists and Ecological Society of America.

Fontana, A., and Frey, J. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. Denzin, and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp.645-672). Thousand Oaks, US: Sage.

Gibbins, R. (1987). Federal societies, institutions, and politics. In H. Bakvis and W. Chandler (Eds.), *Federalism and the role of the state* (pp.15-31). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Grundmann, R. (2007). Climate change and knowledge politics. *Environmental Politics, 16* (3), pp.414- 432.

Hall, N. and Star, C. (2007). Are they hitting the target? Climate change messages and strategies by Australian NGOs. *Other Contact Zones: New Talents 21C, 7,* pp.137- 147.

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2007). Solar festivals and climate Bills: Comparing NGO climate change campaigns in the UK and Australia. *Voluntas, 18,* pp.317-338.

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2008a), 'Room for Climate Advocates in a Coal-focused Economy? NGO influence on Australian climate policy', *Australian Journal of Social Issues 43* (3), pp.359-379.

Hannan, E. (2007). Water costs don't wash with Bracks. *The Australian,* Sydney, May 12-13, p.31.

Hillary for President (2008). Powering America's future: New energy, new jobs. *Hillary for President homepage.* Online: http://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/energy/, accessed 13/03/08.

Jänicke, M. and Jörgens, H. (1998). National environmental policy planning in OECD countries: Preliminary lessons from cross-national comparisons. *Environmental Politics, 7* (2), pp.27-54.

Kates, R. and Wilbanks, T. (2003). Making the global local. *Environment, 45* (3), pp.12-23.

Krauss, L. (2006). California nears net metering cap. *United Press International*, June 5. Online: http://www.seia.org/solarnews.php?id=113, accessed 08/05/08.

Krugman, P. (2008). The Edwards effect. *New York Times online*, New York City, February 1. Online: http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/01/opinion/01krugman.html, accessed 13/03/08.

Little, A. (2006). No campaign, no gain: California climate deal could help Schwarzenegger win re-election, *Grist online: Muckraker*, September 8. Online: http://www.grist.org/news/muck/2006/09/08/california/, accessed 18/9/07.

Luers, A., Cayan, D., Franco, G., Hanemann, M. and Croes, B. (2006). *Our changing climate: Assessing the risks to California.* Berkeley: California Climate Change Center, University of California. Online: http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-500-2006-077, accessed 8/9/06.

Magavern, B. (2006). *Why Sierra Club supports Phil Angelides for Governor*. California Progress Report, July 2. Online: http://www.californiaprogressreport.com/2006/07/why_sierra_club.html, accessed 09/05/08.

Mahoney, C. (2007). Networking vs. allying: The decision of interest groups to join coalitions in the US and the EU. *Journal of European Public Policy,* 14 (3), pp.366-383.

McNair, B. (1998). *An introduction to political communication.* London and New York: Routledge.

Moran, S. (2007). Coal rush!. *Worldwatch, 20* (1).

Moser, S. and Dilling, L. (2007). Toward the social tipping point: Creating a climate for change. In S. Moser and L. Dilling (Eds.), *Creating a climate for change: Communicating climate change and facilitating social change (*pp. 491-516). Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

Moyer, B. (2001). *Doing democracy: The MAP model for organizing social movements,* Gabriola Island., Canada: New Society Publishers.

Newell, P. (2000). *Climate for change: Non-state actors and the global politics of the greenhouse.* Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

NRDC (2002). California Gov. Gray Davis signs landmark CO_2 pollution measure: New law uses power of American know-how to tackle global warming. *Press Release,* Natural Resources Defense Council. Online: http://www.nrdc.org/media/pressreleases/020722.asp, accessed 08/04/08.

Obama '08 (2008). Energy and environment: Plan for a clean energy future. *Obama for America homepage.* Online: http://www.barackobama.com/issues/energy/, accessed 13/03/08.

Office of the Governor (2006). Governor Schwarzenegger, British Prime Minister Tony Blair sign historic agreement to collaborate on climate change. *Press Release* July 31, Sacramento: Office of the Governor. Online: http://gov.ca.gov/index.php/press-release/2770/, accessed 8/9/06.

Opie, J. (1998). *Nature's nation: An environmental history of the United States.* Orlando FL: Harcourt Brace and Company.

Peterson, T. and Rose, A. (2006). Reducing conflicts between climate policy and energy policy in the US: The important role of the States. *Energy Policy, 34*, pp.619-631.

Petit, C. (2005). Power struggle. *Nature, 438,* pp.410-412.

Pizer, W. and Tamura, K. (2005). *Climate policy in the United States and Japan: Prospects in 2005 and beyond.* Washington DC: Resources for the Future.

Princen, T. and Finger, M. (1994). Introduction. In T. Princen and M. Finger (Eds.), *Environmental NGOs in world politics: Linking the local and the global* (pp.1-27). London UK: Routledge, London.

Rabe, B., Roman, M. and Dobelis, A. (2005). State competition as a source driving climate change mitigation. *New York University Environmental Law Journal, 14,* pp.1-53.

Rabe, B. (2006). Second generation climate policies in the American States: Proliferation, diffusion and regionalization. *Issues in Governance Studies, 6,* pp.1-9.

Radin, B. and Boase, J. (2000). Federalism, political structure, and public policy in the United States and Canada. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis, 2* (10), pp.65-89.

Riker, W. (1964). *Federalism: Origin, operation, significance*. Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company,

Roberts, D. (2007). One nation, under Terry: An interview with California environmental adviser Terry Tamminen. *Grist online: Main Dish*, January 4. Online: http://www.grist.org/news/maindish/2007/01/04/tamminen/, accessed 19/01/07.

Rosencranz, A. (2002). 'US climate change policy. In S. Schneider, A. Rosencranz and J. Niles (Eds.), *Climate change policy: A Survey* (pp.221-234), Washington and London: Island Press.

Rush, M. (1990). *Parliament and pressure politics.* Oxford UK: Clarendon Press.

Santora, M. (2007). Global warming starts to divide G.O.P. contenders. *New York Times online*, October 17. Online: http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/17/us/politics/17climate.html?_r=1&oref=slogin, accessed 13/03/08.

SB 1 (2006). *Senate Bill No. 1*, Chapter 132: An Act to add Sections 25405.5 and 25405.6 to, and to add Chapter 8.8 (commencing with Section 25780) to Division 15 of, the Public Resources Code, and to amend Section 2827 of, and to add Sections 387.5 and 2851 to, the Public Utilities Code, relating to solar electricity. Approved by Governor, August 21, Sacramento.

SB 1368 (2006). *Senate Bill No. 1368*, Chapter 598: An Act to add Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 8340) to Division 4.1 of the Public Utilities Code, relating to electricity. Approved by Governor, September 29, Sacramento.

Schlosberg, D. (2005). Networks and mobile arrangements: Organizational innovation in the US environmental justice movement. In J. Dryzek and D. Schlosberg (Eds.), *Debating the earth: The environmental politics reader* (pp.550-568), Oxford UK: Oxford University Press.

Shellenberger, M. and Nordhaus, T. (2004). The death of environmentalism: Global warming politics in a post-environmental world. Address to the *Environmental Grantmakers Association*, reprinted by *Grist online: Main* Dish. Online: www.grist.org/news/maindish/2005/01/13/doe-reprint/, accessed 18/3/05.

Sierra Club (2006a). Inside the Sierra Club. *Sierra Club website.* Online: www.sierraclub.org/inside, accessed 29/8/06.

Sierra Club (2006b). Global warming. *Sierra Club website.* Online: http://www.sierraclub.org/globalwarming/, accessed 25/8/06.

Sierra Club Insider (2006). Sierra Club's election 2006 campaign. *Sierra Club Insider*, October 10.

State of California (2008). Climate Action Team and Climate Action Initiative. *California Climate Change Portal online.* Online: http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/climate_action_team/index.html, accessed 6/03/08.

Tanner, A. (2006). Schwarzenegger wins in landslide. *Reuters Election 2006 online*, November 8. Online: http://elections.us.reuters.com/top/news/usnN08250412.html, accessed 6/03/08.

UCS (2006a). *About us.* Union of Concerned Scientists website. Online: www.ucsusa.org, accessed 19/01/06.

UCS (2006b). AB32- Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: As passed by the Californian Legislature on August 31, 2006. Berkeley CA: Union of Concerned Scientists. Online: www.ucsusa.org/jump.jsp?itemID=30027175, accessed 20/07/07.

UCS (2008). *UCS Sound Science Initiative.* Union of Concerned Scientists website. Online: http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/sound-science-initiative.html, accessed 04/04/08.

UNFCCC (2007). *Synthesis and assessment report on the greenhouse gas inventories submitted in 2007.* United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Online: http://unfccc.int/resource/webdocs/sai/2007.pdf, accessed 7/03/08.

Vote Solar Initiative (2006). *About us.* Vote Solar Initiative website. Online: www.votesolar.org, accessed 25/08/06.

Whelan, J. (2005). A hard road to learn: Learning from failed social action. In J. Crowther, V. Galloway and I. Martin (Eds.), *Popular education: Engaging the academy* (pp.157-168), Leicester UK: NIACE.

White House (2007). Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007: President Bush signs energy Bill to improve fuel economy and reduce oil dependence. *Press Release*, December 19. Online: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2007/12/print/20071219-1.html, accessed 5/3/08.

Worth, D. (2003). The WA forest conflict: The construction of the political effectiveness of advocacy organisations. *Grit: Journal of Australian Studies*, 78.

Yodeler (2005). Slowing global warming - the local way. *Yodeler*, May-June. Online: http://sanfranciscobay.sierraclub.org/yodeler/html/2005/05/feature9.htm, accessed 25/8/06.

Pages 193-198 of this thesis have been removed as they contain published material. Please refer to the following citation for details of the article contained in these pages.

Hall, N. (2009), 'CMOs in USA: Burgeoning grassroots power' in M. Diesendorf (ed.) (2009), *Climate Action: A Campaign Manual for Greenhouse Solutions,* UNSW Press (in press).

Published journal article

Hall, N. and McGee, J. (2007), 'Climate Change in Australia: Shifting public attitudes and Federal Government policy', *Local Government Reporter* 6(3) pp.38-42 (invited submission).

Pages 207-231 of this thesis have been removed as they contain published material. Please refer to the following citation for details of the article contained in these pages.

Hall, N. L., Taplin, R., & Goldstein, W. (2010). Empowerment of individuals and realization of community agency: Applying action research to climate change responses in Australia. *Action Research*, 8(1), 71-91. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750309335203

6. Concluding Reflections

This research sought to determine the obstacles and opportunities facing climate-focused campaigns by a selection of Australian NGOs. It was based on the following five research questions:

1. What social movement theories and frameworks are useful for understanding and guiding NGO climate change campaigns in Australia?
2. What campaign activities are being undertaken by NGOs, and can they be categorised as 'revolutionary' or 'reformist' strategies?
3. How have campaign outcomes been perceived by the NGOs and the intended audiences, and how can the effectiveness of these campaigns be evaluated?
4. What have been effective NGO climate campaigns in the UK and in California, and were the social and political conditions that supported these achievements similar to Australian conditions?
5. What have been the public and the policy shifts on climate change in Australia, and what is their potential for creating adequate climate policy development and adoption?

The findings were reported through nine articles that captured the progressive inquiry into this topic and were presented as a thesis by publication. The six main conclusions from the research question are outlined below; they are followed by the overall obstacles and opportunities that were revealed by this research.

6.1 Conclusions drawn from the discrete research articles

The *first conclusion* is that the theoretical understanding of Australian environmental NGOs' own activities is not well developed and this limits campaign effectiveness. Awareness of relevant social movement theories and theoretical frameworks can guide climate change campaigns to be more effective. New social movement theories can deepen the understanding of fundamental assumptions about social change and the potential of pressure groups to effect change. Environmental NGOs work from a position associated strongly with post-materialism, while politicians and other power-holders maintain a dominant economic paradigm that emphasises materialism. Identifying such positions and assumptions enables NGOs to communicate targeted messages that resonate with

the values of specific audiences. Political process theories regarding the relationship between institutional political actors and protest, and the role of pressure groups within social movements, can help to understand the sources of power of potential for influence. Such theories ensure that NGOs are able to continue their efforts in pursuit of their goals throughout political and institutional changes and periods of apparent public indifference.

The activities of the selected Australian environmental NGOs were divided into a theoretical dichotomy of 'revolutionary' and 'reformist' strategies. However, it was found that the NGOs showed no preference for a single strategy, instead undertaking a number of activities from both strategies. This suggested that the notion of Australian environmental NGO climate campaign activities being conducted within the proposed dichotomy of reform *versus* revolution, or other dichotomies such as 'insider *versus* outsider' or 'confrontational *versus* reformist' are too simple for analysing campaigns. Instead, the selected NGOs preferred a 'multi-strategic' approach where the most relevant and effective activities from all themes are considered and utilised towards achieving campaign goals.

This analysis leads to the *second conclusion* that NGOs need to develop measures for determining effectiveness that relate to the mechanism through which change is sought. This research summarised perceptions of success held by both the NGO campaigners and external observers from the audience groups. Each audience displayed different levels of receptiveness to climate campaign messages. Most of the politicians and political advisors interviewed acknowledged the existence of NGO activities on climate change, and recommended NGOs propose more 'realistic' policy demands and encourage voters to pressure their local MPs. Some policy-makers interviewed remarked on the alliances and collaborations that the NGOs facilitated during the mid-2000s, such as the ACF-facilitated Australian Business Roundtable on Climate Change, to provide a new 'face' and credibility to NGO concerns. They suggested that NGOs could benefit from forging closer links with scientists and should pursue greater 'mileage' from their policy engagement.

The interview participants from energy-intensive and electricity-generating industries generally appreciated the new alliances and 'business-aware' approaches of NGOs, and some were willing to publicly acknowledge the concerns their industry shared with NGOs regarding climate change. They said they preferred a more collaborative, 'softly-softly' negotiation process towards policy change and away from public and media attention. This reflects the maturation process of social movements from the early phase of visible protest to the bureaucratisation of a mature movement, where economic and social understandings are challenged on a variety of fronts. Media representatives recommended that NGOs improve the 'newsworthiness' of their stories, but commended the new alliances that NGOs had formed to overcome the sceptical treatment of the climate change issue by conservative commentators. The government-commissioned surveys of community attitudes in 2003 found that Australians had received messages about climate change, but owing to poor understanding and other environmental issues taking greater priority, there was insignificant agitation or action by the community at that time to be registered by politicians.

Given the above findings, it appears that NGOs have communicated their concerns to a range of specific audiences. New alliances negotiated with business, scientists, academics and others appear to have been well-received and strengthened the credibility of the climate change issue. However, the findings from the community and media reinforced the challenge of making climate change messages resonate with their audiences, and ensuring the message is acted upon.

The *third conclusion* is that the lack of policy creation, despite the NGO climate campaigns, was due to the Howard Government's exclusion of civil society (including NGOs) in climate policy development. It reflects earlier discussion of NGO exclusion from the policy process due to their framing of campaign messages external to economic policy concerns, a lack of support from social ‘elites’, or the lack of demonstration- until recently- of concern from the broader public. This lack of obvious public support resulted in climate change being unrepresented in climate policy and not becoming an electoral force until the

2007 election. This research evaluated NGO campaigns using three specific approaches:

1. Use of Moyer's Movement Action Plan (Moyer, 2001) identified that the campaigns of the selected NGOs had collectively moved the climate change issue towards the Plan's fourth stage of political 'take-off'.
2. Use of Schumaker's Assessment of Political Effectiveness (Schumaker, 1975) indicated that many campaigners and experts considered the Howard Government took the concerns of NGOs into consideration, but had not adopted these concerns into policy.
3. A document analysis of submissions by the selected NGOs to climate-related policy processes assisted in identification of when and why NGOs had (or had not) influenced policies.

All three approaches indicated a lack of campaign evaluation. Ideally, NGOs should select evaluation methods during the development of a campaign strategy. This enables identifiable goals to be determined, an evaluation timeline to be developed, and the evaluation findings to be incorporated into the later stages of the campaign. Adequate evaluation should also guide and improve later campaigns on similar issues of concern.

The *fourth conclusion* is that the socio-political context in which campaigns are undertaken heavily influences campaign success. Comparative analysis found the apparent achievements by the UK NGOs, in contrast to Australian NGOs, appeared to stem from more conducive political and policy conditions provided by the Blair Labour Government over the past decade and the UK's membership within the EU. There was very strong political posturing on climate change by the Blair Government, and the fossil fuel lobby did not have a predominant influence. NGOs are highly regarded by the UK Government and public, and have millions of supporters from whom to draw their main financial support. The UK NGOs enjoy diversity and collaboration, and recognize and incorporate the variety of resources, skills and niches that each organisation inhabits. UK NGOs were concerned that a gap still existed between government policy rhetoric and actual outcomes, but their efforts appeared to have contributed to substantial climate

change policy modifications through their strong credibility with the Blair Government.

Similarly, Californian NGO campaign achievements have occurred under favourable state-level political, community and, until the recent national downturn, economic contexts. California's history of progressive environmental legislation, a strong public trust and credibility bestowed upon NGOs, and Governor Schwarzenegger's use of climate change to demonstrate his leadership have provided a strong foundation for NGO campaign influence on climate policy development at a state level.

By contrast, climate change has only recently appeared as a political priority in Australia because the financially and politically powerful fossil fuel dependent industries have had significant influence. The Howard Government did not ratify the Kyoto Protocol. Their policies were considered inadequate by NGOs and later, with growing concern, by the public, as evidenced by the 2007 electoral outcomes. During Howard's time in office, Australian NGOs did not enjoy great political legitimacy, and public support of NGOs was eroded as by the Government's use of the tax system to limit political advocacy. NGOs were challenged by limited resources to make a substantial and continuous impact in climate debates.

The *fifth conclusion* is that a complex mix of social and political factors at both international and national levels has created a shift in community and government concern for adequate climate policy development and adoption in Australia. This relates to recent changes in the socio-political conditions in Australia. As mentioned in Section 3, Al Gore's popular documentary publicised climate change as a public issue in late 2006. The continuing drought conditions and related water restrictions in many Australian states demonstrated climate change impacts in a tangible way to the general public. The *Stern Review* was very influential internationally and in Australia, providing an economic perspective on climate change. These events all raised the concern for climate change that had been built by NGO climate campaigns over the past twenty years. As a result, the media profile of climate change in Australia increased, citizen action became more visible, and the Federal election period created a relatively dynamic terrain for

Australian climate change policy. The applications of the Movement Action Plan identified that the climate campaigns of the selected NGOs had collectively moved the climate change issue towards the Plan's fourth stage of political 'take-off'. Whether these changes and the associated momentum will be sufficient to overcome the powerful pressure groups of economic, fossil fuel and mining union interests remains to be seen.

The *sixth conclusion* is that NGOs can capitalise on the recent change in political leadership that has prioritised climate change. This is evidenced by the Rudd Government signing the instrument of ratification of the Kyoto Protocol in its first Act of Parliament, and re-stating its election commitments of GHG emissions reduction targets. The political achievements of the community-authored Climate Protection Bill reflected the increased ability of citizens to demand a legislative response to climate change. The widespread political awareness of the Bill by November 2007 reflected the grassroots lobbying achievements. There was a high probability that climate change became an election issue in November 2007 in part through the influence of CAC and other grassroots climate groups. NGOs, in combination with community-based groups, can increase their campaign effectiveness in this political context by continuing to collaborate with other interest groups to demand adequate political responses to climate change, to design campaigns that are constantly evaluated to sharpen their effectiveness, and to ensure that campaigns are developed with evaluation criteria underpinned by understanding drawn from relevant social movement theories.

6.2 Reflections on research approach

Constructivism provided an appropriate epistemology that enabled this research to explore how NGOs had created and developed their knowledge about effective campaign approaches and political intervention. It allowed the researcher to accept and work with the diversity of meaningful realities held both between and within organisations. The concurrent realities affected how the meaning of situations, such as the political 'landscape' upon which NGO climate campaigns are conducted, were derived and defined through the individual's and organisation's experience of them. The use of interviews, literature, comparative analysis and PAR were able to draw out and identify these realities and explain how these realities affected the NGO responses to climate change politics and adequate political responses.

Matched with this, phenomenology was a useful theoretical framework to examine NGO strategies and politics on climate change, and thus to seek new meanings and enhance former assumptions about these. Phenomenology was applied to understand the phenomena of NGO strategies, politics, policy change and climate change within the contexts in which they occurred. Using phenomenology to explore the underlying assumptions in the PAR project, in particular, allowed new meanings and authentication of these meanings to emerge.

Using a methodology informed by ethnography allowed the meanings and perceptions held by interview participants to be described, explored and analysed within the context of the participants' world view. Applying ethnographic methods ensured that the research did not embark on the research with preconceived findings and meanings, but allowed the interviews and documents to reveal these meanings contextually.

With one exception, the array of methods used proved effective in achieving the research outcomes. Semi-structured interviews drew out themes that were not overly represented in the academic literature. The Movement Action Plan (Moyer, 2001) identified and matched common campaign phases to the Australian experience, allowing a broader view to be obtained of the climate movement's

progress. The analysis of climate policy processes revealed other, perhaps stronger, sources of influence than NGOs. Comparative analyses of NGO campaigns in the UK and California identified opportunities beyond the limitations and issues specific to the Australian situation. Participatory Action Research provided an effective process for developing shared plans of action, for collaborative reflection and for evaluation. PAR encouraged participants to collectively 'own' the Climate Protection Bill project and its outcomes, and was critical in developing them into politically effective citizen advocates on climate change. Less useful was the application of Schumaker's (1975) Assessment of Political Effectiveness, as it proved difficult to apply to a range of non-homogeneous NGO campaigns and did not facilitate consideration of the variety of Australian Government policy responses to climate and greenhouse issues. Schumaker's Assessment would be more appropriate and usefully applied to a single campaign approach undertaken by one NGO.

6.3 Obstacles and opportunities for NGO climate campaigns

There are five broad areas in which NGO climate campaigns are facing both obstacles and opportunities. These are the resource-dependent structure of the Australian economy, the political influences of special interest groups, climate policy development, public awareness, and aspects of the Australian environment movement.

Firstly, coal mining and exports currently make an important contribution to the Australian economy and have significant political influence. This creates a campaign obstacle. Although there has been a recent change of Government, the Labor Party has strong historical ties with the mining sector through union representation. It will be difficult for NGO campaigns to influence the Federal Government to not pay deference to the coal miners' union. This may result in the Rudd Government predominantly supporting technologically-focused responses to climate change, such as 'clean coal' and Carbon Capture and Storage.

The second area that offers an obstacle or an opportunity, depending on the Rudd Government's approach, is the political influence of special interest groups, particularly industry groups and NGOs. As yet, it is unclear whether the Rudd Government will address the fossil fuel lobby's 'Greenhouse Mafia' relationship with, and influence over, the Federal Government's energy and other climate-related decisions. Unless the Rudd Government offers greater pluralism for pressure groups that represent concerns other than economic interests, NGOs will continue to be excluded from political access.

The third aspect that offers an opportunity for NGOs is climate policy development. The ratification of the Kyoto Protocol and the recent establishment of the Federal Department of Climate Change have placed the Rudd Government significantly closer to the measures of the grassroots-authored Climate Protection Bill than the Howard Government's policies. This Bill provides an opportunity for citizens to influence political responses to climate change. The professional research, peer review process and legal presentation of the Bill's demands ensure the credibility of both the Bill and the grassroots climate groups' concerns. The strategic timing of the Bill, written and used to lobby MPs prior to the Federal election, increased the potential for grassroots influence and political access.

The Rudd Government's recent response to climate policy, matched with the progress of the Climate Protection Bill, may be the beginning of a return to the broad pluralism enjoyed by NGOs and other interest groups during the ecologically sustainable development (ESD) process facilitated by the Labor Government in the early 1990s. If such access and opportunity is offered by the Rudd Government, it will increase the public legitimacy and media opportunities of NGOs, both of which decreased under the Howard Government.

The fourth area of opportunity for NGOs is public awareness of climate change. The continuing nationwide drought, notwithstanding recent heavy rains in some regions of Eastern Australia, has allowed NGOs to maintain their focus on the Australian impacts of climate change by providing a climate-related 'hook' for media interest in climate change. If the high media profile of the drought and its association with climate change continues, this is likely to maintain public awareness and thus promote continued growth of community-based climate action groups. These groups may require assistance or guidance from environmental NGOs to ensure their campaigns are politically effective. Importantly, all NGOs and community groups must ensure that adverse weather events they attribute to climate change have a scientific basis, rather than are loosely related or have an unproven link to climate change. The model of the UCS in the US, whereby scientific findings are presented by local scientists and policy recommendations are presented by an NGO, could be an effective organisational model to adopt in Australia.

A final area that poses both obstacles and opportunities are aspects of the fractionated Australian environment movement. As NGOs currently divide their resources and campaign focus between both state/territory- and federal-level climate policies, they are stretching their already low funding and resources. However, the change in Federal Government has resulted in Labor leadership in all states as well as at the Federal level. This electoral hegemony of Labor may improve state/federal relations, thus reducing the obstacle that requires NGOs to 'split their energies' across the different levels of government.

Secure and sufficient funding remains an obstacle for many NGOs. Currently, Australian NGOs are applying their limited resources across a multi-strategic range of climate campaign activities, rather than investing in a limited number of campaign approaches. This is in contrast to the UK, where each NGO has specialised in a particular campaign that allows a thorough and long-term undertaking of that approach. The UK NGOs then work in alliance to support a variety of approaches. The cooperation of UK NGOs on climate change may be due to the stability of funding sources for each NGO, which allows a non-competitive working alliance. In Australia, the competition to secure sufficient funding and resources for the NGOs without risking movement rifts can only be overcome by diversifying income sources, or by working in alliance with shared funding under all NGO 'brands' involved.

Ideological divisions between Australian environmental NGOs remain a challenge. This is not just an Australian phenomenon, but some of these divisions were created or amplified by the Howard Government's favouring of particular NGOs with funding and political access whilst isolating others. As yet, it is uncertain whether these tensions will be alleviated following the change of Federal Government. However, recently-established alliances between environmental NGOs and other industry and pressure groups offer opportunities as they have been well received by external observers and enable pressure for action on climate change to come from a broader range of concerned stakeholders. Such alliances with faith, social justice, alternative energy, union, energy industry and other organisations can continue to be built.

To ensure that campaigners and their campaigns are as effective as possible, NGOs have the opportunity to undertake training in social movement theories and their practical application to provide guidance and historical perspectives to current campaigns. Campaign effectiveness can be increased by designing the campaign goals and evaluation criteria in parallel to ensure that campaigns achieve what they propose.

6.4 Future research directions

This research project has indicated a number of future research directions that respond to the above obstacles and opportunities. These seek to connect both research and practice to enhance movement effectiveness. There are research opportunities to work with NGOs to build and then evaluate their campaigns, and to develop training and evaluation materials for their use. There is the need to survey the shift in public concern about climate change to determine effective framing and communication of climate change issues. With the increase in NGO-initiated cross-sectoral alliances that demand adequate climate change policy, there will be an opportunity to assess these processes and their effectiveness. As the Rudd Government establishes its NGO-Government relations with regard to climate change, research opportunities will exist to analyse the shifts in NGO legitimacy and political interactions. Further research questions will emerge as Australian policy begins to focus more closely on climate change adaptation, beyond mitigation only. The methodological approach and methods employed in this research would be appropriate for this future research. In particular, PAR provides an effective methodological approach for undertaking and participating in grassroots citizen research.

For two decades, Australian NGOs have persistently undertaken campaigns for political action on climate change in less-than-favourable socio-political conditions. Nonetheless, these NGOs have been successful in helping to raise awareness and develop the conditions for issue 'take off'. There are both obstacles and opportunities facing NGO campaigns for action on climate change. The greatest opportunity is provided by the Rudd Labor Government, whose recent election victory was partly determined by the Labor Party's policy commitments to international and domestic action on climate change. In addition, strong and visible community support for climate change has emerged through high attendance at the annual Walks Against Warming and the growth of citizen-based climate groups. With these recent developments of more favourable conditions, the role of environmental NGOs in Australia will be very important in articulating public concern and proposing new policy directions on climate change.

References

ABC (2006), 'Senate committee numbers to be cut', *ABC News Online*, Australian Broadcasting Corporation, June 20, www.abc.net.au/news (accessed 06/10/2006).

ABC (2007), 'Tens of thousands march for climate change action: Walk Against Warming march', *ABC News*, Australian Broadcasting Corporation, November 11.

ABC TV (2006), *Enough Rope,* Australian Broadcasting Corporation, September 11, http://www.abc.net.au/tv/enoughrope/transcripts/s1734175.htm (accessed 14/09/06).

ARG (2007), *Climate Institute: Marginal electorates election campaign poll,* Australian Research Group, Sydney.

Beder, S. (1991), 'Activism versus Negotiation: Strategies for the environmental movement', *Social Alternatives* 10(4):53-56.

Bührs, T. (2000), 'Green Planning in Australia and Canada: Dead or alive?', *Environmental Politics* 9(2):102-125.

Burgmann, V. (1993), *Power and Protest: Movements for change in Australian society,* Allen & Unwin, Sydney.

Calnan, S. (2004), *In the Trenches: A comparative analysis of the nature and effectiveness of the mobilisation of law by domestic human rights NGOs in the United States, Britain and Germany,* Doctoral Thesis, Faculty of Law, University of New South Wales, Sydney.

CANA (2005a), *Turning Up the Heat: Increasing the impact of climate change campaigning,* Climate Action Network Australia, Sydney.

CANA (2005b), *CANA home,* Climate Action Network Australia, Sydney, www.cana.net.au (accessed 23/6/05).

Castellanos, P. and Pateriya, D. (2003). *Power Tools: A Manual for Organizations Fighting for Justice,* Strategic Concepts in Organizing and Policy Education (SCOPE), Los Angeles.

CBSR and RA (2003), *Community Perceptions of Climate Change: A report on benchmark research,* Colmar Brunton Social Research and Redsuit Advertising for the Australian Greenhouse Office, Canberra.

CCGA (2006), *The United States and the Rise of China and India: Results of a 2006 multination survey of public opinion*, Chicago Council on Global Affairs, Chicago, Asia Society, East Asia Institute and Lowy Institute for International Policy, Chicago and Sydney.

CFMEU (2007), *Carbon Capture and Storage: Making it happen- A CFMEU position paper,* Mining and Energy Division of the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union, Sydney, www.cfmeu.com.au (accessed 31/01/08).

Charmaz, K. (2000), 'Grounded Theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods', in N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research,* Sage, Thousand Oaks, USA:509-535.

Christoff, P. (2005), 'Policy autism or double-edged dismissiveness? Australia's climate policy under the Howard government', Global Change, Peace and Security, 17(1): 29-44

Climate Action Communities (2007), Climate Protection Bill 2007, Climate Movement online, www.climatemovement./org.au/ClimateProtectionBill (accessed 22/10/07).

Colombo, M. (2003), 'Reflexivity and Narratives in Action Research: A discursive approach', *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research 4(2)* (Online journal), http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-03/2-03colombo-e.htm (accessed 12/06/07).

Crane, P. and Richardson, L. (2000), *Reconnect Action Research Kit,* Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services, Canberra.

Crotty, M. (1998), *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

CSIRO (2005), *New hope for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Australia,* Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, http://www.csiro.au/news/pso2.html (accessed 23/02/07).

Davis, G., Wanna, J., Warhurst, J., and Weller, P. (1993), *Public Policy in Australia,* Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

DEC (2003), *Who Cares about the Environment in 2003? A survey of NSW people's environmental knowledge, attitudes and behaviours,* NSW Department of Environment and Conservation, Sydney.

della Porta, D. and Diani, M. (1999), *Social Movements: An introduction,* Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

DEFRA (2007), *Taking Forward the UK* Climate Change Bill*: The Government response to pre-legislative scrutiny and public consultation,* Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, London.

DITR (2006), *Carbon Dioxide Capture and Geological Storage (CCS): General information*, Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources, Canberra, www.industry.gov.au (accessed 22/12/06).

Doyle, T. (2000), *Green Power: The Environmental Movement in Australia,* University of New South Wales Press, Sydney.

Doyle, T. (2005), *Environmental Movements in Minority and Majority Worlds: A global perspective,* Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.

DPMC (2007), *Emissions Trading*, Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, Canberra,http://www.pmc.gov.au/climate_change/emissions/index.cfm#taskgroup (accessed 23/10/07).

DPMC (2004), *Securing Australia's Energy Future,* Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, Canberra, www.dpmc.gov.au/energy_future (accessed 15/9/05).

Dryzek, J., Downes, D., Hunold, C., Schlosberg, D. and Hernes, H-K. (2003), *Green States and Social Movements: Environmentalism in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany and Norway,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

ECITA (2005), *Lurching forward, looking back: Budgetary and environmental implications of the Government's Energy White Paper,* Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee, Canberra.

Finley, M. and Soifer, S. (2001). 'Social Movement Theories and MAP: Beginnings of a Dialogue'. In B. Moyer, *Doing Democracy: The MAP Model for Organizing Social Movements,* Gabriola Island, New Society Publishers.

Fontana, A. and Frey, J. (2000), 'The Interview: From structured questions to negotiated text', in N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research,* Sage, Thousand Oaks, USA:645-672.

Frew, W. (2006), 'Howard's Agenda', *The Walkley Magazine*: 19-20.

Gerlach, L. (2001), 'The Structure of Social Movements: Environmental activism and its opponents', in J. Arquilla and D. Ronfeldt (eds.), *Networks and Netwars: The Future of Terror, Crime and Militancy*, RAND Corporation, USA:289-310.

Gilbert, L. (2002), 'Going Their Distance: 'Closeness' in qualitative data analysis software', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 5(3):215-228.

Giugni, M. (1999), 'Introduction', in M. Giugni, D. McAdam and C. Tilly (eds.), *How Social Movements Matter*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis:xiii-xxxiii.

Guggenheim, D. (2006), *An Inconvenient Truth*, Paramount Classics and Participant Productions, USA.

Hall, N. (2009), 'CMOs in USA: Burgeoning grassroots power' in Diesendorf, M. (ed.) (2009), Climate Action: A Campaign Manual for Greenhouse Solutions, UNSW Press (forthcoming).

Hall, N. and McGee, J. (2007), 'Climate Change in Australia: Shifting public attitudes and Federal Government policy', Local Government Reporter 6(3):38-42.

Hall, N. and Star, C. (2007), 'Climate change messages and strategies by Australian NGOs', in J. Ensor, I. Polak and P. van de
Merwe (eds.), Other Contact Zones, Network Books, Perth, New Talents 21C (7):137- 147.

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2006), 'Confronting Climate Change: A review of theoretical perspectives on environmental NGOs and their campaign effectiveness', Griffith Journal of the Environment (2) (Online journal), http://www.griffith.edu.au/faculty/ens/gje/issues/2006-2/articles/gje-2006-02-hall.pdf (accessed 03/04/08).

Hall, N., and Taplin, R. (2007a), 'Revolution or Inch-By-Inch? Campaign approaches on climate change by environmental groups', The Environmentalist 27:95-107.

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2007b), 'Solar Festivals and Climate Bills: Comparing NGO climate change campaigns in the UK and Australia', Voluntas 18(4):317-338.

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2008a), 'Room for Climate Advocates in a Coal-focused Economy? NGO influence on Australian climate policy', Australian Journal of Social Issues 43 (3), pp.359-379.

Hall, N. and Taplin, R. (2008b), 'Nonprofit campaigns and state competition: Influences on climate policy in California', submitted for publication to Voluntas (October 28, 2008; currently under review).

Hall, N., Taplin, R. and Goldstein, W. (2009), 'Empowerment of individuals and realisation of community agency: Applying Action Research to climate change responses in Australia', Action Research (accepted for publication, January 16, 2009).

HM Treasury (2006), *Stern Review: The economics of climate change*, Her Majesty's Treasury, London, www.hm-treasury.gov.uk (accessed 20/11/06).

Hoepfl, M. (1997), Choosing Qualitative Research: A primer for technology education researchers', *Journal of Technology Education* 9(1):47- 63.

Howard, J., The Hon. (2005), *Australia Joins New Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate*, Press Release, Office of the Prime Minister, Canberra, July 28.

Howes, M. (2005), *Politics and the Environment: Risk and the role of government and industry*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

Hutton, D. and Connors, L. (1999), *A History of the Australian Environmental Movement*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

IPCC (2007), *Climate Change 2007: The physical science basis (Summary for policymakers)*, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Geneva.

Kates, R. and Wilbanks, T. (2003), 'Making the Global Local', *Environment* 45(3):12-23.

Kay, P. (1998), 'Terms and Impacts of the Kyoto Protocol', *Current Issues Brief* (10), Science, Technology, Environment and Resources Group, Australian Parliamentary Library, Canberra, http://www.aph.gov.au/library/pubs/CIB/1997-98/98cib10.htm (accessed 20/03/07).

Kent, A. and Mercer, D. (2006), 'Australia's Mandatory Renewable Energy Target (MRET): An assessment', *Energy Policy* 34(9):1046-1062.

Liamputtong, P. and Ezzy, D. (2005), *Qualitative Research Methods* (2nd edition), Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lowe, I. (2006), 'Changing Public Attitudes to Long-term Issues', *Griffith Review: Hot Air- How nigh's the end?*(6):143-152.

McCarthy, J. and Zald, M. (2003), 'Social Movement Organizations', in J. Goodwin, and J. Jasper (ed.s), *The Social Movement Reader,* Blackwell Publishing, Malden and Oxford: 169-186.

McGee, J. and Taplin, R. (2006), 'The Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate: A complement or competitor to the Kyoto protocol?', *Global Change, Peace & Security,* 18(3):173 – 192.

MacGill, I., Outhred, H. and Nolles, K. (2006), 'Some Design Lessons from Market-based Greenhouse Gas Regulation in the Restructured Australian Electricity Industry', *Energy Policy* 34(1): 11-25.

Maddison, S. and Hamilton, C. (2007), 'Non-Government Organisations', in C. Hamilton and S. Maddison (eds.), *Silencing Dissent: How the Australian Government is controlling public opinion and stifling debate,* Allen and Unwin, Sydney: 78-10.

Maddison, S. and Scalmer, S. (2006), *Activist Wisdom: Practical knowledge and creative tension in the life of social movements*, UNSW Press, Sydney.

Marsh, I. (2002), 'Interest Groups', in J. Summers, D. Woodward and A. Parkin (eds.), *Government, Politics, Power and Policy in Australia,* Pearson Education Australia, Sydney: 345-361.

Matthews, T. (1997), 'Interest Groups', in R. Smith (ed.), *Politics in Australia,* Allen and Unwin, Sydney: 269-289.

Marcus, G. (1998), *Ethnography through thick and thin,* Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Maxcy, S. (2003), 'Pragmatic threads in mixed methods research in the social sciences: The search for multiple modes of inquiry and the end of the philosophy of formalism, in A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie (ed.s), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research*, SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA: 51- 90.

Moyer, B. (2001), *Doing Democracy: The MAP model for organizing social movements,* New Society Publishers. Gabriola Island, Canada.

Newell, P. (2000), *Climate for Change: Non-state actors and the global politics of the greenhouse, C*ambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Opie, J. (1998), *Nature's Nation: An environmental history of the United States,* Harcourt Brace and Company, Orlando USA.

Papadakis, E. (1993), *Politics and the Environment: The Australian experience,* Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

Pearse, G. (2005), *The Business Response to Climate Change: Case studies of Australian interest groups*, Doctoral thesis, Policy and Governance Program, Asia Pacific School of Economics and Government, The Australian National University, Canberra.

Pearse, G. (2007), 'Ratifying Kyoto Will Be the Easy Bit', *Crikey.com online journal*, Melbourne, November 25, www.crikey.com.au (accessed 31/01/08).

Phillips, R. (2006), 'The Role of Nonprofit Advocacy Organisations in Australian Democracy and Policy Governance', *Voluntas* 17(1):59-75.

Pitman, A., Narisma, G. and McAneney, K. (2007), 'The Impact of Climate Change on the Risk of Forest and Grassland Fires in Australia', *Climatic Change* 84(3-4):383-401.

Poole, M., Lansbury, R., and Wailes, N. (2001), 'A Comparative Analysis of Developments in Industrial Democracy', *Industrial Relations* 40(3):490- 525.

Preston, B. and Jones, R. (2006), *Climate Change Impacts on Australia and the Benefits of Early Action to Reduce Global Greenhouse Gas Emissions: A consultancy report for the Australian Business Roundtable on Climate Change*, CSIRO, Canberra.

Princen, T. and Finger, M. (1994), 'Introduction', in T. Princen and M. Finger (eds.), *Environmental NGOs in World Politics: Linking the local and the global*, Routledge, London:1-27.

Productivity Commission (2005), *The Private Cost Effectiveness of Improving Energy Efficiency*, Productivity Commission Inquiry Report (36), Canberra.

Richards, J. and Heard, J. (2005), 'European Environmental NGOs: Issues, resources and strategies in marine campaigns', *Environmental Politics* 14(1):23-41.

Riedy, C. (2005), *The Eye of the Storm: An integral perspective on sustainable development and climate change response*, Doctoral thesis, Institute for Sustainable Futures, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney.

Roberts, D. (2007), 'One Nation, Under Terry: An interview with California environmental adviser Terry Tamminen', *Main Dish- Grist*, January 4, http://www.grist.org/news/maindish/2007/01/04/tamminen/ (accessed 19/01/07).

Rootes, C. (2004), 'Environmental Movements', in D. Snow, S. Soule and H. Kriesi (ed.s), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford

Rootes, C. (2007), 'Nature Protection Organisations in England', *Working Paper 1/2007*, Centre for the Study of Social and Political Movements, University of Kent, Kent, http://www.kent.ac.uk/sspssr/staff/academic/rootes.html (accessed 24/08/08).

Rudd, K., The Hon. (2007), 'Ratifying the Kyoto Protocol', *Press release*, December 3, Official website of the Australian Labor Party, http://www.alp.org.au/media/1207/mspm030.php (accessed 21/12/07).

Rush, M. (1990), *Parliament and Pressure Politics*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

SCC (2006), *Stop Climate Chaos website*, Stop Climate Chaos, London, www.stopclimatechaos.org.uk (accessed 23/06/06).

SBS (2006), *SBS world guide,* Hardie Grant Books, Melbourne.

Schlosberg, D. (2005), 'Networks and Mobile Arrangements: Organisational innovation in the US environmental justice movement', in J. Dryzek, and D. Schlosberg (eds.), *Debating the Earth: The environmental politics reader*, Oxford University Press, Oxford:550-568.

Schumaker, P. (1975), 'Policy Responsiveness to Protest-Group Demands', *Journal of Politics* 37:488-521.

SkyNews (2007), 'Exit poll- Labor win', *SkyNews online*, November 25, http://www2.skynews.com.au/election07/article.aspx?id=202773 (accessed 27/11/07).

Snow, D., Soule, S. and Kriesi, H. (2004), 'Mapping the Terrain', in D. Snow, S. Soule and H. Kriesi (ed.s), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements,* Blackwell Publishing, Oxford

Switkowski, Z., Dracoulis, G., Johnston, A., McKibbin, W., Thomas, M. and Johnston, P. (2006), *Uranium Mining, Processing and Nuclear Energy: Opportunities for Australia?,* Uranium Mining, Processing and Nuclear Energy Review Taskforce, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, Canberra.

Tambling, G., Laver, P., Oliphant, M. and Stevens, N. (2003), *Renewable Opportunities: A review of the operation of the Renewable Energy (Electricity) Act 2000,* Australian Greenhouse Office, Canberra.

Tashakkori, A. and Teddlie, C. (2003) (ed.s), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research,* SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Tarrow, S. (1998), *Power in Movement: Social movements and contentious politics,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Touraine, A. (1977). *The Voice and the Eye: An Analysis of Social Movements*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

UCS (2008), *UCS Sound Science Initiative*, Union of Concerned Scientists, Cambridge, US, http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/sound-science-initiative.html (accessed 04/04/08).

UK Parliament (2005), *Kyoto Protocol to United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change,* Treaty series No. 6 (2005). London: Parliament of the United Kingdom, http://www.fco.gov.uk/Files/kfile/CM6485,0.pdf (accessed 21/02/07).

UN (1992), *Agenda 21*, United Nations, New York, http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/agenda21/ (accessed 25/01/08)

UNFCCC (2005), *Essential Background: UNFCCC,* The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, http://unfccc.int/essential_background/convention/items/2627.php (accessed 30/03/05).

van Hoven, B. and Poelman, A. (2003), 'Using Computers for Qualitative Data Analysis: An example using NUD.IST', *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 27(1):113-120.

WAW (2006), *Walk Against Warming: International day of action on climate*, Walk Against Warming, http://www.walkagainstwarming.org/index.html (accessed 14/12/06).

Whelan, J. (2001), 'Bringing About Change: Six ways of thinking about achieving environmental advocacy outcomes', *National Environment Movement Conference*, Melbourne.

Whelan, J. (2005), 'A Hard Road to Learn: Learning from failed social action', in J. Crowther, V. Galloway and I. Martin (eds.), *Popular Education: Engaging the Academy,* NIACE, Leicester:157-168.

Worth, D. (2003), 'The WA Forest Conflict: The construction of the political effectiveness of advocacy organisations', *Grit: Journal of Australian Studies*, 78.

WMO (2006), Summary Statement on Tropical Cyclones and Climate Change 6th International Workshop on Tropical Cyclones of the World Meteorological Organization, November 21039, Costa Rica, http://www.wmo.ch/pages/prog/arep/tmrp/documents/iwtc_summary.pdf (accessed 13/05/08).

WWF-UK and FE-EWNI (2005), *Climate Change Bill: A Bill to make provision to control emissions of Carbon Dioxide*, WWF-UK and Friends of the Earth England, Wales and Northern Ireland, London, www.wwf.org.uk (accessed 05/12/06).

Yu, X. and Taplin, R. (2000), 'The Australian Position at the Kyoto Conference', in A. Gillespie and W. Burns (eds.), *Climate Change in the South Pacific*, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht:113-119.

Appendices

Appendix 1: List of interview participants

Note: The name, surname and organisation of some informants were withheld at their request.

Table 3: Interview participants

Organisation	Name
Australian NGO campaigners	
1. Australian Conservation Foundation	Erwin Jackson
2. Australian Conservation Foundation	Mishael J
3. Climate Action Network Australia	Julie-Anne Richards
4. Friends of the Earth Australia	Stephanie Long
5. Greenpeace Australia Pacific	Danny Kennedy
6. Mineral Policy Institute	Geoff Evans
7. Rising Tide	Steve Phillips
8. WWF-Australia	Anna Reynolds
9. Name and organisation withheld	NGO Anon. 1
10. Name and organisation withheld	NGO Anon. 2
UK NGO campaigners	
11. Friends of the Earth England, Wales and Northern Ireland	Germana Canzi
12. Greenpeace-UK	Charlie Kronick
13. Stop Climate Chaos	Ashok Sinha
14. WWF-UK	Sonia Fèvre
15. WWF-UK	Matthew Davis
US NGO campaigners	
16. Apollo Alliance	Jeremy Hays
17. Bluewater Network	Danielle Fugere
18. Greenpeace-US	Chris Miller
19. Sierra Club	Carl Zichella
20. Union of Concerned Scientists	Amy Lynd Luers
21. Vote Solar Initiative	J.P. Ross
Community-based climate group members	
22. Climate Action Coogee	Jacquie (surname withheld)
23. Climate Action Coogee	Jane (“)
24. Climate Action Coogee	Jen (“)
25. Climate Action Coogee	Michael (“)
26. Climate Action Coogee	Suzette (“)

Bureaucrats/ Policy-makers	
27. Retired CSIRO climate scientist	Prof A. Barrie Pittock
28. ACIL Tasman economist	Mike Hitchens
29. Name and organisation withheld	Policy Anon.1
30. Name and organisation withheld	Policy Anon.2
31. Name and organisation withheld	Policy Anon.3
32. Name and organisation withheld	Policy Anon.4
33. Name and organisation withheld	Policy Anon.5
34. Name and organisation withheld	Policy Anon.6
Politicians and Political advisors	
35. NSW Member of Parliament, former Minister for Forestry and Energy	Kim Yeadon
36. Name and organisation withheld (political advisor)	Politics Anon.1
37. Name and organisation withheld (political advisor)	Politics Anon.2
Energy industry representatives	
38. Australian Industry Greenhouse Network	John Daley
39. Cement Industries Federation	Stuart Ritchie
40. Rio Tinto	Fiona Nicholls
41. Name and organisation withheld	Industry Anon.1
42. Name and organisation withheld	Industry Anon.2
43. Name and organisation withheld	Industry Anon.3
44. Name and organisation withheld	Industry Anon.4
45. Tarong Energy	Industry Anon.5
Journalists/ Media editors	
46. Sydney Morning Herald	Stephanie Peatling
47. Name and organisation withheld (newspaper editor)	Media Anon.1
48. Name and organisation withheld (newspaper journalist)	Media Anon.2

Appendix 2: Interview questions schedule

The interviews undertaken for this research were semi-structured, as described in Section 2.2. The interview questions schedules below contain the set questions that were used to guide the interviews. In each interview, all set questions were asked, but further questions were included according to the response provided by the interview participant.

A. Questions schedule for Australian NGO campaigners

1. Background to climate policy, and the NGOs' role in influencing climate policy

1.1 Have environmental NGOs influenced the climate policy or agenda? If so, how? If not, why not?
1.2 Hypothetically, where would the climate change debate be in your country now without NGOs playing a role?
1.3 Looking at the Model of Political Effectiveness (Schumaker, 1975), where is the Howard Government in terms of responding to environmental NGOs?. Is the Government willing to:
    a. Hear their concerns (Access responsiveness)
    b. Place their concerns on the policy agenda (Agenda responsiveness)
    c. Adopt their concerns into legislation or policy (Policy responsiveness)
    d. Implement the policy-related actions (Output responsiveness)
    e. Succeed in alleviating the grievances of the group (Impact responsiveness)

2. Variety of NGO campaign activities

2.1 Briefly describe the range of campaign approaches that your organisation is undertaking / has undertaken.
2.2 Which strategy / campaign is having / had the most effect?
2.3 What will be achieved to consider a partial success/ complete success for a) your NGO? and b) the environmental movement? What are the steps required to achieve these goals?

3. Perceptions of campaigns

3.1 Who is the intended audience of your campaigns?
3.2 How have the various climate change campaigns been received?
3.3 What are the obstacles to your communication? What are the opportunities?

4. Discourse, language and framing

4.1 Considering your intended audiences (described above), how have you tailored your messages to them?

4.2 Have you reached these intended audiences and encourage the right response?
4.3 Fear vs Hope: which approach do you tend to use in your campaign messaging?
4.4 Regarding framing: how are you attempting to reach audiences with whom the campaigns aren't resonating?
4.5 What role does economics play in climate policy? (Are financial aspects an important consideration?)
4.6 Is more economic research required? Or is re-framing of the debate required?

5. Environmental vs political decision-making: is there a conflict?

5.1 What are the political reasons (as you perceive them) for the federal and state stance on climate policy in your country?
5.2 If community pressure were greater, would climate change be a higher political priority?
5.3 How strong do you consider the climate projection science from the IPCC (and CSIRO) to be?
5.4 What is your position on nuclear energy as a way of combating climate change?

6. Overseas examples

6.1 What climate change campaign examples in other countries could be used to influence or inspire the Australian movement?
6.2 What do you see as the 'wins' by these overseas campaigns?
6.3 What other social movements (in Australia or overseas) would you liken the climate change campaign to? What similarities did these issues have? How were they 'solved'?

7. Bringing it all together: obstacles and opportunities of campaigns

7.1 Considering the current limited funding climate for NGOs, will Australian NGOs be able to survive and continue their work?
7.2 How do you evaluate the impact/effectiveness/success of your campaigns?
7.3 In general what are the obstacles (as you perceive them) for climate change campaigns by environmental NGOs? And why?
7.4 Similarly, what are the opportunities?

B. Questions schedule for UK and Californian NGO campaigners

1. Background to climate policy, and the NGOs' role in influencing climate policy

1.1 Have environmental NGOs influenced the climate policy or agenda? If so, how? If not, why not?
1.2 Hypothetically, where would the climate change debate be in your country now without NGOs playing a role?

2. Variety of NGO campaign activities

2.1 Briefly describe the range of campaign approaches that your organisation is undertaking / has undertaken.
2.2 Which strategy / campaign is having / had the most effect?

3. Discourse, language and framing

3.1 Fear vs Hope: which approach do you tend to use in your campaign messaging?
3.2 Regarding framing: how are you attempting to reach audiences with whom the campaigns aren't resonating?
3.3 What role does economics play in climate policy? (Are financial aspects an important consideration?)

4. Environmental vs political decision-making: is there a conflict?

4.1 What are the political reasons (as you perceive them) for the federal (and state, if applicable) stance on climate policy in your country?
4.2 If community pressure were greater, would climate change be a higher political priority?
4.3 How strong do you consider the climate projection science from the IPCC to be?
4.4 What is your position on nuclear energy as a way of combating climate change?

5. Overseas examples

5.1 What other social movements (in Australia or overseas) would you liken the climate change campaign to? What similarities did these issues have? How were they 'solved'? Is it as simple to 'solve'/ address climate change?

6. Bringing it all together: obstacles and opportunities of campaigns

6.1 In general, what are the obstacles (as you perceive them) for climate change campaigns by environmental NGOs? And why?
6.2 Similarly, what are the opportunities?

C. Questions schedule for Australian 'external observers'

1. Background to climate policy, and the NGOs' role in influencing climate policy

1.1 Have environmental NGOs influenced the climate policy or agenda? If so, how? If not, why not?
1.2 Hypothetically, where would the climate change debate be in your country now without NGOs playing a role?

1.3 Looking at the Model of Political Effectiveness (Schumaker, 1975), where is the Howard Government in terms of responding to environmental NGOs?. Is the Government willing to:

a. Hear their concerns (Access responsiveness)
b. Place their concerns on the policy agenda (Agenda responsiveness)
c. Adopt their concerns into legislation or policy (Policy responsiveness)
d. Implement the policy-related actions (Output responsiveness)
e. Succeed in alleviating the grievances of the group (Impact responsiveness)

2. Perceptions of campaigns

2.1 What efforts of NGO campaigns have you noticed in your professional involvement with climate policy?
2.2 What are the environmental NGOs doing well / poorly in their climate campaigns?
2.3 Does your sector share any part of the NGOs' agenda?

3. Discourse, language and framing

3.1 Fear vs Hope: which approach do you respond to NGO climate campaign messaging?
3.2 What role does economics play in climate policy? (Are financial aspects an important consideration?)
3.3 Is more economic research required? Or is re-framing of the debate required?
3.4 Is the language used in NGO campaigns the right language for engaging your sector?

4. Environmental vs political decision-making: is there a conflict?

4.1 What are the political reasons (as you perceive them) for the federal and state stance on climate policy in your country?
4.2 If community pressure were greater, would climate change be a higher political priority?
4.3 How strong do you consider the climate projection science from the IPCC (and CSIRO) to be?
4.4 What is your position on nuclear energy as a way of combating climate change?

5. Overseas examples

5.1 Why is the position on climate policy overseas different to Australia and Australian states?

6. Bringing it all together: obstacles and opportunities of campaigns

6.1 In general what are the obstacles (as you perceive them) for climate change campaigns by environmental NGOs? And why?
6.2 Similarly, what are the opportunities?

D. Questions schedule for members of Climate Action Coogee

During the early stage of the Climate Protection Bill project (April, 2007):

1.1 Why were you motivated to become a member of Climate Action Coogee (CAC)?
1.2 How do you think CAC can affect aspects of climate change (including decisions by politicians and other powerholders)?
1.3 You have become a very involved member of CAC. What was your motivation to become further involved?
1.4 You have shown strong interest in CAC developing the Climate Protection Bill. What lit this interest?
1.5 When I (Nina) first discussed the idea of the Climate Protection Bill with CAC, I told a story about the success of a similar Bill in the UK. How did this affect your view of what CAC could achieve?
1.6 How has the progress of the Climate Protection Bill so far changed your view of CAC's power/ role (including decisions by politicians and other powerholders)?
1.7 What are any single words or phrases that you use to describe:
-climate change in Australia
-Climate Action Coogee
-CAC's proposed Climate Protection Bill
1.8 What do you see as the cause of the world's and Australia's greenhouse gas emissions?
1.9 In your opinion, why are Australia's greenhouse gas emissions per person so high?

During the later stage of the Climate Protection Bill project (November, 2007):

1.10 Has the progress of the Climate Protection Bill changed your view of CAC's power/ role (including decisions by politicians and other powerholders)?
1.11 Looking back, has your involvement in the CAC campaign for a Climate Protection Bill affected your perception (if any) of your power and role as a community member?

Appendix 3: Climate Protection Bill

by
Climate Action Communities
September 2007

The Climate Protection Bill was launched in September 2007. At this time, it was endorsed by 30 grassroots climate groups across Australia, representing over 4,050 people.