IRASA International Scientific Conference
SCIENCE, EDUCATION, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION
SETI VII 2025
Book of Proceedings
https://doi.org/10.62982/seti07.drjo.39

DISENTANGLING ENVIRONMENTAL HETEROGENEITY: A CHAOTIC SYSTEMS FRAMEWORK FOR ECOLOGIC AND CLIMATIC PROCESSES

Dragana Jovanovic [185]

Abstract

Environmental systems are governed by complex interactions that produce nonlinear, sensitive, and unpredictable behavior—features of deterministic chaos. In this article, we examine the intersection between environmental science and chaos theory with the hypothesis that the majority of what can be observed in ecological and climatic processes can be described by chaotic dynamics. We discuss the application of traditional chaotic models, and explain how chaotic dynamics induced by anthropogenic processes (e.g., greenhouse gases, land cover changes, biodiversity loss) make long-term environmental predictions less certain. Furthermore, we explain the application of early warning signs in terms of critical slowing down, rising variance, and rising autocorrelation as a mechanism for predicting chaotic tipping points. This paper highlights the necessity for the inclusion of paradigms that embrace chaos in environmental models and policy-making. By adopting as well as quantifying the unpredictability that occurs in the natural world, scientists and policymakers can achieve robust, adaptive solutions to environmental degradation and climate change. Chaos is not a hindrance to knowledge, but a powerful theoretical as well as mathematical framework for addressing the complexity of the Earth's dynamic systems.

Key words: *Chaos theory, diversity, predictions, unpredictable behavior.*

Introduction

For a long time, the world was explained by Newton's laws, which said that if we know the current state of something, we can easily predict its future. Chaos theory challenges this idea—things are not always predictable, and they don't always follow a strict pattern. Even when we understand how the universe works, we can't measure the exact position and speed of every atom, and this uncertainty makes predictions

[185] Dragana Jovanovic, PhD, Associated Professor, Faculty of Applied Ecology Futura, Metropolitan University, Belgrade, Republic of Serbia, dragana.jovanovic@futura.edu.rs, ORCID 0009-0001-0923-7763

difficult. This is one reason why long-term predictions are hard. But chaos isn't the same as disorder.

Even though chaos makes predictions hard, the universe isn't random. Effects still result from causes. And no matter how chaotic things seem, every system has a path it follows toward a certain outcome. Understanding these patterns of chaos has real-world uses. In daily life, small changes can lead to big problems, which is why we talk about probabilities more than exact predictions. In human behavior, chaos helps us understand behaviors that seem to happen without clear reasons.

So, in human behavior, the butterfly effect can be used to study social trends, for example, how conspiracy theories on social media might lead to creation of potent antigovernment movements.

The universe still follows the laws of cause and effect. Analyzed through the lens of chaos theory, our view of how the world functions becomes uncertain. It shows the limits of our understanding, not of the connections between things, but of the causes behind them. "The association of ecological adaptations to environment with a typology of cultures and culture stages contributed important knowledge, but it was not capable of analyzing adaptation as a process which takes place in human behavior and possesses regularities which may be independent of cultures and stages of development. Lacking the capacity to view adaptation and use of the physical environment (and social phenomena qua environment) as a dynamic process, it was not possible for cultural ecologists to provide answers to the difficult question of why humans do what they do to the environment (and to each other). That is, causal inquiries into the reasons and cures for particular forms of environmental abuse were not easily accomplished in the absence of a behavioral theory of purposive use of the environment".[2]

About the fluke

When we think about flukes, we look for random, chaotic events, and chance that unpredictable and accidental events that shape our lives and societies in ways we do not realize can happen. These forces are more important than the neat, logical explanations we usually accept. If we look closer at the world, we can see that it's not always clear-cut and that we are often influenced by these random events. Fluke looks into this and points out that random, accidental events matter a lot more than we imagine. A fluke is often seen as a chance event that changes the world, and refers to how a small change can lead to a big effect. What chaos theory tells us is that systems are sensitive to initial conditions, which means that a small change can have a big impact over time. Flukes can change the course of our lives, but we often miss them, trying to rationalize causes rather than explain why things happen.

In our lives and societies, there is some regularity, and we base our assumption of order because we have legal and moral laws and habits, and some elaborated patterns in our lives and scientific research. According to some authors, even a small fluke indeed can change the way that we live, but most of the time we adapt to change, and it becomes a way of order in life. And once we are on that path, some forces guide how change happens.

Understanding complex systems

In science, systems can be complicated, complex, or both. Complex systems have many different parts that are not all the same, but they connect. Most importantly, they adapt to each other. Human society is not too complicated—it's a complex system. Over time, scientists have divided this system into different fields like natural science, earth science, social science, mathematics, and medicine. Even though these fields mostly worked separately, they followed a similar path—focused more on nuances and less on human behavior. After the World War I, changes in geopolitics made scientists rethink how they studied human behavior. The war, seen as crossing into chaos, pushed scientists to look at new ideas about emotional and irrational behavior. This led to a more scientific way of researching processes of decision making that could be predicted and controlled. The growing interest in humans within complex systems encouraged scientists to look across different fields to study human behavior and environmental factors. This led to cross-disciplinary research and merged social studies with medicine, biology and similar science disciplines. Over time, human actions have become an important part of scientific fields where their impact is clear. The interdisciplinary nature of studying human behavior also made natural scientists interested in some methods from social science. This path led to the theory of chaos and the butterfly effect.
Speaking about environmental science's application to human society as a complex system, we tend to do the impossible – to maximize efficiency and productivity and minimize the cost of it for sustainable life. There are three misconceptions in this sentence: efficiency, productivity, and sustainability. Technically, efficiency means the ratio of the useful work performed by a machine or in a process to the total energy expended or heat taken in. In a human context, it means how effectively and economically people utilize resources (time, energy, materials, etc.) to achieve desired outcomes. This includes not just physical actions, but also cognitive processes like decision-making and problem-solving.[3] In environmental terms, sustainability means the quality of causing little or no damage to the environment and therefore being able to continue for a long time [4]. So far so good, but let's go back to chaos theory. Human beings are strongly interconnected, depending on each other, with distinctive characteristics such as personality, character, sense of belonging and cultural surroundings. All systems that ignore that will be in serious trouble.

Understanding human factors

In the world, there are about eight billion individuals interacting with each other. If we can imagine a pile of sand with eight billion grains, it looks stable at first sight, right? But a slightly blowing wind can reshape the pile or destroy the inner structure. Bak, Tang and Wiesenfeld in 1987 proposed a sandpile model, arguing that small perturbations acting upon the system may cause huge consequences.[4] But a sandpile is in ideal conditions, stable and motionless. In contrast, human "sandpiles" are in perpetual motion, so the possibility of disaster is high. Also, humans are diverse in culture, religion, gender, education, age, and intellectual capacity, but they adapt to each other. That is what makes human society a complex system, always between order and chaos. Over time, the evolution system evolved humans towards organized societies, and everything changed, so nowadays we have laws, systems of reward and punishment, opinion makers and leaders. Everything around us changes for the better, including technology, quality of life, longevity, and social norms. But there is always a but in chaos theory. In millennia before us, everything has changed except human nature. The sandpile of human society is so high that an avalanche is inevitable. Smaller sandpiles are more resilient, but globalization also globalizes chaos and makes the potential for global catastrophes greater (exp: the COVID-19 pandemic). Flukes happen everywhere, but modern communication and economy make isolated incidents global (exp: the global economic crisis 2008, started with the collapse of US banks but reflects worldwide). The illusion of predictability and patterns in how our world should function in the 21st century is widespread. But do we truly understand how human beings function, even when we undergo such significant changes?

Chaos theory offers a theoretical framework for characterizing nonlinear, intricate interactions in environmental systems, as well as human-modified ones. It highlights the fact that infinitesimal variation in initial conditions can lead to vastly different outcomes, making long-term forecasting difficult, particularly where human beings are involved. Such a mindset suggests that attempts to manage the environment have to embrace the unpredictability and interconnectedness of ecological and social systems.

Table 1: Common correlations in environmental behavior and their tested causal drivers

Observed Correlation	Possible Causal Driver (Evidence-Based)	Notes & Context
Higher environmental literacy ↔ More sustainable actions	Environmental education programs cause measurable increases in recycling, energy conservation, and biodiversity support.	Causation supported by controlled studies in schools and communities.
Urban residency ↔ Greater climate concern	Higher exposure to environmental campaigns, protests, and policy debates in urban centers.	Causation partially tested; effect size varies by political and cultural context.
Frequent media exposure ↔ Support for conservation policies	Targeted environmental documentaries and campaigns can directly increase willingness to donate or vote for environmental policies.	Effect often decays over time without reinforcement.
Higher income ↔ Lower household air pollution	Ability to purchase cleaner energy sources or upgrade to efficient appliances directly reduces emissions.	Causation supported by household intervention trials.

Access to public transport ↔ Reduced car use	Infrastructure improvements (bus lanes, metro expansions) cause measurable decreases in private car trips.	Strong causal evidence from before–after transportation studies.
Proximity to nature ↔ Higher pro-ecological values	Regular contact with natural environments causes long-term increases in ecological concern and stewardship behavior.	Supported by longitudinal studies; effect starts in childhood.
Financial penalties for waste ↔ Lower landfill disposal	"Pay-as-you-throw" waste policies cause households to reduce waste volume.	Effect seen consistently across municipalities.
Plastic bag bans/taxes ↔ Reduced single-use plastic consumption	Direct policy intervention alters purchasing patterns almost immediately.	Well-documented causal link in multiple countries.

Ecological and social systems are connected. Human actions are not random events, but part of an interactive web of reactions that can amplify or dampen the effect of change.

One of the core concepts in chaos theory is the reality that small differences in initial conditions can lead to radically different outcomes in the long term. On an environmental scale, what this means is that minor human activities can have immense, unexpected effects on the environment. Human activity, such as population growth, use of resources, and technological development, can act as key drivers of environmental change. These factors create complexity and uncertainty in the system, making it harder to predict and manage environmental outcomes. For example, increasing urbanization and agriculture can alter land use, disrupt water cycles, and contribute to climate change, destabilizing ecosystems overall. Chaos theory focuses on the function of feedback loops in creating complex systems. Positive feedback loops amplify changes, whereas negative feedback loops reduce them. Human activities can create positive and negative feedback loops in the environment. It is crucial to comprehend these feedback loops to predict and regulate the consequences of human actions. Chaos theory essentially suggests that natural processes are intrinsically complicated and unpredictable, and that human action strongly controls these processes. This embracing of complexity is crucial in devising more effective and sustainable ways of managing the environment.

Factors of human behavior

Behaviors can be explained in a variety of complementary ways at different levels of causation. Proximate explanations deal with physiological and psychological mechanisms and culturally transmitted knowledge behind behaviors. [4]

Faced by changes, we are often attracted to simple solutions, but the world is far more complex than it has ever been. The first assumption we make when facing a problem is the idea that every time something happens, there must be some clear-cut cause behind it. Sometimes it is true because if we increase the consumption of chemical goods, we will produce more toxic waste, it is a clear correlation. But there is so much going on in the world that does not have a clear-cut cause, and there are an infinite number of patterns that need to occur at the same moment to unfold things as it was. Current models of research clearly cannot lead to understanding how an infinite number of causes can produce a single effect. Furthermore, numerous causes of certain human behavior undermine global efforts to change that behavior. The second assumption is that if we understand the components of complex social systems, we can understand the entire system. The third assumption is – if something causes a change in the past, it will cause it in the future. That is why we constantly try to make predictions that cannot be fulfilled.

What we can do is try to understand models of human behavior based on neurology, cultural frames, and basic biological functions. Past linear dynamics in the research of human factors in environmental theory simply don't work well in a non-linear world. Let's take an example of human behavior toward problems of climate change. The modern narrative about the consequences of global warming and climate change operates in the long term, decades, and even centuries. The pressure is constant, from scientists, activists, legislative bodies, and the media. Yet, there is only a slight change in human behavior and not enough fear to stop contributing to the widespread devastation of nature. It is not ignorance that so many underestimates or ignore the long-term effects of environmental hazards — it is how our brains are designed, how society is organized, and how information is perceived.

Here are some of the crucial factors of human behavior:

1. Psychological and neuroscience factors:
   a. Evolutionary bias toward immediate threats - the human brain evolved in environments where staying alive was a matter of reacting to here-and-now danger (predators, starvation, violence among humans), not potential future danger. The amygdala highly overreacts to abrupt, conspicuous danger but not so to gradual, actuarial danger like global warming. This is temporal discounting — we are much more concerned with rewards (or dangers) here and now than far-off ones.
   b. Optimism bias - "it won't happen to me" or "technology will fix it in time". The bias helps with daily coping but reduces the emergency feeling about prevention.
   c. Cognitive load and competing priorities - environmental hazards are cognitively demanding and complex. When survival requirements (job security, bills, medical attention) need to be addressed, the mind low-priorities distant hazards.

2. Sociocultural and media factors
   a. Cultural narratives - some dimensions of cultures are conditioned to normalize resource usage and economic growth and thus make environmental sacrifice illogical. In some belief systems, the world is seen as long-lasting or God-protected, which lowers a feeling of urgency.
   b. Media framing - news cycles such as abrupt crises (politics, natural disasters) versus steady, systemic crises. Climate change stories would be framed with abstractions and statistics rather than concrete, easy-to-relate-to human anecdotes.

c. Social norms - humans copy their peers: if peers, friends, or groups are not visibly acting concerned, others also lower the threat.

3. Political and economic incentives - short election cycles reinforce policies with short-term payoffs, rather than long-term sustainability. The groups benefiting from unsustainable practices are strong lobbyists and shape public opinion. Individuals view individual costs (reduced consumption, increased expense) as more tangible than prevention's intangible benefits in the long term.

4. Perceptual gaps - greenhouse gases, loss of biodiversity, or soil depletion cannot be sensed by human senses as directly observable. Time lag cause-effect: delay between pollution and apparent effects (e.g., high seas a few decades from now) makes it psychologically far away. Problem on the world scale: it is easier not to feel personally responsible when the problem is larger than one nation and culture.

Causation and correlation in human behavior and ecological decision-making

Human behavior and decision-making in environmental settings are interlinked in their complexity, typically controlled by co-associated social, cultural, economic, and psychological variables. Establishing causation (cause–and–effect relationships demonstrated) and correlation (occurrences or association with no showing of causality) among them is most important to devise efficient environmental policy and interventions.

Correlation is where two variables trend together, but one will never cause the other. With human behavior and ecology, correlations can be very insightful about society:

- Pro-environmental behavior and education: various surveys indicate that higher environmental literacy is linked with more room for sustainable behavior (e.g., energy saving, recycling). Correlation does not assure that education affects sustainable behavior—it may be confounded by culture or socioeconomic status.
- Climate concern and urban residence: urban residents are more climate-concerned than rural residents. The link can maybe find greater exposure to environmental propaganda, differing economic concerns, or disparate local environmental conditions.
- Policy support and media exposure: prolonged exposure to nature news or nature documentaries leads to subsequent increased support for conservation policy. This is not, however, proof of media cause support—people who are already interested in the environment can self-select such programs. Studies of correlation serve to offer suggestions of patterns worth further study of causes.
- For establishing causation, we need to make sure of the presence of an obvious cause–and–effect relationship, determined by empirical and controlled experiments.
- Steps for curtailing utilization of resources: charging plastic bags has resulted in a decline in plastic bag use or reuse. In this case, the policy shift (cause) has a direct influence on customer purchase behavior (effect).

- Regulatory bans and species recovery: legal prohibition of harvesting certain species has had a direct impact on producing measurable population growth, such as that of the recovery of the griffon vulture in Uvac canyon.
- Infrastructure provision and modal shift: supply of full-cycle infrastructure in urban areas has been shown to induce an increase in commuter cycling levels by lowering physical and psychological adoption barriers.

These figures show how well-designed interventions are able to produce behavior change, and that these behavioral changes then have ecological impacts.

Correlation is employed in environmental decision-making to suggest probable causal factors. For example, a correlation between recycling rate and the regional income level would make policymakers wonder whether subsidizing garbage cans creates more recycling. In the case of unavailable controlled experiments, such a hypothesis will remain speculative only.

As a result, settled causal relationships can produce time-varying, predictable correlations. A policy that has already been shown to result in lower rates of deforestation in one area will correlate with biodiversity recovery rates across several areas, even where local causal testing has only been conducted.

The failure to distinguish between correlation and causation can lead to ineffective or even harmful ecological policy. Identifying higher GDP with cleaner air, say, might lead to the erroneous conclusion that economic development necessarily improves the environment, when the connection could be mediated by regulation, technological change, or the whims of globalization.

The relationship between human behavior and choice-making in environmental contexts is complex, typically determined by entangled cultural, social, economic, and psychological determinants. Understanding the causation (cause–and–effect relationships) and correlation (patterns or relations with no direct support for causality) between these determinants is crucial for effective environmental policy and intervention planning.

Cultural frameworks, religion, and ecological behavior

In the broadest possible sense, the culture into which an individual is born is composed of all the variables affecting him which are arranged by other people. The social environment is in part the result of those practices of the group which generate ethical behavior and of the extension of these practices to manners and customs.[5]

Human behavior in the presence of environmental issues is no longer the result of scientific know-how, economical means, or political structures—it is also deeply embedded in cultural narratives, values, and belief systems. Cultural frames are mental grids that influence what individuals perceive as desirable, correct, or economically sound within the ecological environment.

Cultural frames as behavioral filters

- Value orientation – societies that value the common good (e.g., East Asian Confucian societies, Indigenous societies) will offer the protection of the environment as a communal responsibility.
- Time horizon – cultures that perceive time as circular (e.g., agriculture and Indigenous cultures) are more likely to intuitively accept long-term sustainability than linear "advance"-oriented societies.
- Risk perception – Cultural narratives determine whether ecological threats are framed as acute crises or slow, manageable issues.

These frames shape people's responses to environmental policy, education campaigns, and alarm about global warming—now sometimes raising the sustainability cause, sometimes producing apathy or hostility.

Monotheistic religions—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—all embrace one Creator and human moral responsibility for their conduct. Ecological implications of these assumptions vary with theological interpretation and cultural reinterpretation:

- Stewardship model – this explanation occurs in all three traditions and views human beings as stewards (e.g., Genesis 2:15, Qur'an 6:165) responsible for maintaining God's creation. Societies that follow this model tend to endorse conservation, resist environmental degradation, and identify sustainability as a moral responsibility.
- Dominion model – a second understanding (within some Christian denominations) emphasizes control by human beings over nature, even to the extent of deserving exploitation. This may lead to resistance to environmental regulation if it is framed as meddling with human "rightful use" of resources.
- Purity and sacredness – religious regulations concerning cleanliness and purity (e.g., kosher, halal) can impact environmental behavior indirectly by influencing attitudes regarding water quality, land use, and animal welfare.
- End-time narratives – certain eschatological worldviews (e.g., emphasis on an imminent apocalypse) disempower motivation for long-term ecological planning, whereas others read environmental degradation as a sign of moral collapse, and require reform.

Chaology suggests that cultural and religious frameworks are taken to be initial condition variables—disagreement in interpretation can mean radically disparate courses of action in the environment: within one community, a climate policy labelled as "protection of God's creation" can garner high support, within another, the same policy labelled as "limiting human use of resources" can have strong opposition.

These diverged results attest to the sensitivity of socio-ecological systems to tenuous cultural inputs, recalling the butterfly effect in nature.

Conclusion

The integration of chaos theory into the study of environmental and climatic processes provides a powerful lens for understanding the inherent unpredictability and interconnectedness of ecological systems. Environmental heterogeneity is not merely a product of random variation, but a manifestation of deterministic chaos shaped by both natural and anthropogenic factors. Small changes in initial conditions—whether climatic fluctuations, land-use shifts, or sociocultural influences—can propagate through ecological and social systems, producing disproportionately large and often unforeseen consequences. Such dynamics underscore the limitations of linear predictive models and the necessity of embracing nonlinearity, feedback loops, and emergent behavior in environmental science.

Essential role of human behavior as both a driver and a modifier of chaotic environmental processes is enlightened by scale of causal factors, before all different cultural frameworks, religious narratives, political incentives, and cognitive biases which do not operate independently; rather, they form complex feedback systems that can either amplify environmental degradation or foster resilience. The examples discussed—from global crises such as pandemics and climate change to localized interventions like species protection policies—illustrate that human actions are embedded in webs of causation and correlation that cannot be fully disentangled through traditional methodologies. The persistent gap between environmental knowledge and behavioral change can be better understood through the lens of chaos theory, which accepts that seemingly minor psychological, cultural, or policy inputs can yield large-scale and sometimes counterintuitive ecological outcomes.

Recognizing environmental systems as complex adaptive networks demands a shift in both scientific modeling and policymaking. Predictive certainty must give way to probabilistic thinking, where scenario planning, resilience-building, and adaptive management replace rigid forecasts. This does not mean abandoning the search for patterns, but rather acknowledging that patterns in chaotic systems are transient and sensitive to context. Effective interventions will require interdisciplinary collaboration, integrating environmental science, neuroscience, sociology, cultural studies, and political economy to anticipate and navigate tipping points.

The concept of "fluke" discussed in this paper—chance events with transformative consequences—reinforces the need for flexible governance structures and early-warning mechanisms. Policies should be designed not only to mitigate foreseeable risks but also to adapt rapidly to unforeseen disruptions. In doing so, chaos theory becomes not merely a descriptive tool but a prescriptive framework, guiding the development of robust, adaptive strategies capable of functioning within the bounds of uncertainty.

Ultimately, disentangling environmental heterogeneity is less about reducing complexity than about learning to work within it. The chaotic nature of ecological and climatic systems is not a barrier to knowledge, but an invitation to rethink the assumptions underlying environmental research and decision-making. By embracing uncertainty, fostering cross-disciplinary integration, and grounding interventions in the realities of nonlinear dynamics, we can move toward a more resilient coexistence with the natural world—one that respects the delicate balance between order and chaos on which our shared future depends.

References

[1] Bennett, W. John, Human Ecology as Human Behavior, A Normative Anthropology of Resource Use and Abuse (Chapter), Transaction Publishers, 2002, pp 243–277
[2] J.W. Walker, T.P. Bechet: Defining Effectiveness and Efficiency Measures in the Context of Human Resource Strategy, pp. 235-245 (chapter) in Niehaus, Richard J.; Price, Karl F. Bottom Line Results from Strategic Human Resource Planning New York: Plenum Press; 1991.
[3] https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/sustainability
[4] Cronk, Lee, Human Behavioral Ecology, *Anthropology,* 1991, pp 25-53
[5] Skinner, B.F. Science and human behavior, 2005. The B.F. Skinner Foundation, pp.419
[6] Swim, Janet K.,Clayton, Susan,Howard, George S. *Human behavioral contributions to climate change: Psychological and contextual drivers.* By American Psychologist, Vol 66(4), May-Jun 2011, 251-264
[7] P. Bak, C. Tang, K. Wiesenfeld. Self-organized criticality. *Physical Review Letters*, 1987, pp 59: 381-384