Building on the conceptual considerations discussed in this chapter, **climate cultures are therefore defined as dynamic variants of social organisation that provide a framework for recognizing culturally relevant information regarding climate change and that are (re-)produced through climate-relevant everyday practices that reveal diverse forms of 'lived' responsibility and 'everyday' efficacy. The latter includes responses to more abstract attributions of responsibility and efficacy in 'official' climate change discourses that may or may not clash with people's lived experiences.**

Thus, the analysis of different climate cultures grants an insight into certain telling conventions, values and mind-sets that can differ substantially between the climate cultures that are present within one society. For example, more fatalistic cultures (that can be based on religion) may believe in some 'higher power' and therefore attribute very limited efficacy and influence to the individual (while a pastor himself may actually display large influence as multiplicatory figure). Alternatively, a climate culture may define itself by who is included in it and who is not, perceiving of its members as 'the chosen few' which again has certain implications for efficacy attributions (and respective actual power).

The approach pursued in this study responds directly to the lack of recognition of the centrality of everyday practices and their links with more abstract attributions of responsibility and efficacy vis-à-vis actual practical manifestations of responsibility and efficacy. This is particularly pertinent because divergences between abstract attributions and 'lived' experiences of responsibility and efficacy appear to be central to variations in climate culture.

2.7 Conclusion

The differing weight and priority given to each of the three concepts of embodied information, responsibility attribution and efficacy expectation in relation to specific social actors marks the distinction between the different climate cultures discussed in this study. The question of what role climate action plays in people's lives (if any) and whether official approaches to climate action fit their everyday practices serves as an apt starting point. An appropriate culture concept first includes an investigation of how responsibility for climate action is collectively attributed within a certain climate culture. Second it investigates whether the group perceives itself as being in the position to make a difference when it comes to climate action (vis-a-vis how large their actual impact is). This interpretation of efficacy as an inherently social phenomenon is central to this study. Making a clear distinction between individual and collective forms of responsibility and efficacy, and focusing on the collective level, can yield important clues as to why people do (not) act when confronted with the challenges of climate change. As Ford and Norgaard emphasise: "People who oc-

cupy different strata within a hierarchical structure hold different cultural schema and have access to different resources. This becomes apparent when we compare specific social groups and their knowledge about, and response to, climate change" (2020, p. 44). This approach is also uniquely suited to acknowledge differences in the everyday realities of groups within the German population that are endowed with different stocks of economic and cultural capital, which is urgently necessary for achieving social fairness and maintaining social stability:

> By remaining inattentive to how differences in social location and culture shape people's knowledge of and response to climate change, public and professional conversations about climate change over-represent elite sensibilities, marginalizing those who fall outside of what Audre Lorde calls 'the mythical norm' of whiteness, heterosexual masculinity, and economic privilege

<div align="right">Lorde, 1987, cited in Ford and Norgaard, 2020, p. 44</div>

Lastly, this study also investigates whether there emerge differences in the conception, understanding or definition of the three key terms responsibility, efficacy and knowing.