

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/140570/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Whitmarsh, Lorraine , Poortinga, Wouter and Capstick, Stuart 2021. Behaviour change to address climate change. *Current Opinion in Psychology* 42 , pp. 76-81. 10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.04.002

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.04.002>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Behaviour change to address climate change

Lorraine Whitmarsh^{a c *}, Wouter Poortinga^{b c}, Stuart Capstick^{b c}

^a Department of Psychology, University of Bath, United Kingdom

^b School of Psychology, Cardiff University, United Kingdom

^c Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations, United Kingdom

* Corresponding author: Prof. Lorraine Whitmarsh, Department of Psychology, University of Bath,

Keywords

Behaviour Chang; Climate Change; Psychology

Abstract

Addressing climate change requires profound behaviour change, not only in consumer action, but also in action as members of communities and organisations, and as citizens who can influence policies. However, while many behavioural models exist to explain and predict mitigation and adaptation behaviours, we argue that their utility in establishing meaningful change is limited due to their being too reductive, individualistic, linear, deliberative and blind to environmental impact. This has led to a focus on suboptimal intervention strategies, particularly informational approaches. Addressing the climate crisis requires a focus on: high-impact behaviours and high-emitting groups; interdisciplinary interventions that address the multiple drivers, barriers and contexts of behaviour; and timing to ensure interventions are targeted to moments of change when habits are weaker.

24 1 Introduction

25

26 Behaviour change is a central element of addressing the climate crisis. Most of the interventions required to
27 reach global emission reduction targets (i.e., climate *mitigation*) require at least some behavioural change
28 (CCC, 2019) and *adapting* to the growing impacts of climate change similarly requires significant lifestyle
29 and societal change (IPCC, 2015). Impactful mitigation actions include avoiding flying and driving, and
30 reducing red meat, dairy, material and energy consumption (Wynes & Nicholas, 2017; Ivanova et al., 2020);
31 while adaptation measures include emergency and long-term behavioural responses such as preparing for
32 extreme weather events (Van Valkengoed & Steg, 2019).

33

34 Behaviour change is often narrowly conceived as individual-level consumer action (e.g., buying a low-carbon
35 product, recycling, reducing meat-eating), but is more appropriately understood as extending across the many
36 roles and contexts humans occupy: as members of communities, participants in organisations, and as citizens
37 who can influence policies (Nielsen et al., 2021). In addition to consumer action, behaviour of relevance for
38 climate action thus encompasses the adoption of low-carbon and climate-resilient technologies (e.g. installing
39 insulation); support for large-scale low-carbon infrastructures (e.g., windfarms); political action to support or
40 demand climate change measures (e.g., voting and protesting); participation in policy formulation (e.g.,
41 through citizen juries) and grassroots activities (e.g., community energy or transport initiatives); and engaging
42 in climate change conversations and interactions with others that raise awareness, enable and normalise low-
43 carbon lifestyles. This extensive list highlights the need for all areas of psychology (social, environmental,
44 community, organisational, political, economic, health, and developmental etc.) to develop, test and apply
45 behaviour change theories and interventions (Clayton et al., 2015; Nielsen et al., 2021). In this article, we
46 describe recent progress in psychological research, identify knowledge gaps, and set priorities for further
47 research to inform more effective mitigation and adaptation behaviour change to address the climate crisis.

48

49 2 Behaviour (change) models and their limitations

50

51 2.1 Overview of models

52

53 Numerous behavioural theories and models exist to explain and predict mitigation and adaptation actions. The
54 Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB; Ajzen, 1991; Yuriev et al., 2020), the Value-Belief-Norm (VBN; Stern,
55 2000; Stern et al., 1999) and the Transtheoretical Model (TTM, Prochaska et al., 2002) are most commonly
56 applied to mitigation behaviours. The TPB, originating in broader social psychology research, posits that
57 intentional behaviour is predicted by attitudes, social norms, and perceived behavioural control (PBC); in other
58 words, what we think and feel, social pressure, and capacity to act drive action. The VBN, by contrast, was
59 developed specifically with pro-environmental behaviour in mind, and emphasises the role of personal norms
60 in personal action, which are a product of people's awareness of consequences and ascription of responsibility
61 to the self. These beliefs in turn are rooted in deeper personal values and worldviews. Broadly, the VBN has

62 been shown to predict political or low-impact pro-environmental actions (e.g., recycling); whereas the TPB
63 can explain higher-impact environmental behaviours (e.g., avoiding driving), since it incorporates structural
64 constraints via the PBC construct (Stern, 2000; Steg & Nordlund, 2018). Unlike the TPB and VBN, the TTM
65 is a more dynamic theory of behaviour *change*, describing the stages a person moves through in establishing
66 new behaviours, including contemplation, preparation, action, and maintenance of behaviour change. This
67 model has been influential in health psychology, but has also been used to predict certain climate mitigation
68 behaviours such as red meat reduction and cycle use (Wolstenholme et al., 2020; Forward, 2014).

69

70 Protection Motivation Theory (PMT; Rogers, 1983) has been applied to adaptation behaviours such as flood
71 protection. This model posits that risk-protection measures result from appraisals of a threat and an adaptive
72 coping response to deal with the threat (Grothmann & Patt, 2005). These appraisals are in turn influenced by
73 knowledge of available adaptation strategies (Blennow & Persson, 2009); descriptive norms (i.e., what is seen
74 as ‘normal’), negative emotions, perceived self-efficacy and outcome efficacy (belief that the adaptive actions
75 will have intended benefit) of adaptive actions (Moser, 2014; van Valkengoed & Steg, 2019).

76

77 2.2 Critiques and gaps

78

79 While these models highlight some of the main drivers of and barriers to climate action, recent critiques have
80 identified limitations and gaps that impede significant progress in this area. First, the models are restricted to
81 a small number of common theoretical constructs which limits their utility in understanding behaviour and
82 informing interventions (cf., Sniehotta et al., 2014; Ferguson et al., 2016). Second, a related criticism is that
83 the models are too *individualistic*. Structural factors (e.g., income, location) have been shown to far outweigh
84 psychological factors in predicting carbon-emitting behaviours (Whitmarsh et al., 2017; Whittle et al., 2019),
85 and yet with the partial exception of PBC, the cultural and physical context of action is absent from these
86 models, and interventions have not been targeted towards high-emitters (Nielsen et al., 2021; Galvin, 2013).
87 Attempts to offer more integrative and interdisciplinary perspectives on pro-environmental action, such as the
88 Attitude-Behaviour-Context (ABC; Stern, 2000) or Capability, Opportunity, Motivation-Behaviour (COM-B;
89 Michie et al., 2011) models, have hardly been taken up by psychologists working on climate action.

90

91 Third, widely-used behaviour models can be considered too *linear*, by assuming that behaviour is the end-
92 point of a causal chain of attitudinal-psychological factors. Yet, behaviour change can lead to changed attitudes
93 or identity (Bem, 1972; Thomas et al., 2019) and impact on other behaviours via spillover or rebound effects
94 (Nash et al., 2017; Nilsson et al., 2016). Fourth, with the exception of some research on collective action (e.g.,
95 van Zomeren et al., 2019) psychological approaches assume people act alone and in isolation from others;
96 even social norms are conceived as individual *perceptions* of expectations and obligations held by the
97 individual, and there have been few attempts to understand how personal action influences others, or affects
98 the broader contexts within which people act (e.g., via processes of ‘social contagion’ and peer influence;
99 Wolske et al., 2020). Together, these concerns highlight the need for more interdisciplinary and systems

100 perspectives to understand how to establish pro-environmental behaviour change (cf. behavioural ecology;
101 Geller, 2002; social influence and cooperation; Henrich & Muthukrishna, 2020; social-ecological systems;
102 Masterson et al., 2017).

103
104 Fifth, models typically assume a ‘rational’, or at least *deliberative*, mode of decision-making, whereas much
105 of our behaviour (including climate-relevant action) is habitual, i.e., unconscious routines triggered by
106 contextual cues rather than a conscious deliberation of alternatives (Kurz et al., 2015). This omission has meant
107 interventions have failed to factor in habit-breaking as a precursor to behaviour change (Thomas et al., 2019).
108 Finally, the models fail to distinguish *types of behaviour* in terms of their impact or malleability, and thus
109 provide no practical guidance for which behaviours interventions should focus on for maximal climate benefit.
110 Consequently, there has been a tendency for environmental psychologists to focus on low-impact, incremental
111 behaviour changes (e.g., curtailment of energy use) that is ‘simple and painless’ (Thøgersen & Crompton,
112 2009) rather than higher-impact, more transformative behaviour changes, such as purchasing energy-efficient
113 or renewable energy equipment (Nielsen et al., 2021) which are necessary for lifestyle change that is in line
114 with effective climate change mitigation (UNEP, 2020). As we discuss in the next section, these gaps and
115 limitations in theory has led to suboptimal interventions (e.g., information provision).

116

117 3 *Behaviour change interventions*

118

119 3.1 *Intervention typologies*

120

121 Different typologies of behaviour change interventions exist that target *individual decision-making*
122 (‘downstream’) versus the *context* in which decisions are made (‘upstream’; Verplanken & Wood, 2006);
123 measures that *provide/improve* options (‘pull’) versus *removing* them (‘push’; De Groot & Schuitema, 2012);
124 or that make use of automatic (‘nudge’) versus more intentional or deliberative processes (e.g., citizens
125 assemblies; Capstick et al., 2020). In general, evidence from climate change and related areas suggests the
126 need for combining multiple approaches. Changing choice architecture ‘behind the scenes’ may help to change
127 specific behaviours, but this is not sufficient for the profound and participatory social transformation required
128 to respond to the climate crisis (Corner et al., 2014; Otto et al., 2020); information provision and incentives
129 are more effective when combined with broader social and infrastructural interventions (UNEP, 2020); and
130 removing high-carbon options may be needed alongside providing low-carbon ones in order to establish the
131 greatest change (Cairns et al., 2002).

132

133 3.2 *Efficacy of different interventions*

134

135 Psychologists have tended to focus on informational interventions – whether to raise knowledge, or influence
136 psychological variables – in line with the individualist, deliberative focus of their behavioural models. Yet,
137 evidence shows that informational approaches are generally less effective than other types of intervention

138 (Abrahamse & Matthies, 2012). Information campaigns may raise awareness and concern, but do not always
139 produce behaviour change (Staats et al., 1996). Informational approaches that are more effective in changing
140 behaviour: (a) tailor messages to audience values and beliefs (Whitmarsh & Corner, 2017); (b) communicate
141 the wider (co-)benefits of climate action (Maibach et al., 2010; Bain et al., 2016; Wolstenholme et al., 2020);
142 (c) target times and locations of decision-making, such as via product labels (WRAP, 2019; Kaiser et al., 2020)
143 or energy feedback meters (Abrahamse et al., 2005); (d) leverage moral or social influence through normative
144 messaging (Kormos et al., 2015; Sweetman & Whitmarsh, 2016); (e) promote self-efficacy instead of, or in
145 addition to appealing to fear (Peters et al., 2013; Hunter & Rös, 2016), and (f) encourage setting specific and
146 realistic goals to motivate action (Abrahamse et al., 2005).

147
148 Social influence is one of the strongest factors shaping behaviour, yet rarely recognised by individuals
149 themselves (Nolan et al., 2008). Adoption of low-carbon innovations, such as electric cars and solar panels, is
150 significantly shaped by social norms and neighbourhood effects (Bollinger & Gillingham, 2012; Graziano &
151 Gillingham, 2015; Pettifor et al., 2017). The importance of social modelling in low-carbon, climate-resilient
152 behaviours highlights the relevance of leadership in reshaping social norms (Gössling, 2019) and fostering
153 collective efficacy (Sabherwal et al., 2021); and the potential for more discursive approaches (e.g., group
154 discussion) to promoting climate action (cf. Lewin, 1947; Kurz et al., 2010). Among interventions that leverage
155 social norms, the block leader approach, public commitment, and social modelling have been shown to be
156 effective, with direct personal influence from similar others a key process shaping action (Abrahamse & Steg,
157 2013). Effective organisational interventions similarly find that social factors, such as management support,
158 are important for bringing about behaviour change, alongside informational, financial and infrastructural
159 measures (Young et al., 2015; Henderson & Mokhtarian, 1996).

160
161 Public commitment approaches involve asking respondents to make a pledge to change their behaviour, and
162 rely on the psychological drive for consistency (or reducing ‘cognitive dissonance’) between attitudes and
163 behaviours (Abrahamse & Matthies, 2012). Commitment interventions can be effective for promoting climate
164 actions, such as using public transit (Matthies et al., 2006). Consistency processes are also thought to be
165 relevant for behavioural spillover – the notion that changing one behaviour may trigger further behavioural
166 changes (Thøgersen, 2012). Yet, a growing evidence base shows that spillover remains an elusive or even
167 counter-productive phenomenon (Thomas et al., 2016; Thøgersen & Ölander, 2003; Steinhorst et al., 2015;
168 Maki et al., 2019; Nash et al., 2017).

169
170 Economic and structural interventions have been studied much less in the psychological literature, consistent
171 with gaps in the dominant behavioural models. Pricing policies can change incentives in favour of low-carbon
172 alternatives and/or away from high-carbon options. Congestion charging has been shown to reduce car use
173 (TfL, 2006) and shift demand towards public transport (Agarwal & Koo, 2016) and lower-emission vehicles
174 (Percoco, 2014). Charges have also been suggested as a way to disrupt automatic behaviours by making
175 purchase decisions more deliberative (Thomas et al., 2019), but may need to be combined with other

176 approaches to boost their efficacy (Poortinga & Whitaker, 2018). Physical and broader structural measures
177 might include designing stair use (rather than lift use) as the default in buildings; pedestrianisation and cycle
178 lanes; green infrastructure; low-carbon buildings and so on (e.g., RAE, 2015; Cairns et al., 2002).

179
180 A growing literature points to the importance not only of *how* to intervene to achieve social and lifestyle
181 change, but also *when*. Habits are one of the strongest impediments to lifestyle change, acting to ‘lock in’
182 behaviour (Marechal & Lazaric, 2011). Many interventions (e.g., information campaigns) are ineffective
183 because they are not strong enough to disrupt habits (Verplanken et al., 1997). But since habits are cued by
184 stable contexts (i.e., the same time, place and/or social group; Wood et al., 2005), change in context disrupts
185 habits (Verplanken et al., 2008). Consistent with this, times of significant change or transition (Thompson et
186 al., 2011) have been identified as key opportunities for reconfiguring lifestyles (Capstick et al., 2014; Graham-
187 Rowe et al., 2011) and identities (Devine-Wright et al., 2020). Research shows that disruptions – either life-
188 course (e.g. moving home) or structural events (e.g. economic downturn, extreme weather events, the COVID-
189 19 pandemic) – provide opportunities to more effectively change behaviours (Verplanken et al., 2018;
190 Birkmann et al., 2010; Marsden et al., 2020; Carroll & Conboy, 2020). For example, low-carbon behaviours,
191 such as bus use, energy efficiency and waste reduction measures, have been shown to be more effectively
192 changed using low-cost interventions in the 12 weeks following relocation (Verplanken & Roy, 2016;
193 Thøgersen, 2012; Ralph & Brown, 2017), as well as at other moments of change (Nicolson et al., 2017).

194

195 4 Conclusion

196

197 While several behaviour models exist to explain and predict mitigation and adaptation behaviours, their utility
198 in establishing meaningful change is limited due to their being too reductive, individualistic, linear,
199 deliberative and blind to environmental impact. This has led to a focus on suboptimal intervention strategies,
200 particularly informational approaches, that are relatively ineffective in changing impactful climate behaviours.
201 Addressing the climate crisis requires a focus on high-impact behaviours (mobility, food, consumption,
202 resilience) and high-emitting groups; interdisciplinary approaches to designing interventions that address the
203 diverse and interacting behavioural barriers and drivers; people’s multiple roles (not only as consumers),
204 including professional and collective actions; and temporal dynamics to ensure interventions are targeted to
205 times when habits are weaker.

206

207 References

208

209 Abrahamse, W., & Steg, L. (2013). Social influence approaches to encourage resource conservation: a meta-
210 analysis. *Global Environ Change*, 23, 1773–1785.

211 Abrahamse, W., & Matthies, E. (2012). Informational strategies to promote pro-environmental behaviours:
212 Changing knowledge, awareness, and attitudes. In: L. Steg, A. E. van den Berg, & J. I. M. de Groot
213 (Eds.). *Environmental Psychology: An Introduction* (pp. 224-231). Stafford: Wiley- Blackwell.

- 214 Abrahamse, W., Steg, L., Vlek, C., & Rothengatter, T. (2005). A review of intervention studies aimed at
215 household energy conservation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25(3), 273–291.
- 216 Agarwal S., & Koo, K.M. (2016). Impact of electronic road pricing (ERP) changes on transport modal choice.
217 *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 60:1-1.
- 218 Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision*
219 *Processes*, 50, 179-211
- 220 Bain P.G., Hornsey M.J., Bongiorno R., & Jeffries C. (2012). Promoting pro-environmental action in climate
221 change deniers. *Nature Climate Change*, 2:600–603.
- 222 Bamberg, S. (2002). Effects of implementation intentions on the actual performance of new environmentally
223 friendly behaviours: results of two field experiments. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 22(4), 399–
224 411.
- 225 Bem D.J. (1972) Self-perception theory In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*
226 (Vol. 6, pp.1-62). New York: Academic Press.
- 227 Birkmann, J., Buckle, P., Jaeger, J., et al. (2010). Extreme events and disasters: a window of opportunity for
228 change? Analysis of organizational, institutional and political changes, formal and informal responses
229 after mega-disasters. *Natural Hazards*, 55, 637–655.
- 230 Bollinger, B. & Gillingham, K. (2012). Peer effects in the diffusion of solar photovoltaic panels. *Marketing*
231 *Science* 31(6), 900-912.
- 232 Blennow, K. & J. Persson, (2009). Climate change: Motivation for taking measure to adapt. *Global*
233 *Environmental Change*, 19 (1), 100-104.
- 234 Cairns, S., Atkins, S., & Goodwin, P. (2002). *Disappearing traffic? The story so far.*
235 https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/disappearing_traffic_cairns.pdf
- 236 Capstick S, Demski C, Cherry C, Verfuert C & Steentjes K (2020) Climate Change Citizens’ Assemblies.
237 CAST Briefing Paper 03. Available from: www.cast.ac.uk/publications.
- 238 Capstick, S., Lorenzoni, I., Corner, S. & Whitmarsh, L. (2014). Social science prospects for radical emissions
239 reduction. *Carbon Management*, 4(5), 429-445.
- 240 Carroll, N., & Conboy, K. (2020). Normalising the “new normal”: Changing tech-driven work practices under
241 pandemic time pressure. *International Journal of Information Management* 55, 102186.
- 242 CCC (2019). *Net Zero: The UK’s contribution to stopping global warming*. UK Committee on Climate
243 Change, London.
- 244 Clayton, S., Devine-Wright, P., Stern, P., Whitmarsh, L., Carrico, A., Steg, L. Swim, J. & Bonnes, M. (2015).
245 Psychological Research and Global Climate Change. *Nature Climate Change*, 5, 640-646.
- 246 Corner, A., Markowitz, E. & Pidgeon, N. (2014), Public engagement with climate change: the role of human
247 values. *WIREs Clim Change*, 5: 411-422.
- 248 De Groot J., & Schuitema G. (2012). How to make the unpopular popular? Policy characteristics, social norms
249 and the acceptability of environmental policies. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 19–20, 100–107.

250 Devine-Wright, P., Pinto de Carvalho, L., Di Masso, A., Lewicka, M., Manzo, L., & Williams, D. R. (2020).
251 “Re-placed” - Reconsidering relationships with place and lessons from a pandemic. *Journal of*
252 *Environmental Psychology*, 72, 101514.

253 Ferguson, M. A., McDonald, R. I., & Branscombe, N. R. (2016). Global climate change: A social identity
254 perspective on informational and structural interventions. In S. McKeown, R. Haji, & N. Ferguson
255 (Eds.), *Understanding peace and conflict through social identity theory: Contemporary and worldwide*
256 *perspectives* (pp. 145-164). Springer.

257 Forward, S. E. (2014). Exploring people’s willingness to bike using a combination of the theory of planned
258 behavioural and the transtheoretical model. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 64(3), 151–159.

259 **Galvin, R. (2013). Targeting ‘behavers’ rather than behaviours: a ‘subject-oriented’ approach for reducing
260 space heating rebound effects in low energy dwellings. *Energy and buildings*, 67, 596-607.
261 *Empirical paper using sensor data in homes to identify predictors of energy consumption, including*
262 *routines and physical fabric of buildings. Findings importantly highlight the large inequality in emissions*
263 *linked to homes: e.g., ‘heavy’ consumers (23% of households) consume 52% of space heating energy,*
264 *versus ‘light consumers’ (20% of households) consume only 3%.*

265 Geller, E.S. (2002). From Ecological Behaviorism to Response Generalization: Where Should We Make
266 Discriminations? *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 21, 55-73.

267 Gössling, S. (2019). Celebrities, air travel, and social norms. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 79, 102775.

268 Graham-Rowe E, Skippon S, Gardner B, & Abraham C (2011). Can we reduce car use and, if so, how? A
269 review of available evidence. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy & Practice*, 45(5): 401–418.

270 Graziano, M. & Gillingham, K. (2015). Spatial patterns of solar photovoltaic system adoption: the influence
271 of neighbors and the built environment. *Journal of Economic Geography* 15(4), 815-839.

272 Grothmann, T. & A. Patt, 2005: Adaptive capacity and human cognition: The process of individual adaptation
273 to climate change. *Global Environmental Change*, 15 (3), 199-213,

274 Henderson DK, Mokhtarian PL. (1996). Impacts of center-based telecommuting on travel and emissions:
275 analysis of the Puget Sound Demonstration Project. *Transp. Res. D Transp. Environ.* 1(1), 29–45.

276 Henrich, J., & Muthukrishna, M. (2020). The Origins and Psychology of Human Cooperation. *Annual Review*
277 *of Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-081920-042106>

278 Hunter, E., & Rööös, E. (2016). Fear of climate change consequences and predictors of intentions to alter meat
279 consumption. *Food Policy*, 62, 151-160.

280 *Ivanova, D. et al 2020 Quantifying the potential for climate change mitigation of consumption options
281 *Environ. Res. Lett.* 15 093001
282 *Systematic review of modelling studies to identify most effective emission-reduction behaviours, which*
283 *together could make a large contribution to reaching climate mitigation targets. Results show that these*
284 *actions include: living car-free, shifting to a battery electric vehicle, reducing flying, adopting a vegan*
285 *diet, using renewable electricity, refurbishment and renovation.*

286 Kaiser, M., Bernauer, M., Sunstein, C.R. & Reisch, L.A. (2020). The power of green defaults: the impact of
287 regional variation of opt-out tariffs on green energy demand in Germany. *Ecological Economics* 174,
288 106685.

289 Kurz, T., Augoustinos, M. & Crabb, S. (2010), Contesting the ‘national interest’ and maintaining ‘our
290 lifestyle’: A discursive analysis of political rhetoric around climate change. *British Journal of Social
291 Psychology*, 49: 601-625.

292 Kurz B, Gardner B, Verplanken C, Abraham C. (2015). Habitual behaviours or patterns of practice? Explaining
293 and changing repetitive climate-relevant actions. *WIREs Climate Change*, 6:113–128.

294 Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers of group dynamics, *Human Relations*, 1, 5-41.

295 Maibach EW, Nisbet M, Baldwin P et al (2010) Reframing climate change as a public health issue: an
296 exploratory study of public reactions. *BMC Public Health* 10(299).

297 **Maki, A., Carrico, A. R., Raimi, K. T., Truelove, H. B., Araujo, B., & Yeung, K. L. (2019). Meta-analysis
298 of pro-environmental behaviour spillover. *Nature Sustainability*, 2(4), 307-315.
299 *Meta-analysis of pro-environmental behavioural (PEB) spillover, showing mixed but small effects of
300 interventions on non-targeted behaviours; positive spillover was more likely when interventions targeted
301 intrinsic motivation and when targeted and untargeted behaviours were similar.*

302 Marechal, K. & Lazaric, N. (2011). Overcoming inertia: insights from evolutionary economics into improved
303 energy and climate policies. *Climate Policy*, 10, 103-119.

304 Masterson VA, Stedman RC, Enqvist J, Tengö M, Giusti M, Wahl D, & Svedin U. (2017). The contribution
305 of sense of place to social-ecological systems research: a review and research agenda. *Ecology and
306 Society*, 1:22(1).

307 Matthies, E., Klöckner, C.A. & Preißner, C.L. (2006), Applying a Modified Moral Decision Making Model to
308 Change Habitual Car Use: How Can Commitment be Effective? *Applied Psychology*, 55: 91-106.

309 Michie, S., van Stralen, M.M. & West, R. (2011). The behaviour change wheel: A new method for
310 characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Implementation Science*, 6 (1).

311 Moser, S.C. (2014). Communicating adaptation to climate change: the art and science of public engagement
312 when climate change comes home. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 5 (3), 337-358.

313 Nash N., Whitmarsh, L., Capstick, S., Hargreaves, T., Poortinga, W., Thomas, G., Sautkina, E. & Xenias, D.,
314 (2017). Climate-relevant behavioral spillover and the potential contribution of social practice
315 theory. *WIREs Climate Change*, 8: doi: 10.1002/wcc.481

316 Nicolson, M., Huebner, G. M., Shipworth, D., & Elam, S. (2017). Tailored emails prompt electric vehicle
317 owners to engage with tariff switching information. *Nature Energy*, 2, 17073.

318 *Nielsen, K. S., Clayton, S., Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., Capstick, S., & Whitmarsh, L. (2021). How psychology
319 can help limit climate change. *American Psychologist*, 76(1), 130–144.
320 *Critical review paper arguing that psychological concepts should be integrated into interventions to more
321 effectively reduce greenhouse gas emissions.; but also argues that psychology should be better at
322 distinguishing different types of behaviour, acknowledging sociocultural context, and collaborating
323 across disciplines.*

- 324 Nilsson A, Bergquist M, Schultz W.P. (2016). Spillover effects in environmental behaviors, across time and
325 context: a review and research agenda. *Environmental Education Research*, 3:1–7.
- 326 Nolan JM, Schultz PW, Cialdini RB, Goldstein NJ, & Griskevicius V. (2008). Normative social influence is
327 underdetected. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34:913–923.
- 328 **Otto, I. M., Wiedermann, M., Cremades, R., Donges, J. F., Auer, C., & Lucht, W. (2020). Human agency
329 in the anthropocene. *Ecological Economics*, 167, 106463.
330 *Conceptual paper that demonstrates how human agency has shaped global environment, and outlines the*
331 *multiple roles (both directly and indirectly via social structures) individuals can play in addressing*
332 *climate change*
- 333 Percoco M. (2014). The effect of road pricing on traffic composition: Evidence from a natural experiment in
334 Milan, Italy. *Transport Policy*, 31:55-60.
- 335 Peters, G. J. Y., Ruiter, R. A., & Kok, G. (2013). Threatening communication: a critical re-analysis and a
336 revised meta-analytic test of fear appeal theory. *Health Psychology Review*, 7(sup1), S8-S31.
- 337 Pettifor, H., Wilson, C., McCollum, D., & Edelenbosch, O. Y. (2017). Modelling social influence and cultural
338 variation in global low-carbon vehicle transitions. *Global Environmental Change*, 47, 76-87.
- 339 *Poortinga W, & Whitaker L. (2018). Promoting the use of reusable coffee cups through environmental
340 messaging, the provision of alternatives and financial incentives. *Sustainability*, 10(3):873.
341 *A field experiment conducted in workplaces cafes to reduce use of disposable coffee cups, finding that*
342 *environmental messaging, provision of reusable cups, and a charge on disposable cups (but not a discount*
343 *on reusable cups) changed behaviour. Importantly, effects were additive; that is, behaviour change was*
344 *greatest when a combination of measures were applied.*
- 345 Prochaska, J.O., Redding, C.A., & Evers, K. (2002). The Transtheoretical Model and Stages of Change. In K.
346 Glanz, B.K. Rimer & F.M. Lewis, (Eds.) *Health Behavior and Health Education: Theory, Research, and*
347 *Practice* (3rd Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- 348 RAE (2015). *Built for Living*. [https://www.raeng.org.uk/publications/reports/built-for-living-understanding-](https://www.raeng.org.uk/publications/reports/built-for-living-understanding-behaviour)
349 [behaviour](https://www.raeng.org.uk/publications/reports/built-for-living-understanding-behaviour).
- 350 Ralph, K. M., & Brown, A. E. (2017). The role of habit and residential location in travel behavior change
351 programs, a field experiment. *Transportation*. doi: 10.1007/s11116-017-9842-7.
- 352 Rogers, R.W. (1983). Cognitive and physiological processes in fear appeals and attitude change: A Revised
353 theory of protection motivation. In J. Cacioppo & R. Petty (Eds.), *Social Psychophysiology*. New York:
354 Guilford Press.
- 355 Sabherwal, A, Ballew, MT, van der Linden, S, et al. (2021). The Greta Thunberg Effect: Familiarity with Greta
356 Thunberg predicts intentions to engage in climate activism in the United States. *Journal of Applied Social*
357 *Psychology, in press.*
- 358 Sniehotta, F. F., Pesseau, J., & Araújo-Soares, V. (2014) Time to retire the Theory of Planned Behaviour,
359 *Health Psychology Review*, 8(1), 1-7.

360 Staats, H. J., Wit, A. P., & Midden, C. J. H. (1996). Communicating the greenhouse effect to the public :
361 evaluation of a mass media campaign from a social dilemma perspective. *Journal of Environmental*
362 *Management*, 46(2), 189-203.

363 Steg, L. & Nordlund, A. (2018). Theories to Explain Environmental Behaviour. In *Environmental Psychology*
364 (eds L. Steg and J.I.M. Groot). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119241072.ch22>

365 Steinhorst J, Klöckner CA, & Matthies E. (2015). Saving electricity—for the money or the environment? Risks
366 of limiting pro-environmental spillover when using monetary framing. *Journal of Environmental*
367 *Psychology*, 43:125–135.

368 Stern, P. C. (2000). Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*,
369 56, 407–424.

370 Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., Abel, T., Guagnano, G.A. & Kalof, L. (1999). A value-belief-norm theory of support
371 for social movements: The case of environmentalism. *Human Ecology*, 6, 81–97

372 Sweetman, J. & Whitmarsh, L. (2016). Climate Justice: High-status ingroup social models increase pro-
373 environmental action through making actions seem more moral. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 8, 196-221.

374 TfL (2006). *Central London congestion charging: Impacts monitoring*. [http://content.tfl.gov.uk/fourth-annual-](http://content.tfl.gov.uk/fourth-annual-report-overview.pdf)
375 [report-overview.pdf](http://content.tfl.gov.uk/fourth-annual-report-overview.pdf)

376 Thøgersen, J., & Crompton, T. (2009). Simple and painless? The limitations of spillover in environmental
377 campaigning. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 32(2), 141-163.

378 Thøgersen J, Ölander F. (2003). Spillover of environment-friendly consumer behaviour. *Journal of*
379 *Environmental Psychology*, 23:225–236.

380 Thøgersen, J. (2012). The importance of timing for breaking commuters' car driving habits. In A. Warde & D.
381 Southerton (Eds), *The Habits of Consumption* (pp.130-140). Helsinki: Helsinki Collegium for Advances
382 Studies.

383 Thomas GO, Poortinga W, & Sautkina E. (2016). The Welsh single-use carrier bag charge and behavioural
384 spillover. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 47:126-35.

385 Thomas, G. O., Sautkina, E., Poortinga, W., Wolstenholme, E., & Whitmarsh, L. (2019). The English plastic
386 bag charge changed behavior and increased support for other charges to reduce plastic waste. *Frontiers*
387 *in Psychology*, 10, 266.

388 UNEP (2020). *Emissions Gap Report*. Available from <https://www.unep.org/>

389 van Zomeren, M., Pauls, I. L., & Cohen-Chen, S. (2019). Is hope good for motivating collective action in the
390 context of climate change? Differentiating hope's emotion-and problem-focused coping functions. *Global*
391 *Environmental Change*, 58, 101915.

392 **Van Valkengoed, A. M. & L. Steg, (2019). Meta-analyses of factors motivating climate change adaptation
393 behaviour. *Nature Climate Change*, 9 (2), 158-163.

394 *This paper presents a meta-analysis of factors which influence adaptation behaviours. Contrary to what*
395 *is often assumed, knowledge and experience of extreme weather are weak predictors; whereas descriptive*
396 *norms, negative affect, perceived self-efficacy and outcome efficacy are the main predictors.*

- 397 Verplanken B, & Wood W. (2006). Interventions to Break and Create Consumer Habits. *Journal of Public*
398 *Policy & Marketing*, 25(1):90-103.
- 399 Verplanken, B. & Roy, D. (2016). Empowering interventions to promote sustainable lifestyles: Testing the
400 habit discontinuity hypothesis in a field experiment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 45, 127-134.
- 401 Verplanken, B., Aarts, H., & van Knippenberg, A. (1997). Habit, information acquisition, and the process of
402 making travel mode choices. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 539–560.
- 403 *Verplanken, B., Roy, D. & Whitmarsh, L. (2018). Cracks in the Wall: Habit Discontinuities as Vehicles for
404 Behavior Change. In Verplanken, B. (Ed). *The Psychology of Habit*. Springer.
405 *This chapter reviews the evidence of how habits are disrupted during periods of transition, such as*
406 *relocation and retirement, and how these periods represent opportunities to more effectively intervene to*
407 *change behaviour (e.g., towards low-carbon action).*
- 408 Verplanken, B., Walker, I., Davis, A., & Jurasek, M. (2008). Context change and travel mode choice:
409 Combining the habit discontinuity and self-activation hypotheses. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*,
410 28, 121-127
- 411 Whitmarsh L, Capstick S, & Nash N. (2017). Who is reducing their material consumption and why? A cross-
412 cultural analysis of dematerialization behaviours. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*,
413 20160376.
- 414 Whitmarsh, L. & Corner, A. (2017). Tools for a new climate conversation: A mixed-methods study of language
415 for public engagement across the political spectrum. *Global Environmental Change*, 42, 122–135.
- 416 Whittle, C., Whitmarsh, L., et al. (2019). User decision-making in transitions to electrified, autonomous,
417 shared or reduced mobility. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 71, 302-319.
- 418 *Wolske, K.S., Gillingham, K.T. & Schultz, W. (2020). Peer influence on household energy behaviours.
419 *Nature Energy*, 5, 2012-212.
420 *This review paper presents a conceptual framework for predicting which social influence processes result*
421 *in peer effects (when behaviour is shaped by that of neighbours) for different energy behaviours, such as*
422 *installing solar panels and domestic energy saving.*
- 423 *Wolstenholme E, Poortinga W, & Whitmarsh L. (2020). Two Birds, One Stone: The Effectiveness of Health
424 and Environmental Messages to Reduce Meat Consumption and Encourage Pro-environmental
425 Behavioral Spillover. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7;11:577111.
426 *Experimental study comparing the efficacy of different message framings (environmental, health,*
427 *combined) on red/processed meat reduction, finding that all messages effectively reduced behaviour*
428 *during the experimental period and one month later .*
- 429 WRAP (2019). The Effectiveness of Providing Pre-Purchase Factual Information in encouraging more
430 Environmentally Sustainable Product Purchase Decisions. Downloaded on 28 Nov 2020 from
431 <https://www.wrap.org.uk/providing-pre-purchase-information>
- 432 Wynes, S. & Nicholas, K.A. (2017). The climate mitigation gap: education and government recommendations
433 miss the most effective individual actions, *Environmental Research Letters* 12, 074024.

- 434 Young, W., Davis, M., McNeill, I. M., Malhotra, B., Russell, S., Unsworth, K., & Clegg, C.
435 W. (2015) Changing Behaviour: Successful Environmental Programmes in the Workplace. *Business*
436 *Strategy & the Environment*, 24: 689–703.
- 437 Yuriev, A., Dahmen, M., Paillé, P., Boiral, O., & Guillaumie, L. (2020). Pro-environmental behaviors through
438 the lens of the theory of planned behavior: A scoping review. *Resources, Conservation and*
439 *Recycling*, 155, 104660.