Περιβαλλοντική Εκπαίδευση για την Αειφορία

Vol 6, No 1 (2024)

Περιβαλλοντική Εκπαίδευση για την Αειφορία

The Ecological Self: Integrating Environmental Psychology, Ecopsychology, and Ecotheology in the Anthropocene

Georgios Fountoulakis, Khader I. Alkhouri

doi: 10.12681/ees.38255

To cite this article:

Fountoulakis, G., & Alkhouri, K. I. (2025). The Ecological Self: Integrating Environmental Psychology, Ecopsychology, and Ecotheology in the Anthropocene. *Περιβαλλοντική Εκπαίδευση για την Αειφορία*, *6*(1), 22–35. https://doi.org/10.12681/ees.38255

ΠΕΡΙΒΑΛΛΟΝΤΙΚΗ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗ ΓΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΑΕΙΦΟΡΙΑ
2024, ΤΟΜΟΣ 6, ΤΕΥΧΟΣ 1, 22-35
DOI: https://doi.org/10.12681/ees.38255

The Ecological Self: Integrating Environmental Psychology, Ecopsychology, and Ecotheology in the Anthropocene

Georgios Fountoulakis[1], Khader I. Alkhouri[2]

[1] Professor, Department of Social Theology & the Study of Religion, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens [2] Phd, Department of Social Theology & the Study of Religion, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

ABSTRACT
This article provides an in-depth exploration of the intersection between environmental psychology, ecopsychology, and ecotheology in addressing contemporary environmental challenges. It examines how these interdisciplinary fields can contribute to fostering sustainable human-nature relationships and environmental stewardship in the context of the Anthropocene. The research analyzes psychological, spiritual, and ethical dimensions of human-nature interactions, emphasizing the need for an integrative approach that incorporates scientific, humanistic, and spiritual perspectives. Key themes include the psychological and health impacts of nature exposure, religious and philosophical views of nature, environmental ethics, risk perception, adaptation to environmental changes, and strategies for promoting pro-environmental behaviors. By synthesizing insights from multiple disciplines, this article aims to provide a comprehensive framework for understanding and nurturing the ecological self in the face of global environmental challenges.

KEY WORDS:
Environmental psychology; Ecopsychology Ecotheology; Anthropocene; Human-nature relationships.

Introduction

As the global environmental crisis intensifies in the Anthropocene, there is growing recognition that addressing these challenges requires not only scientific and technological solutions but also transformations in human consciousness, values, and spirituality (Γεωργόπουλος, 2002). The Anthropocene, a term proposed by scientists to describe the current geological epoch, signifies the profound and often detrimental impact of human activities on Earth's ecosystems, climate, and geological processes. This concept underscores the urgent need for a fundamental shift in how humans perceive and interact with the natural world.

This article examines how the fields of environmental psychology, ecopsychology, and ecotheology can provide complementary insights into human-nature connections and inform efforts to promote more sustainable human-environment interactions within the context of the Anthropocene. Environmental psychology investigates how people perceive, experience, and behave in relation to their physical surroundings, both natural and built (Steg et al., 2012), offering empirical insights into the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral aspects of human-environment interactions. Ecopsychology explores the emotional and spiritual dimensions of human-nature relationships, emphasizing nature's healing potential and humans' innate affinity for the natural world (Fisher, 2012), while addressing the psychological impacts of environmental degradation. Ecotheology examines religious and spiritual perspectives on nature, environmental ethics, and humanity's role as stewards of creation (Jenkins, 2008), reinterpreting traditional religious teachings in light of contemporary environmental challenges.

Furthermore, this article explores issues of adaptation, psychological resilience, and environmental crisis management, providing a framework for developing individual and community strategies to cope with the unprecedented challenges of the Anthropocene. By synthesizing insights from these diverse fields, this article aims to develop a more holistic understanding of the ecological self – the expanded sense of identity that encompasses humans' relationship with the natural world – and provide a comprehensive framework for nurturing this ecological self in the face of global environmental challenges.

This paper will explore the intersection of environmental psychology, ecopsychology, and ecotheology through the lens of the 'ecological self'. We will begin by examining psychological and health impacts of nature, then delve into spiritual and religious perspectives. This will be followed by an analysis of environmental ethics and behavior, risk perception and adaptation to environmental change, and finally, integrative approaches to fostering the ecological self.

The Anthropocene

The Anthropocene, a term popularized by Paul Crutzen, represents a proposed new geological epoch defined by human impact on Earth's geology and ecosystems (Crutzen & Stoermer, 2000; Steffen et al., 2011). This concept suggests that human activities have become the dominant influence on the planet's climate and ecosystems, marked by climate change, biodiversity loss, and alterations to geochemical cycles (Waters et al., 2016; Zalasiewicz et al., 2011). The onset of the Anthropocene is debated, with proposals ranging from the Neolithic Revolution to the mid-20th century (Lewis & Maslin, 2015; Ruddiman, 2013; Zalasiewicz et al., 2015).

Key characteristics of the Anthropocene include widespread deforestation, increased greenhouse gas emissions, pervasive pollution, and significant alterations to sedimentary processes (Steffen et al., 2015; Wilkinson et al., 2014). These changes are so profound that they are expected to leave a discernible trace in the geological record, distinguishing the Anthropocene from the previous epoch, the Holocene (Waters et al., 2016; Williams et al., 2016). The concept has expanded beyond geology, influencing discussions in environmental science, sociology, and philosophy (Castree, 2014; Palsson et al., 2013; Schmidt et al., 2016).

The Anthropocene concept has significant implications for environmental psychology, ethics, and policy. It challenges traditional notions of nature as separate from human influence and calls for new frameworks of environmental responsibility (Arias-Maldonado, 2020; Schmidt et al., 2016). However, the concept is not without criticism. Some argue it reinforces human exceptionalism and fails to address inequalities in environmental impact and vulnerability (Crist, 2013; Malm & Hornborg, 2014; Moore, 2016;). Despite these debates, the Anthropocene provides a crucial context for understanding current environmental challenges and the urgent need for sustainable human-nature relationships (Biermann et al., 2016; Pihkala, 2018; Steffen et al., 2018).

Psychological and Health Impacts of Nature

Understanding the psychological and health impacts of nature exposure is crucial for developing a comprehensive view of the ecological self. These impacts form the foundation upon which deeper connections between humans and nature can be built.

Restorative Effects of Nature Exposure

Research in environmental psychology has consistently documented numerous psychological and physiological benefits of nature exposure and contact, with studies showing that time spent in natural environments can reduce stress, improve mood, enhance cognitive functioning, and promote overall well-being (Berman et al., 2008). Even brief nature experiences or viewing nature scenes can have restorative effects on attention and emotional state. Attention Restoration Theory

(ART) posits that natural environments contain elements that allow for effortless attention, providing a restorative break from the directed attention required in many modern urban settings (Kaplan, 1995). This restorative effect can lead to improved cognitive performance, reduced mental fatigue, and enhanced ability to cope with stress. The mechanisms underlying these benefits are multifaceted, involving sensory engagement, activation of the parasympathetic nervous system, and exposure to visually soothing patterns like fractals. Natural environments often combine physical activity, social interaction, and a break from technology, all contributing to improved mental and physical health. The application of these findings extends to biophilic design in urban planning and architecture, aiming to incorporate natural elements into built environments to mitigate the negative psychological effects of urbanization. As global urbanization accelerates, understanding and harnessing nature's restorative power becomes increasingly crucial for maintaining public health and well-being, underscoring the importance of preserving natural environments and ensuring equitable access to green spaces in urban areas.

Biophilia and Evolutionary Perspectives

The concept of biophilia, proposed by E.O. Wilson in 1984, suggests that humans possess an innate affinity for nature and other living organisms, rooted in our evolutionary history of developing in natural environments. This perspective argues that our species' long-standing connection to nature has resulted in an inherent preference for and positive response to natural settings, which continues to influence our well-being even in modern, urbanized societies. The biophilia hypothesis may help explain the consistent findings of nature's positive impacts on human health and functioning across various domains, including physical health, cognitive performance, emotional well-being, and social relationships. It proposes that exposure to nature satisfies a fundamental human need, contributing significantly to psychological and physiological well-being by reducing stress, improving mood, enhancing cognitive function, and potentially accelerating physical healing. This theory has far-reaching implications, influencing fields such as architecture, urban planning, and environmental psychology, and encouraging the integration of natural elements into built environments to foster human-nature connections. While the biophilia hypothesis continues to be the subject of ongoing research and debate, it offers a compelling framework for understanding the profound relationship between humans and the natural world, suggesting that nurturing this connection may be crucial for addressing modern challenges and promoting holistic well-being for individuals and communities alike.

Nature Deficit and Urban Environments

As urbanization increases globally, many people experience reduced access to natural environments, a phenomenon termed "nature deficit" by Richard Louv in 2005, which has been associated with various psychological and physical health issues. Research indicates that the degradation of natural environments and reduced nature access in urban settings may contribute to increased stress, attention deficits, and mood disorders. This widespread disconnection from nature in urban areas has far-reaching consequences, impacting cognitive functions, emotional balance, and overall well-being. The constant stimulation of urban environments, coupled with a lack of restorative natural settings, can impair attention and focus, particularly in children and young adults. Moreover, the absence of nature's calming and rejuvenating effects may contribute to higher rates of anxiety, depression, and other mood-related issues among urban populations. These findings underscore the critical importance of integrating natural elements into urban design and ensuring equitable access to green spaces for all urban residents. Urban planners and policymakers are increasingly recognizing the need to prioritize the creation and preservation of green areas within cities, ranging from large urban parks and community gardens to smaller-scale interventions like green roofs, living walls, and tree-lined streets. Such integration of nature into urban environments not only addresses health concerns but also contributes to improved air quality, mitigation of urban heat island effects, support for biodiversity, and overall urban

sustainability. As global urbanization continues to accelerate, the imperative to reconnect urban populations with nature becomes ever more pressing, emphasizing the need to create more livable, sustainable, and health-promoting cities that balance urban development with access to natural environments.

Ecopsychology and the Ecological Self

Ecopsychology emphasizes the concept of the "ecological self" – an expanded sense of self that includes the natural world (Roszak et al., 1995). This perspective views many contemporary psychological issues as stemming from alienation from nature and advocates for reconnection with nature as part of psychological health and wholeness (Conn, 1998). The ecological self-concept suggests that human well-being is intrinsically linked to the health of the natural environment. This field of study proposes that our psychological state is not isolated from the world around us, but rather intimately connected to and influenced by the ecological systems of which we are a part. Proponents argue that the disconnection from nature has far-reaching consequences for mental health, emotional well-being, and overall psychological functioning. By fostering a sense of connection with nature, individuals may develop greater empathy for the natural world and a stronger motivation to engage in pro-environmental behaviors. This reconnection process can lead to a deeper understanding of our place within the broader ecosystem and a heightened sense of responsibility for its protection and preservation. The concept challenges traditional notions of self that are limited to the individual psyche, proposing instead a more holistic and interconnected view of human identity. As this connection strengthens, individuals may find themselves more attuned to the needs and rhythms of the natural environment, potentially translating into concrete actions such as adopting more sustainable lifestyle practices or participating in ecological restoration projects. Ecopsychology suggests that by recognizing our fundamental connection to nature, we can not only improve our own psychological well-being but also contribute to the health and sustainability of the planet as a whole. This perspective views reconnecting with the natural world not merely as a luxury or a pleasant pastime, but as an essential component of achieving and maintaining psychological health, balance, and a sense of wholeness.

While the previous section explored the psychological and health benefits of nature connection, spiritual and religious perspectives offer complementary insights into the human-nature relationship. These viewpoints can deepen our understanding of the ecological self by adding dimensions of meaning, ethics, and transcendence to our connection with the natural world.

Spiritual and Religious Perspectives on Nature

Overview of Ecotheology

Ecotheology examines how different faith traditions conceptualize nature and environmental ethics (Gottlieb, 2006). This field seeks to reinterpret religious traditions in light of contemporary environmental crises and develop faith-based environmental ethics (Deane-Drummond, 2008). Key themes that emerge across various religious and spiritual traditions include: Nature as sacred or imbued with divine presence; Humans as stewards of creation with responsibility to care for nature; Interconnectedness of all life; Nature as a source of spiritual insight and connection to the divine. These themes foster a holistic understanding of humanity's relationship with the environment, encouraging believers to view the natural world as intrinsically valuable and worthy of protection. Ecotheology also explores how religious rituals, practices, and scriptures can be reinterpreted to promote greater environmental awareness and action. By engaging with these concepts, ecotheology aims to inspire religious communities to take an active role in addressing environmental issues, promoting sustainable practices rooted in faith traditions, and recognizing the spiritual dimensions of ecological stewardship. This interdisciplinary field draws on insights from theology, environmental science, ethics, and cultural studies to develop a comprehensive

approach to environmental concerns that resonates with religious believers. Ecotheologists argue that religious traditions can offer unique perspectives and motivations for environmental protection, tapping into deeply held beliefs and values to inspire ecological consciousness and action. Through this lens, environmental conservation becomes not just a practical necessity but a spiritual imperative, aligning care for the Earth with religious devotion and moral responsibility. Ecotheology also often addresses issues of environmental justice, recognizing the disproportionate impact of ecological degradation on marginalized communities and framing environmental protection as a matter of social and spiritual justice. By bridging the gap between scientific understanding of environmental issues and religious worldviews, ecotheology seeks to create a more holistic and spiritually grounded approach to addressing the global ecological crisis.

Indigenous and Eastern Spiritual Traditions

Indigenous spiritual traditions often emphasize humans' embeddedness in nature and reciprocal relationships with the land (Kimmerer, 2013). These worldviews typically view humans as part of nature rather than separate from or dominant over it. Many indigenous traditions incorporate practices and rituals that reinforce this sense of connection and responsibility to the natural world. These perspectives stand in contrast to some Western viewpoints that have historically framed humans as separate from or dominant over nature. Instead, indigenous traditions often cultivate a profound sense of embeddedness within and responsibility towards the natural environment. This manifests in various cultural practices, ceremonies, and rituals that serve to reinforce and celebrate humans' place within the wider web of life. Many indigenous cultures have developed sophisticated systems of ecological knowledge passed down through generations. These traditional ways of knowing often emphasize sustainable resource use and stewardship of the land. There is frequently a spiritual dimension to this relationship with nature, with many indigenous traditions viewing the natural world as imbued with sacred significance. Eastern religions like Buddhism and Taoism tend to emphasize the interconnectedness of humans and nature (Sponsel, 2012). Buddhist concepts such as dependent origination highlight the interdependence of all phenomena, while Taoist philosophy emphasizes harmony with the natural world. These Eastern traditions have developed various practices and teachings aimed at cultivating a sense of unity with the natural world. In Buddhist thought, concepts such as dependent origination highlight how all phenomena are deeply interlinked and mutually arising. This perspective encourages practitioners to recognize their embeddedness within wider natural and cosmic processes. Similarly, Taoist philosophy places great emphasis on living in harmony with the natural world and its rhythms. The Taoist ideal of wu-wei, or effortless action, encourages alignment with rather than domination over nature.

Abrahamic Faiths and Nature

Abrahamic faiths (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) generally view humans as stewards of God's creation with a duty of responsible care (Foltz, 2006). While these traditions have sometimes been criticized for anthropocentric views, many contemporary interpretations emphasize environmental stewardship and the sacredness of creation. For example, Orthodox Christian theology emphasizes humans' role as stewards rather than exploiters of creation. It highlights the profound interdependence between humanity and nature, viewing both as part of God's creation (Γιαννουλάτος, 2000). Key Orthodox teachings relevant to environmental ethics include: the inherent goodness and sacredness of creation; humanity's vocation as "priests of creation" called to offer the world back to God; the cosmic dimensions of salvation, encompassing the whole of creation; and ascetic traditions that cultivate simplicity and restrained use of material resources. This perspective underscores the importance of ecological responsibility within the framework of religious belief, suggesting that care for the environment is not just a practical necessity but a spiritual imperative. It challenges believers to reconsider their relationship with the natural world, advocating for a more harmonious and sustainable interaction that reflects divine intentions for

creation. Such interpretations of religious texts and traditions can serve as powerful motivators for environmental action, bridging the gap between faith and ecological consciousness in an era of increasing environmental concerns.

Modern Panentheistic Approaches

In the contemporary philosophical and theological landscape, panentheism has emerged as a compelling attempt to bridge the gap between theistic and panentheistic worldviews. This nuanced perspective posits that the physical world is encompassed within the divine, while simultaneously affirming that God's essence extends beyond the confines of the material universe (Gikas, 1966). By doing so, panentheism endeavors to maintain a delicate equilibrium between the concepts of divine transcendence and immanence in nature. This philosophical framework has gained traction in various spheres, particularly within modern environmental thought. Numerous contemporary environmental philosophies have embraced panentheistic ideas as a means to imbue nature with sacred significance without entirely conflating it with the divine. This approach facilitates a profound spiritual reverence for the natural world while preserving important distinctions between humanity, nature, and the divine realm (Zaleha, 2009). As a result, panentheism has become an increasingly influential concept in modern theological, philosophical, and environmental discourse, offering a sophisticated middle ground that resonates with those seeking to reconcile traditional religious beliefs with a more holistic and ecologically-minded worldview. The implications of panentheistic thought extend beyond purely academic considerations, potentially influencing how individuals and societies conceptualize their relationship with the environment and their place within a broader cosmic order.

Environmental Ethics and Behavior

The development of the ecological self is intimately tied to our ethical frameworks and behaviors towards the environment. This section explores how various ethical perspectives shape our relationship with nature and influence pro-environmental actions.

Factors Influencing Pro-Environmental Behavior

Understanding human environmental attitudes and behaviors is crucial for addressing the complex and pressing environmental challenges facing our planet, including climate change, biodiversity loss, pollution, and resource depletion. Environmental psychology, an interdisciplinary field merging psychology with environmental science, examines the multifaceted factors shaping pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors, including personal values, belief systems, social norms, and various contextual elements influencing how individuals perceive and interact with their environment (Steg & Vlek, 2009). This field investigates why some people engage in environmentally friendly behaviors while others do not, and how to effectively promote sustainable practices across diverse populations. Key psychological barriers impeding pro-environmental behavior include psychological distance, where climate change and environmental issues are perceived as distant problems in time and space, leading to a lack of urgency and reduced motivation to act; cognitive biases such as optimism bias (underestimating personal risk), confirmation bias (seeking information that confirms existing beliefs), and status quo bias (preferring current conditions), which interfere with rational decision-making and can reinforce misconceptions about environmental issues; conflicting goals and values, where environmental concerns compete with other personal or societal priorities such as economic growth, convenience, or cultural traditions; lack of self-efficacy, with individuals feeling powerless in the face of large-scale environmental problems, believing their actions cannot make a significant difference; social norms that do not support sustainable behaviors, making it challenging for individuals to adopt environmentally friendly practices without feeling they're going against societal expectations or risking social disapproval; knowledge deficits, where lack of accurate information about

environmental issues and effective pro-environmental actions hinders informed decision-making and appropriate action; deeply ingrained habits and routines that are difficult to change, even when individuals are aware of their negative environmental impact; and complex emotional responses like fear, anxiety, guilt, and overwhelm that can lead to avoidance, denial, or paralysis rather than constructive action. Additionally, the behaviors and expectations of one's social group strongly influence individual actions, and in many societies, unsustainable practices are deeply ingrained and socially accepted, creating a significant barrier to change. Economic factors also play a role, as perceived or actual financial constraints can limit individuals' ability or willingness to invest in more sustainable technologies or practices. The media and political landscape further complicate matters by sometimes presenting conflicting or misleading information about environmental issues, making it difficult for individuals to form accurate perceptions and make informed decisions. Understanding these psychological barriers is essential for developing effective strategies to promote pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors, enabling environmental psychologists, policymakers, educators, and community leaders to design targeted interventions, educational programs, communication campaigns, and policies that address these barriers and facilitate positive change in individual and collective environmental practices. This may involve techniques such as reframing environmental issues to make them more personally relevant and immediate, leveraging social influence and norm-setting to promote sustainable behaviors, enhancing individuals' sense of efficacy through education and empowerment, and creating supportive environments that make pro-environmental choices easier and more socially rewarding.

Strategies for Promoting Sustainable Behavior

Research in environmental psychology has uncovered a diverse array of strategies to foster pro-environmental behavior, each targeting different aspects of human psychology and decision-making processes. These strategies include comprehensive education and information provision to increase awareness and knowledge; economic incentives and disincentives to align financial motivations with environmental goals; social influence and norm-based interventions that leverage the power of peer pressure and cultural expectations; choice architecture and nudges that subtly guide individuals towards more sustainable options; commitment strategies that encourage people to pledge to specific environmental actions; and feedback mechanisms that provide individuals with tangible information about the impacts of their behaviors. Importantly, the most effective interventions typically do not rely on a single approach but instead skillfully combine multiple strategies to create a synergistic effect. This multi-pronged approach recognizes the complex interplay between individual factors (such as attitudes, values, and habits) and structural elements (like infrastructure, policies, and societal norms) that collectively shape environmental behaviors. By addressing these various levels of influence simultaneously, interventions can more effectively overcome the numerous barriers to sustainable behavior and create lasting change. Furthermore, this holistic strategy acknowledges that different individuals and communities may respond better to certain types of interventions, necessitating a flexible and adaptable approach to behavior change. As our understanding of environmental psychology continues to evolve, researchers and policymakers are increasingly focusing on developing sophisticated, context-specific interventions that can be tailored to diverse populations and environmental challenges, ultimately working towards a more sustainable future for our planet. This comprehensive approach recognizes that changing environmental behaviors requires a multifaceted strategy, leveraging different psychological and social mechanisms to encourage sustainable practices and overcome barriers to adoption, as highlighted in the seminal work of Osbaldiston and Schott (2012).

Environmental Ethics Frameworks

Environmental ethics, a crucial branch of philosophy, delves into the complex relationship between humans and nature, exploring our moral obligations to the environment. This field encompasses a wide array of debates and perspectives, each offering unique insights into how we should approach our interactions with the natural world. At the forefront of these discussions is the tension between anthropocentric and ecocentric ethics. Anthropocentrism places human interests at the center of moral consideration, while ecocentrism argues for the inherent worth of entire ecosystems and the biosphere. This fundamental divide shapes many subsequent ethical considerations. Another key debate revolves around the value of nature itself: whether it should be viewed primarily through the lens of its instrumental value to humans (e.g., as a resource or for aesthetic enjoyment) or if it possesses intrinsic value independent of human needs or perceptions. Additionally, environmental ethicists grapple with the question of scale: should we focus on the rights or welfare of individual organisms, or adopt a more holistic approach that prioritizes the health of entire species, ecosystems, or the planet as a whole? Within this rich philosophical landscape, environmental virtue ethics has emerged as a significant approach. As articulated by Sandler (2007) and other scholars, this perspective shifts the focus from rigid rules or calculated consequences to the cultivation of virtuous character traits. It emphasizes the development of qualities such as humility in the face of nature's complexity, a sense of wonder at its beauty and intricacy, and a deep-seated care for the well-being of the natural world. By fostering these virtues, proponents argue, we can develop a more nuanced and emotionally engaged relationship with nature, potentially leading to more sustainable and harmonious interactions. This approach complements other ethical frameworks by addressing the psychological and character-based aspects of environmental stewardship, recognizing that lasting change often requires not just intellectual understanding but also emotional and moral growth.

Deep Ecology and Radical Approaches

Deep ecology, a transformative philosophical and spiritual movement that emerged in the 1970s, proposes a radical and comprehensive rethinking of human-nature relationships (Naess, 1973). This paradigm shift challenges conventional anthropocentric worldviews and advocates for a more holistic understanding of humanity's place within the broader ecological context. Its key principles include biocentrism/ecocentrism (valuing nature intrinsically, not just for human interests), interconnectedness (recognizing the profound interdependence of all living things within the biosphere), self-realization (expanding human identity beyond individual ego to encompass the natural world), and simple living (significantly reducing consumption and human impacts on ecosystems to achieve ecological balance). Deep ecology has substantially influenced environmental thought, inspiring more radical approaches to environmental ethics and contributing to various ecological movements. It has informed discussions on sustainability, conservation, and the rights of nature, pushing for more comprehensive and systemic approaches to addressing environmental challenges. While the movement has faced criticism for potentially misanthropic views and oversimplifying complex social issues (Watson, 2005), it continues to play a significant role in shaping environmental discourse and policy. The legacy of deep ecology is evident in contemporary environmental movements, from conservation efforts and rewilding projects to initiatives promoting sustainable living and ecological restoration. As global environmental crises intensify, the principles of deep ecology remain relevant, challenging fundamental assumptions about progress, development, and humanity's relationship with nature, while offering alternative visions for a more sustainable and harmonious coexistence with the natural world.

Risk Perception and Adaptation to Environmental Change

How we perceive and adapt to environmental risks is a crucial aspect of our ecological self. This section examines the psychological factors influencing risk perception and adaptation, building on the concepts of nature connection and environmental ethics discussed earlier.

Factors Influencing Environmental Risk Perception

Research shows that personal experience with environmental hazards and disasters significantly impacts risk perception, with direct experiences making abstract environmental risks feel more concrete and immediate, potentially motivating protective or adaptive behaviors (Poussin et al., 2014; Wachinger et al., 2013). This effect operates through psychological mechanisms like the availability heuristic and emotional responses, though successful past coping can sometimes lead to overconfidence. Trust in authorities also plays a crucial role in how people assess environmental risks, with higher trust often correlating to lower risk perception (Bradford et al., 2012; Siegrist & Cvetkovich, 2000). This highlights the importance of transparent and trustworthy communication from scientific and governmental institutions regarding environmental risks. The interplay between personal experience, trust, and risk perception has significant implications for environmental policy and public engagement, necessitating tailored approaches that account for local experiences and varying levels of institutional trust. Media coverage further influences risk perceptions, particularly for risks not directly experienced, emphasizing the need for responsible and accurate reporting. Understanding these complex dynamics is crucial for developing effective strategies to communicate and manage environmental risks, fostering greater resilience and adaptive capacity in the face of evolving global threats. This nuanced approach considers psychological factors, institutional trust, and media influence to create more impactful and comprehensive environmental risk management strategies.

Psychological Distance and Climate Change Perception

The concept of psychological distance is crucial for understanding why global, long-term environmental issues like climate change often feel abstract and distant to many people, despite their significant importance. This phenomenon encompasses temporal, spatial, social, and hypothetical dimensions, explaining the disconnect between the severity of climate change and the lack of urgency in public perception and action. Research shows that phenomena that are temporally, spatially, or hypothetically distant require more abstract mental construal (Howe et al., 2019), leading to less emotional and experiential processing of climate risks compared to immediate environmental changes. This reduced emotional engagement can result in lower levels of concern, perceived risk, and motivation to take action. The global scale and long-term nature of climate change can make it feel like an insurmountable problem or one that will primarily affect future generations or distant locations, leading to feelings of helplessness or a tendency to prioritize more immediate concerns. To address these challenges and make climate change feel more immediate and relevant, several strategies can be employed: emphasizing local and current impacts to bridge spatial and temporal distance; using vivid, concrete imagery and narratives to make abstract concepts more tangible; connecting climate change to personally relevant issues such as health, economy, or recreation; highlighting shorter-term impacts to overcome temporal distance; promoting collective efficacy to combat feelings of helplessness; and using immersive technologies to simulate future scenarios or current impacts in distant locations. By implementing these approaches, communicators, educators, and policymakers can work to reduce the psychological distance of climate change, potentially increasing public engagement, concern, and motivation to take action, while balancing this with a comprehensive understanding of the global and long-term nature of the issue to ensure informed decision-making and support for both immediate and long-term solutions.

Adaptation and Resilience

Studies have found complex relationships between environmental changes, including natural disasters, and subjective well-being. While disasters initially decrease life satisfaction, people often adapt and return to baseline levels of well-being over time (Liman & Wen-qiao, 2022). This demonstrates human resilience but also highlights the need for ongoing support for communities affected by environmental changes. Adaptation to environmental risks involves cognitive and behavioral changes as people learn to live with potential hazards. The "levee effect" demonstrates how protective infrastructure can paradoxically increase risk by encouraging development in hazardous areas (Richert et al., 2019). This underscores the importance of considering both physical and psychological factors in adaptation strategies. The interplay between environmental changes and human well-being is multifaceted, involving not only immediate impacts but also long-term psychological and societal adjustments. As communities face increasing challenges due to climate change and other environmental pressures, understanding these dynamics becomes crucial for developing effective policies and support systems. The capacity for human adaptation is remarkable, yet it's essential to recognize that this adaptation process can be both a strength and a potential vulnerability. While people may regain their sense of well-being after a disaster, this psychological recovery might lead to underestimating future risks or becoming complacent about necessary precautions. Moreover, the concept of the "levee effect" illustrates how attempts to mitigate environmental risks can have unintended consequences, potentially increasing vulnerability in the long run. This phenomenon highlights the need for holistic approaches to environmental planning and disaster preparedness that take into account both the physical infrastructure and the human behavioral responses to perceived safety. As we continue to grapple with global environmental challenges, integrating insights from psychology, sociology, and environmental science will be critical in developing resilient communities that can thrive in the face of change while maintaining a realistic assessment of ongoing risks and the need for sustainable practices.

Community-Based Adaptation

Community-based approaches to environmental adaptation emphasize local knowledge, participatory processes, and social capital, recognizing that effective adaptation strategies must be context-specific and engage local stakeholders. Drawing insights from ecopsychology and community psychology, these approaches focus on fostering community resilience and adaptive capacity through several key elements: building social connections and support networks; enhancing collective efficacy and empowerment; cultivating place attachment and local environmental knowledge; promoting adaptive learning and flexibility. By integrating these components, communities can develop more robust and locally appropriate responses to environmental challenges, leveraging their unique strengths and resources to create sustainable and resilient solutions.

Integrative Approaches to Fostering the Ecological Self

Drawing on the psychological, spiritual, ethical, and adaptive dimensions explored in previous sections, we now turn to integrative approaches for fostering the ecological self. These approaches synthesize insights from environmental psychology, ecopsychology, and ecotheology to provide a holistic framework for understanding and nurturing human-nature relationships.

Bridging Disciplinary Perspectives

Integrating psychological, philosophical, and spiritual perspectives can inform more holistic approaches to fostering sustainable attitudes and behaviors, allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of human-nature relationships and more effective interventions. This

interdisciplinary approach encompasses key areas of integration, including cultivating emotional and spiritual connections to nature, developing ethical frameworks emphasizing care and responsibility, implementing practices that nurture ecological consciousness, addressing psychological barriers to sustainable behavior, and leveraging nature's psychological benefits for well-being and resilience. By combining these diverse perspectives, we can create a more nuanced and impactful strategy for promoting environmental sustainability and fostering a deeper, more meaningful relationship between humans and the natural world.

Ecopsychology in Practice

The emerging field of ecopsychology offers promising avenues for reconnecting humans with nature and fostering environmental stewardship, focusing on key areas such as personal leadership through self-discovery and identifying one's unique talents and contributions, ecological relationships by building respectful, dialogical relationships at all levels, and terrestrial identity by expanding one's sense of self beyond the ego to encompass connection with the Earth. Practical applications of ecopsychology include nature-based therapies and interventions, wilderness experiences and outdoor education programs, eco-art therapy and creative expression, mindfulness practices in nature, and community-based ecological restoration projects. These approaches aim to deepen our understanding of the human-nature relationship and promote sustainable behaviors and attitudes towards the environment.

Ecotheology and Environmental Education

Integrating ecotheological perspectives into environmental education can help address the spiritual and ethical dimensions of human-nature relationships by providing moral and spiritual motivations for environmental care, offering frameworks for understanding human responsibility to nature, fostering a sense of awe, wonder, and reverence for the natural world, and connecting environmental issues to existing religious and cultural values. Additionally, interfaith dialogue and collaboration on environmental issues can help build broader coalitions for environmental action and foster mutual understanding across diverse belief systems, ultimately strengthening the overall impact of environmental education and advocacy efforts.

Policy Implications and Societal Transformation

Nurturing the ecological self has implications beyond individual behavior change, calling for broader societal transformations in how we relate to and value the natural world. Policy implications include incorporating well-being and environmental indicators alongside economic measures of progress, designing urban environments that foster connection with nature, reforming educational systems to emphasize ecological literacy and nature connection, and developing economic models that account for ecological limits and natural capital. These changes would collectively work to reshape our societal relationship with the environment, moving beyond a narrow focus on individual actions to create systemic shifts that support and reinforce an ecological worldview across various domains of public life, from urban planning and education to economic policy and governance.

Conclusion

The concept of the ecological self offers a powerful framework for understanding and addressing the complex challenges of the Anthropocene. By integrating insights from environmental psychology, ecopsychology, and ecotheology, we can develop more comprehensive approaches to fostering sustainable human-nature relationships.

This integrative approach offers several key benefits:

1. It provides a more holistic understanding of human-nature interactions, encompassing cognitive, emotional, behavioral, and spiritual dimensions.

2. It addresses both individual and collective levels of environmental responsibility and action.

3. It offers multiple pathways for cultivating ecological consciousness and promoting pro-environmental behavior.

4. It recognizes the importance of both scientific knowledge and cultural/spiritual wisdom in addressing environmental challenges.

Future research should continue to bridge disciplinary divides to develop more comprehensive models of human-environment interaction. Practical applications could include:

• Developing nature-based therapies that integrate psychological and spiritual elements.

• Creating environmental education programs that foster both ecological knowledge and nature connection.

• Designing environmental campaigns that leverage insights from multiple fields to promote sustainable behavior.

• Informing policy decisions with a more comprehensive understanding of human-nature relationships.

Ultimately, nurturing the ecological self is crucial for both human and planetary well-being in the face of mounting environmental crises. By fostering a deeper sense of connection with nature, cultivating environmental virtues, and addressing the psychological and spiritual dimensions of our relationship with the natural world, we can work towards a more sustainable and flourishing future for all.

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ ΣΤΑ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΑ

Αυτό το άρθρο παρέχει μια εις βάθος διερεύνηση του σημείου επαφής μεταξύ της περιβαλλοντικής ψυχολογίας, της οικοψυχολογίας και της οικοθεολογίας στην αντιμετώπιση των σύγχρονων περιβαλλοντικών προκλήσεων. Εξετάζει πώς αυτά τα διεπιστημονικά πεδία μπορούν να συμβάλουν στην προώθηση βιώσιμων σχέσεων ανθρώπου- φύσης και περιβαλλοντικής διαχείρισης στο πλαίσιο της Ανθρωπόκαινου. Η έρευνα αναλύει ψυχολογικές, πνευματικές και ηθικές διαστάσεις των αλληλεπιδράσεων ανθρώπου- φύσης, τονίζοντας την ανάγκη για μια ολοκληρωμένη προσέγγιση που ενσωματώνει επιστημονικές, ανθρωπιστικές και πνευματικές προοπτικές. Τα βασικά θέματα περιλαμβάνουν τις ψυχολογικές και υγειονομικές επιπτώσεις της έκθεσης στη φύση, τις θρησκευτικές και φιλοσοφικές απόψεις για τη φύση, την περιβαλλοντική ηθική, την αντίληψη κινδύνου, την προσαρμογή στις περιβαλλοντικές αλλαγές και τις στρατηγικές για την προώθηση φιλοπεριβαλλοντικών συμπεριφορών. Συνθέτοντας ιδέες από πολλούς κλάδους, αυτό το άρθρο στοχεύει να παρέχει ένα ολοκληρωμένο πλαίσιο για την κατανόηση και την καλλιέργεια του οικολογικού εαυτού ενόψει των παγκόσμιων περιβαλλοντικών προκλήσεων.

References

Arias-Maldonado, M. (2020). *Anthropocene: The political ecology of the Anthropocene*. Routledge.

Berman, M. G., Jonides, J., & Kaplan, S. (2008). The cognitive benefits of interacting with nature. *Psychological Science*, *19*(12), 1207-1212. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02225.x

Biermann, F., Bai, X., Bondre, N., Broadgate, W., Chen, C. T. A., Dube, O. P., ... & Seto, K. C. (2016). Down to Earth: Contextualizing the Anthropocene. *Global Environmental Change*, *39*, 341-350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.11.004

Bradford, R. A., O' Sullivan, J. J., van der Craats, I. M., Krywkow, J., Rotko, P., Aaltonen, J., ... & Schelfaut, K. (2012). Risk perception - issues for flood management in Europe. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, *12*(7), 2299-2309. DOI: 10.5194/nhess-12-2299-2012

Γεωργόπουλος, Α. (2002). *Περιβαλλοντική ηθική*.Αθήνα: Gutenberg.

Γιαννουλάτος, Α. (2000). *Παγκοσμιότητα και Ορθοδοξία.Μελετήματα Ορθόδοξου προβληματισμού*. Αθήνα: Ακρίτας.

Castree, N. (2014). The Anthropocene and the environmental humanities: Extending the conversation. *Environmental Humanities*, *5*(1), 233-260. DOI: 10.1215/22011919-3615496

Conn, S. A. (1998). Living in the earth: Ecopsychology, health and psychotherapy. *The Humanistic Psychologist*,*26*(1-3), 179-198. https://doi.org/10.1080/08873267.1998.9976972

Crist, E. (2013). On the poverty of our nomenclature. *Environmental Humanities*, *3*(1), 129-147. https://doi.org/10.1215/22011919-3611266

Crutzen, P. J. & Stoermer, E. F. (2000). The Anthropocene. *Global Change Newsletter*, *41*, 17-18.

Deane-Drummond, C. (2008). *Eco-theology*. Anselm Academic.

Fisher, A. (2012). *Radical ecopsychology: Psychology in the service of life*. SUNY Press.

Foltz, R. C. (2006). Islam. In R. S. Gottlieb (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of religion and ecology* (pp. 207-219). Oxford University Press.

Gikas, S. (1966). Panentheism. In *Theological Dictionary of the Church*, 9. Athens.

Gottlieb, R. S. (Ed.). (2006). *The Oxford handbook of religion and ecology*. Oxford University Press.

Howe, P. D., Marlon, J. R., Mildenberger, M. & Shield, B. S. (2019). How will climate change shape climate opinion?. *Environmental Research Letters*, *14*(11), 113001. DOI: 10.1088/1748-9326/ab466a

Jenkins, W. (2008). *Ecologies of grace: Environmental ethics and Christian theology*. Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, S. (1995). The restorative benefits of nature: Toward an integrative framework. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *15*(3), 169-182. https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-4944(95)90001-2

Kimmerer, R. W. (2013). *Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge and the teachings of plants*. Milkweed Editions.

Lewis, S. L. & Maslin, M. A. (2015). Defining the Anthropocene. *Nature*, *519*(7542), 171-180. DOI: 10.1038/nature14258

Liman, M. W. & Wen-qiao, L. (2022). Chronic vulnerability to natural disasters and subjective well-being.*Current Research in Ecological and Social Psychology*, *3*, 100041. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cresp.2022.100041

Malm, A. & Hornborg, A. (2014). The geology of mankind? A critique of the Anthropocene narrative. *The Anthropocene Review*, *1*(1), 62-69. DOI: 10.1177/2053019613516291

Moore, J. W. (2016). *Anthropocene or Capitalocene? Nature, history, and the crisis of capitalism*. PM Press.

Naess, A. (1973). The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement.A summary. *Inquiry*, *16*(1-4), 95-100. https://doi.org/10.1080/00201747308601682

Osbaldiston, R. & Schott, J. P. (2012). Environmental sustainability and behavioral science: Meta-analysis of proenvironmental behavior experiments. *Environment and Behavior*, *44*(2), 257-299. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916511402673

Palsson, G., Szerszynski, B., Sörlin, S., Marks, J., Avril, B., Crumley, C., ... & Weehuizen, R. (2013). Reconceptualizing the 'Anthropos' in the Anthropocene: Integrating the social sciences and humanities in global environmental change research. *Environmental Science & Policy*, *28*, 3-13. DOI: 10.1016/j.envsci.2012.11.004

Pihkala, P. (2018). Eco-anxiety, tragedy, and hope: Psychological and spiritual dimensions of climate change. *Zygon*, *53*(2), 545-569. DOI: 10.1111/zygo.12407

Poussin, J. K., Botzen, W. W., & Aerts, J. C. (2014). Factors of influence on flood damage mitigation behaviour by households. *Environmental Science & Policy*, *40*, 69-77. DOI: 10.1016/j.envsci.2014.01.013

Richert, C., Erdlenbruch, K., & Grelot, F. (2019). The impact of flood management policies on individual adaptation actions: Insights from a French case study. *Ecological Economics*, *166*, 1-14. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106387

Roszak, T., Gomes, M. E. & Kanner, A. D. (Eds.). (1995). *Ecopsychology: Restoring the earth, healing the mind*. Sierra Club Books.

Ruddiman, W. F. (2013). The Anthropocene. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, *41*, 45-68. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-earth-050212-123944

Sandler, R. L. (2007). *Character and Environment: A Virtue-Oriented Approach to Environmental Ethics*. Columbia University Press.

Schmidt, J. J., Brown, P. G. & Orr, C. J. (2016). Ethics in the Anthropocene: A research agenda. *The Anthropocene Review*, *3*(3), 188-200. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053019616662052

Siegrist, M. & Cvetkovich, G. (2000). Perception of hazards: The role of social trust and knowledge. *Risk Analysis*, *20*(5), 713-720. DOI: 10.1111/0272-4332.205064

Sponsel, L. E. (2012). *Spiritual ecology: A quiet revolution*. Praeger.

Steffen, W., Broadgate, W., Deutsch, L., Gaffney, O. & Ludwig, C. (2015). The trajectory of the Anthropocene: The Great Acceleration. *The Anthropocene Review*, *2*(1), 81-98. DOI: 10.1177/2053019614564785

Steffen, W., Grinevald, J., Crutzen, P. & McNeill, J. (2011). The Anthropocene: conceptual and historical perspectives. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, *369*(1938), 842-867. DOI: 10.1098/rsta.2010.0327

Steffen, W., Rockström, J., Richardson, K., Lenton, T. M., Folke, C., Liverman, D., ... & Schellnhuber, H. J. (2018). Trajectories of the Earth System in the Anthropocene. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *115*(33), 8252-8259. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1810141115

Steg, L., & Vlek, C. (2009). Encouraging pro-environmental behaviour: An integrative review and research agenda. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *29*(3), 309-317. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2008.10.004

Steg, L., van den Berg, A. E., & de Groot, J. I. M. (Eds.). (2012). *Environmental psychology: An introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Wachinger, G., Renn, O., Begg, C. & Kuhlicke, C. (2013). The risk perception paradox-implications for governance and communication of natural hazards. *Risk Analysis*, *33*(6), 1049-1065. DOI: 10.1111/j.1539-6924.2012.01942.x

Waters, C. N., Zalasiewicz, J., Summerhayes, C., Barnosky, A. D., Poirier, C., Gałuszka, A., ... & Wolfe, A. P. (2016). The Anthropocene is functionally and stratigraphically distinct from the Holocene. *Science*, *351*(6269). DOI: 10.1126/science.aad2622

Watson, R. A. (2005). A critique of anti-anthropocentric biocentrism. *Environmental Ethics*, *5*(3), 245-256. Doi: 10.5840/enviroethics19835325

Wilkinson, B. H., McElroy, B. J., Kesler, S. E., Peters, S. E., & Rothman, E. D. (2014). Global geologic maps are tectonic speedometer- Rates of rock cycling from area-age frequencies. *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, *126*(3-4), 374-380. DOI: 10.1130/B26457.1

Williams, M., Zalasiewicz, J., Haff, P. K., Schwägerl, C., Barnosky, A. D. & Ellis, E. C. (2016). The Anthropocene biosphere. *The Anthropocene Review*, *3*(2), 196-219. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053019615591020

Zalasiewicz, J., Waters, C. N., Williams, M., Barnosky, A. D., Cearreta, A., Crutzen, P. ... & Oreskes, N. (2015). When did the Anthropocene begin? A mid-twentieth century boundary level is stratigraphically optimal. *Quaternary International*, *383*, 196-203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2014.11.045

Zalasiewicz, J., Williams, M., Haywood, A. & Ellis, M. (2011). The Anthropocene: a new epoch of geological time? Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, *Physical and Engineering Sciences*, *369*(1938), 835-841. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2010.0339

Zaleha, B. D. (2009). "The Least of These": The Evangelical Environmental Movement's Challenge to Contemporary American Fundamentalism. *Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture*, *3*(2), 199-225.

Η αναφορά στο άρθρο γίνεται ως εξής:
Fountoulakis, G. & Alkhouri, K. I. (2024). The Ecological Self: Integrating Environmental Psychology, Ecopsychology, and Ecotheology in the Anthropocene. *Περιβαλλοντική Εκπαίδευση για την Αειφορία*, *6*(1), 22-35. https://doi.org/10.12681/ees.38255

https://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/enveducation/index