Review

Behaviour change to address climate change

Lorraine Whitmarsh[1,3], Wouter Poortinga[2,3] and
Stuart Capstick[2,3]

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.

Addresses
[1] Department of Psychology, University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath, BA2 7AY, United Kingdom
[2] School of Psychology, Cardiff University, United Kingdom
[3] Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations, United Kingdom

Corresponding author: Whitmarsh, Lorraine (lw2253@bath.ac.uk)

Introduction

Behaviour change is a central element of addressing the climate crisis. Most of the interventions required to reach global emission reduction targets (i.e., climate *mitigation*) require at least some behavioural change [1] and *adapting* to the growing impacts of climate change similarly requires significant lifestyle and societal change [2]. Impactful mitigation actions include avoiding flying and driving, and reducing red meat, dairy, material and energy consumption [3,4]; while adaptation measures include emergency and long-term behavioural responses such as preparing for extreme weather events [5].

Behaviour change is often narrowly conceived as individual-level consumer action (e.g., buying a low-carbon product, recycling, reducing meat-eating), but is more appropriately understood as extending across the many roles and contexts humans occupy: as members of communities, participants in organisations, and as citizens who can influence policies [6]. In addition to consumer action, behaviour of relevance for climate action thus encompasses the adoption of low-carbon and climate-resilient technologies (e.g. installing insulation); support for large-scale low-carbon infrastructures (e.g., windfarms); political action to support or demand climate change measures (e.g., voting and protesting); participation in policy formulation (e.g., through citizen juries) and grassroots activities (e.g., community energy or transport initiatives); and engaging in climate change conversations and interactions with others that raise awareness, enable and normalise low-carbon lifestyles. This extensive list highlights the need for all areas of psychology (social, environmental, community, organisational, political, economic, health, and developmental etc.) to develop, test and apply behaviour change theories and interventions [6,7]. In this article, we describe recent progress in psychological research, identify knowledge gaps, and set priorities for further research to inform more effective mitigation and adaptation behaviour change to address the climate crisis.

Behaviour (change) models and their limitations
Overview of models
Numerous behavioural theories and models exist to explain and predict mitigation and adaptation actions. The theory of planned behaviour (TPB; [8,9], the value-belief-norm (VBN; [10,11] and the transtheoretical model (TTM; [12]) are most commonly applied to mitigation behaviours. The TPB, originating in broader social psychology research, posits that intentional behaviour is predicted by attitudes, social norms and perceived behavioural control (PBC); in other words,

what we think and feel, social pressure, and capacity to act drive action. The VBN, by contrast, was developed specifically with pro-environmental behaviour in mind, and emphasises the role of personal norms in personal action, which are a product of people's awareness of consequences and ascription of responsibility to the self. These beliefs in turn are rooted in deeper personal values and worldviews. Broadly, the VBN has been shown to predict political or low-impact pro-environmental actions (e.g., recycling); whereas the TPB can explain higher-impact environmental behaviours (e.g., avoiding driving) because it incorporates structural constraints via the PBC construct [10,13]. Unlike the TPB and VBN, the TTM is a more dynamic theory of behaviour *change*, describing the stages a person moves through in establishing new behaviours, including contemplation, preparation, action, and maintenance of behaviour change. This model has been influential in health psychology but has also been used to predict certain climate mitigation behaviours such as red meat reduction and cycle use [14,15].

Protection motivation theory [16]) has been applied to adaptation behaviours such as flood protection. This model posits that risk-protection measures result from appraisals of a threat and an adaptive coping response to deal with the threat [17]. These appraisals are in turn influenced by knowledge of available adaptation strategies [18]; descriptive norms (i.e., what is seen as 'normal'), negative emotions, perceived self-efficacy and outcome efficacy (belief that the adaptive actions will have intended benefit) of adaptive actions [5,19].

Critiques and gaps

While these models highlight some of the main drivers of and barriers to climate action, recent critiques have identified limitations and gaps that impede significant progress in this area. First, the models are restricted to a small number of common theoretical constructs which limits their utility in understanding behaviour and informing interventions (cf., [20,21]. Second, a related criticism is that the models are too *individualistic*. Structural factors (e.g., income, location) have been shown to far outweigh psychological factors in predicting carbon-emitting behaviours [22,23], and yet with the partial exception of PBC, the cultural and physical context of action is absent from these models, and interventions have not been targeted towards high emitters [6,24]. Attempts to offer more integrative and interdisciplinary perspectives on pro-environmental action, such as the attitude-behaviour-context (ABC; [10]) or capability, opportunity, motivation-behaviour (COM-B; [25]) models, have hardly been taken up by psychologists working on climate action.

Third, widely used behaviour models can be considered too *linear*, by assuming that behaviour is the end point of a causal chain of attitudinal psychological factors. Yet, behaviour change can lead to changed attitudes or identity [26,27] and impact on other behaviours via spillover or rebound effects [28,29]. Fourth, with the exception of some research on collective action (e.g., [30] psychological approaches assume people act alone and in isolation from others; even social norms are conceived as individual *perceptions* of expectations and obligations held by the individual, and there have been few attempts to understand how personal action influences others, or affects the broader contexts within which people act (e.g., via processes of 'social contagion' and peer influence; [31]. Together, these concerns highlight the need for more interdisciplinary and systems perspectives to understand how to establish pro-environmental behaviour change (cf. behavioural ecology; [32]; social influence and cooperation; [33]; social-ecological systems; [34].

Fifth, models typically assume a 'rational', or at least *deliberative*, mode of decision-making, whereas much of our behaviour (including climate-relevant action) is habitual, i.e., unconscious routines triggered by contextual cues rather than a conscious deliberation of alternatives [35]. This omission has meant interventions have failed to factor in habit-breaking as a precursor to behaviour change [27]. Finally, the models fail to distinguish *types of behaviour* in terms of their impact or malleability, and thus provide no practical guidance for which behaviours interventions should focus on for maximal climate benefit. Consequently, there has been a tendency for environmental psychologists to focus on low-impact, incremental behaviour changes (e.g., curtailment of energy use) that is 'simple and painless' [36] rather than higher impact, more transformative behaviour changes, such as purchasing energy-efficient or renewable energy equipment [6] which are necessary for lifestyle change that is in line with effective climate change mitigation [37]. As we discuss in the next section, these gaps and limitations in theory has led to suboptimal interventions (e.g., information provision).

Behaviour change interventions
Intervention typologies

Different typologies of behaviour change interventions exist that target *individual decision-making* ('downstream') versus the *context* in which decisions are made ('upstream'; [38]; measures that *provide/improve* options ('pull') versus *removing* them ('push'; [39]; or that make use of automatic ('nudge') versus more intentional or deliberative processes (e.g., citizens assemblies; [40]. In general, evidence from climate change and related areas suggests the need for combining multiple approaches. Changing choice architecture 'behind the scenes' may help to change specific behaviours, but this is not sufficient for the profound and participatory social

transformation required to respond to the climate crisis [41,42]; information provision and incentives are more effective when combined with broader social and infrastructural interventions [37]; and removing high-carbon options may be needed alongside providing low-carbon ones to establish the greatest change [43].

Efficacy of different interventions

Psychologists have tended to focus on informational interventions—whether to raise knowledge, or influence psychological variables—in line with the individualist, deliberative focus of their behavioural models. Yet, evidence shows that informational approaches are generally less effective than other types of intervention [44]. Information campaigns may raise awareness and concern but do not always produce behaviour change [45]. Informational approaches that are more effective in changing behaviour: (a) tailor messages to audience values and beliefs [46]; (b) communicate the wider (co-)benefits of climate action [14,47,48]; (c) target times and locations of decision-making, such as via product labels [49,50] or energy feedback metres [51]; (d) leverage moral or social influence through normative messaging [52,53]; (e) promote self-efficacy instead of, or in addition to appealing to fear [54,55], and (f) encourage setting specific and realistic goals to motivate action [51].

Social influence is one of the strongest factors shaping behaviour, yet rarely recognised by individuals themselves [56]. Adoption of low-carbon innovations, such as electric cars and solar panels, is significantly shaped by social norms and neighbourhood effects [57—59]. The importance of social modelling in low-carbon, climate-resilient behaviours highlights the relevance of leadership in reshaping social norms [60] and fostering collective efficacy [61]; and the potential for more discursive approaches (e.g., group discussion) to promoting climate action (cf. [62,63]. Among interventions that leverage social norms, the block leader approach, public commitment and social modelling have been shown to be effective, with direct personal influence from similar others a key process shaping action [64]. Effective organisational interventions similarly find that social factors, such as management support, are important for bringing about behaviour change, alongside informational, financial and infrastructural measures [65,66].

Public commitment approaches involve asking respondents to make a pledge to change their behaviour, and rely on the psychological drive for consistency (or reducing 'cognitive dissonance') between attitudes and behaviours [44]. Commitment interventions can be effective for promoting climate actions, such as using public transit [67]. Consistency processes are also thought to be relevant for behavioural spillover—the notion that changing one behaviour may trigger further behavioural changes [68]. Yet, a growing evidence base shows that spillover remains an elusive or even counterproductive phenomenon [28,69—72].

Economic and structural interventions have been studied much less in the psychological literature, consistent with gaps in the dominant behavioural models. Pricing policies can change incentives in favour of low-carbon alternatives and/or away from high-carbon options. Congestion charging has been shown to reduce car use [73] and shift demand towards public transport [74] and lower-emission vehicles [75]. Charges have also been suggested as a way to disrupt automatic behaviours by making purchase decisions more deliberative [27], but may need to be combined with other approaches to boost their efficacy [76]. Physical and broader structural measures might include designing stair use (rather than lift use) as the default in buildings; pedestrianisation and cycle lanes; green infrastructure; low-carbon buildings and so on (e.g., [43,77].

A growing literature points to the importance not only of *how* to intervene to achieve social and lifestyle change, but also *when*. Habits are one of the strongest impediments to lifestyle change, acting to 'lock in' behaviour [78]. Many interventions (e.g., information campaigns) are ineffective because they are not strong enough to disrupt habits [79]. But because habits are cued by stable contexts (i.e., the same time, place and/or social group; [80]), change in context disrupts habits [81]. Consistent with this, times of significant change or transition [82] have been identified as key opportunities for reconfiguring lifestyles [83,84] and identities [85]. Research shows that disruptions—either life-course (e.g., moving home) or structural events (e.g., economic downturn, extreme weather events, the COVID-19 pandemic)—provide opportunities to more effectively change behaviours [86—89]. For example, low-carbon behaviours, such as bus use, energy efficiency and waste reduction measures, have been shown to be more effectively changed using low-cost interventions in the 12 weeks after relocation [68,90,91], as well as at other moments of change [92].

Conclusion

While several behaviour models exist to explain and predict mitigation and adaptation behaviours, 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, that are relatively ineffective in changing impactful climate behaviours. Addressing the climate crisis requires a focus on high-impact behaviours (mobility, food, consumption,

resilience) and high-emitting groups; interdisciplinary approaches to designing interventions that address the diverse and interacting behavioural barriers and drivers; people's multiple roles (not only as consumers), including professional and collective actions; and temporal dynamics to ensure interventions are targeted to times when habits are weaker.

Funding

Author contributions

LW: contributed to writing—original draft; writing—review and editing. WP: Writing − review & editing. SC: Writing − review & editing

Conflict of interest statement

Nothing declared.

References

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

* of special interest

[1]. CCC: *Net Zero: the UK's Contribution to Stopping Global Warming*. London: UK Committee on Climate Change; 2019.

[2]. IPCC: *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]*. Geneva, Switzerland: IPCC; 2014.

[3]. Wynes S, Nicholas KA: **The climate mitigation gap: education and government recommendations miss the most effective individual actions**. *Environ Res Lett Strat Environ* 2017, **12**, 074024.

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

[5]. Van Valkengoed AM, Steg L: **Meta-analyses of factors moti-**
** **vating climate change adaptation behaviour**. *Nat Clim Change* 2019, **9**(2):158−163.
This paper presents a meta-analysis of factors which influence adaptation behaviours. Contrary to what is often assumed, knowledge and experience of extreme weather are weak predictors; whereas descriptive norms, negative affect, perceived self-efficacy and outcome efficacy are the main predictors.

[6]. Nielsen KS, Clayton S, Stern PC, Dietz T, Capstick S,
* Whitmarsh L: **How psychology can help limit climate change**. *Am Psychol* 2021, **76**(1):130−144.
Critical review paper arguing that psychological concepts should be integrated into interventions to more effectively reduce greenhouse gas emissions.; but also argues that psychology should be better at distinguishing different types of behaviour, acknowledging sociocultural context, and collaborating across disciplines.

[7]. Clayton S, Devine-Wright P, Stern P, Whitmarsh L, Carrico A, Steg L, Swim J, Bonnes M: **Psychological research and global climate change**. *Nat Clim Change* 2015, **5**:640−646.

[8]. Ajzen I. *The Theory of Planned Behaviour Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, vol. 50; 1991: 179−211.

[9]. Yuriev A, Dahmen M, Paillé P, Boiral O, Guillaumie L: **Pro-environmental behaviors through the lens of the theory of planned behavior: a scoping review**. *Resour Conserv Recycl* 2020, **155**:104660.

[10]. Stern PC: **Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior**. *J Soc Issues* 2000, **56**:407−424.

[11]. Stern PC, Dietz T, Abel T, Guagnano GA, Kalof L: **A value-belief-norm theory of support for social movements: the case of environmentalism**. *Hum Ecol* 1999, **6**:81−97.

[12]. Prochaska JO, Redding CA, Evers K: **The transtheoretical model and stages of change**. In *Health Behavior and Health Education: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Edited by Glanz K, Rimer BK, Lewis FM. third ed., San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc; 2002.

[13]. Steg L, Nordlund A: **Theories to explain environmental behaviour**. In *Environmental Psychology*. Edited by Steg L, Groot JIM; 2018; https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119241072.ch22.

[14]. Wolstenholme E, Poortinga W, Whitmarsh L: **Two birds, one**
* **stone: the effectiveness of health and environmental messages to reduce meat consumption and encourage pro-environmental behavioral spillover**. *Front Psychol* 2020, **7**(11):577111.
Experimental study comparing the efficacy of different message framings (environmental, health, combined) on red/processed meat reduction, finding that all messages effectively reduced behaviour during the experimental period and one month later.

[15]. Forward SE: **Exploring people's willingness to bike using a combination of the theory of planned behavioural and the transtheoretical model**. *Eur Rev Appl Psychol* 2014, **64**(3): 151−159.

[16]. Rogers RW: **Cognitive and physiological processes in fear appeals and attitude change: a Revised theory of protection motivation**. In *Social Psychophysiology*. Edited by Cacioppo J, Petty R, New York: Guilford Press; 1983.

[17]. Grothmann T, Patt A: **Adaptive capacity and human cognition: the process of individual adaptation to climate change**. *Global Environ Change* 2005, **15**(3):199−213.

[18]. Blennow K, Persson J: **Climate change: motivation for taking measure to adapt**. *Global Environ Change* 2009, **19**(1): 100−104.

[19]. Moser SC: **Communicating adaptation to climate change: the art and science of public engagement when climate change comes home**. *Wiley Interdisc Rev Climate Change* 2014, **5**(3): 337−358.

[20]. Sniehotta FF, Presseau J, Araújo-Soares V: **Time to retire the theory of planned behaviour**. *Health Psychol Rev* 2014, **8**(1): 1−7.

[21]. Ferguson MA, McDonald RI, Branscombe NR: **Global climate change: a social identity perspective on informational and structural interventions**. In *Understanding Peace and Conflict through Social Identity Theory: Contemporary and Worldwide Perspectives*. Edited by McKeown S, Haji R, Ferguson N, Springer; 2016:145−164.

[22]. Whitmarsh L, Capstick S, Nash N: **Who is reducing their material consumption and why? A cross-cultural analysis of dematerialization behaviours**. *Philos Trans Royal Soc A* 2017: 20160376.

[23]. Whittle C, Whitmarsh L, et al.: **User decision-making in transitions to electrified, autonomous, shared or reduced mobility**. *Transport Res Transport Environ* 2019, **71**:302−319.

[24]. Galvin R: **Targeting 'behavers' rather than behaviours: a**
** **'subject-oriented' approach for reducing space heating rebound effects in low energy dwellings**. *Energy Build* 2013, **67**:596−607.
Empirical paper using sensor data in homes to identify predictors of energy consumption, including routines and physical fabric of buildings. Findings importantly highlight the large inequality in emissions linked to homes: e.g., 'heavy' consumers (23% of households) consume 52% of

space heating energy, versus 'light consumers' (20% of households) consume only 3%.

[25]. Michie S, van Stralen MM, West R: **The behaviour change wheel: a new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions**. *Implement Sci* 2011, **6**(1).

[26]. Bem DJ: **Self-perception theory**. In Berkowitz L. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 6. New York: Academic Press; 1972:1−62.

[27]. Thomas GO, Sautkina E, Poortinga W, Wolstenholme E, Whitmarsh L: **The English plastic bag charge changed behavior and increased support for other charges to reduce plastic waste**. *Front Psychol* 2019, **10**:266.

[28]. Nash N, Whitmarsh L, Capstick S, Hargreaves T, Poortinga W, Thomas G, Sautkina E, Xenias D: **Climate-relevant behavioral spillover and the potential contribution of social practice theory**. *WIREs Clim Change* 2017, **8**, https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.481.

[29]. Nilsson A, Bergquist M, Schultz WP: **Spillover effects in environmental behaviors, across time and context: a review and research agenda**. *Environ Educ Res* 2016, **3**:1−7.

[30]. van Zomeren M, Pauls IL, Cohen-Chen S: **Is hope good for motivating collective action in the context of climate change? Differentiating hope's emotion-and problem-focused coping functions**. *Global Environ Change* 2019, **58**: 101915.

[31]. Wolske KS, Gillingham KT, Schultz W: **Peer influence on household energy behaviours**. *Nature Energy* 2020, **5**: 2012−2212.
* This review paper presents a conceptual framework for predicting which social influence processes result in peer effects (when behaviour is shaped by that of neighbours) for different energy behaviours, such as installing solar panels and domestic energy saving.

[32]. Geller ES: **From ecological behaviorism to response generalization: where should we make discriminations?** *J Organ Behav Manag* 2002, **21**:55−73.

[33]. Henrich J, Muthukrishna M: **The origins and psychology of human cooperation**. *Annu Rev Psychol* 2020, https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-081920-042106.

[34]. Masterson VA, Stedman RC, Enqvist J, Tengö M, Giusti M, Wahl D, Svedin U: **The contribution of sense of place to social-ecological systems research: a review and research agenda**. *Ecol Soc* 2017, **1**(1):22.

[35]. Kurz B, Gardner B, Verplanken C, Abraham C: **Habitual behaviours or patterns of practice? Explaining and changing repetitive climate-relevant actions**. *WIREs Clim Change* 2015, **6**:113−128.

[36]. Thøgersen J, Crompton T: **Simple and painless? The limitations of spillover in environmental campaigning**. *J Consum Pol* 2009, **32**(2):141−163.

[37]. UNEP: *Emissions gap report*. 2020. Available from: https://www.unep.org/.

[38]. Verplanken B, Wood W: **Interventions to break and create consumer habits**. *J Publ Pol Market* 2006, **25**(1):90−103.

[39]. De Groot J, Schuitema G: **How to make the unpopular popular? Policy characteristics, social norms and the acceptability of environmental policies**. *Environ Sci Pol* 2012, **19−20**:100−107.

[40]. Capstick S, Demski C, Cherry C, Verfuerth C, Steentjes K: *Climate Change Citizens' Assemblies*. CAST Briefing Paper 03. 2020. Available from:, www.cast.ac.uk/publications.

[41]. Corner A, Markowitz E, Pidgeon N: **Public engagement with climate change: the role of human values**. *WIREs Clim Change* 2014, **5**:411−422.

[42]. Otto IM, Wiedermann M, Cremades R, Donges JF, Auer C,
** Lucht W: **Human agency in the anthropocene**. *Ecol Econ* 2020, **167**:106463.
Conceptual paper that demonstrates how human agency has shaped global environment, and outlines the multiple roles (both directly and indirectly via social structures) individuals can play in addressing climate change

[43]. Cairns S, Atkins S, Goodwin P: *Disappearing Traffic? the Story So Far*. 2002. https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/disappearing_traffic_cairns.pdf.

[44]. Abrahamse W, Matthies E: **Informational strategies to promote pro-environmental behaviours: changing knowledge, awareness, and attitudes**. In *Environmental Psychology: an Introduction*. Edited by Steg L, van den Berg AE, de Groot JIM, Stafford: Wiley- Blackwell; 2012:224−231.

[45]. Staats HJ, Wit AP, Midden CJH: **Communicating the greenhouse effect to the public : evaluation of a mass media campaign from a social dilemma perspective**. *J Environ Manag* 1996, **46**(2):189−203.

[46]. Whitmarsh L, Corner A: **Tools for a new climate conversation: a mixed-methods study of language for public engagement across the political spectrum**. *Global Environ Change* 2017, **42**:122−135.

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

[48]. Bain P, Milfont T, Kashima Y, *et al.*: **Co-benefits of addressing climate change can motivate action around the world**. *Nature Clim Change* 2016, **6**:154−157.

[49]. WRAP: *The Effectiveness of Providing Pre-Purchase Factual Information in Encouraging More Environmentally Sustainable Product Purchase Decisions*. 2019. Downloaded on 28 Nov 2020 from, https://www.wrap.org.uk/providing-pre-purchase-information.

[50]. Kaiser M, Bernauer M, Sunstein CR, Reisch LA: **The power of green defaults: the impact of regional variation of opt-out tariffs on green energy demand in Germany**. *Ecol Econ* 2020, **174**:106685.

[51]. Abrahamse W, Steg L, Vlek C, Rothengatter T: **A review of intervention studies aimed at household energy conservation**. *J Environ Psychol* 2005, **25**(3):273−291.

[52]. Sweetman J, Whitmarsh L: **Climate Justice: high-status ingroup social models increase pro-environmental action through making actions seem more moral**. *Topics Cogn Sci* 2016, **8**:196−221.

[53]. Kormos C, Gifford R, Brown E: **The influence of descriptive social norm information on sustainable transportation behavior: a field experiment**. *Environ Behav* 2015, **47**(5): 479−501.

[54]. Peters GJY, Ruiter RA, Kok G: **Threatening communication: a critical re-analysis and a revised meta-analytic test of fear appeal theory**. *Health Psychol Rev* 2013, **7**(Suppl. 1):S8−S31.

[55]. Hunter E, Röös E: **Fear of climate change consequences and predictors of intentions to alter meat consumption**. *Food Pol* 2016, **62**:151−160.

[56]. Nolan JM, Schultz PW, Cialdini RB, Goldstein NJ, Griskevicius V: **Normative social influence is underdetected**. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull* 2008, **34**:913−923.

[57]. Bollinger B, Gillingham K: **Peer effects in the diffusion of solar photovoltaic panels**. *Market Sci* 2012, **31**(6):900−912.

[58]. Graziano M, Gillingham K: **Spatial patterns of solar photovoltaic system adoption: the influence of neighbors and the built environment**. *J Econ Geogr* 2015, **15**(4):815−839.

[59]. Pettifor H, Wilson C, McCollum D, Edelenbosch OY: **Modelling social influence and cultural variation in global low-carbon vehicle transitions**. *Global Environ Change* 2017, **47**:76−87.

[60]. Gössling S: **Celebrities, air travel, and social norms**. *Ann Tourism Res* 2019, **79**:102775.

[61]. Sabherwal A, Ballew MT, van der Linden S, *et al.*: **The greta thunberg effect: familiarity with greta thunberg predicts intentions to engage in climate activism in the United States**. *J Appl Soc Psychol* 2021, **51**:321−333.

[62]. Lewin K: **Frontiers of group dynamics**. *Hum Relat* 1947, **1**: 5−41.

[63]. Kurz T, Augoustinos M, Crabb S: **Contesting the 'national interest' and maintaining 'our lifestyle': a discursive analysis of political rhetoric around climate change**. *Br J Soc Psychol* 2010, **49**:601−625.

[64]. Abrahamse W, Steg L: **Social influence approaches to encourage resource conservation: a meta-analysis**. *Global Environ Change* 2013, **23**:1773−1785.

[65]. Young W, Davis M, McNeill IM, Malhotra B, Russell S, Unsworth K, Clegg CW: **Changing behaviour: successful environmental programmes in the workplace**. *Bus Strat Environ* 2015, **24**:689−703.

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

[67]. Matthies E, Klöckner CA, Preißner CL: **Applying a modified moral decision making model to change habitual car use: how can commitment be effective?** *Appl Psychol* 2006, **55**: 91−106.

[68]. Thøgersen J: **The importance of timing for breaking commuters' car driving habits**. In *The Habits of Consumption*. Edited by Warde A, Southerton D, Helsinki: Helsinki Collegium for Advances Studies; 2012:130−140.

[69]. Thomas GO, Poortinga W, Sautkina E: **The Welsh single-use carrier bag charge and behavioural spillover**. *J Environ Psychol* 2016, **47**:126−135.

[70]. Thøgersen J, Ölander F: **Spillover of environment-friendly consumer behaviour**. *J Environ Psychol* 2003, **23**:225−236.

[71]. Steinhorst J, Klöckner CA, Matthies E: **Saving electricity—for the money or the environment? Risks of limiting pro-environmental spillover when using monetary framing**. *J Environ Psychol* 2015, **43**:125−135.

[72]. Maki A, Carrico AR, Raimi KT, Truelove HB, Araujo B, ** Yeung KL: **Meta-analysis of pro-environmental behaviour spillover**. *Nature Sustain* 2019, **2**(4):307−315.
Meta-analysis of pro-environmental behavioural (PEB) spillover, showing mixed but small effects of interventions on non-targeted behaviours; positive spillover was more likely when interventions targeted intrinsic motivation and when targeted and untargeted behaviours were similar.

[73]. TFL: *Central London Congestion Charging: Impacts Monitoring*. 2006. http://content.tfl.gov.uk/fourth-annual-report-overview.pdf.

[74]. Agarwal S, Koo KM: **Impact of electronic road pricing (ERP) changes on transport modal choice**. *Reg Sci Urban Econ* 2016, **60**. 1-1.

[75]. Percoco M: **The effect of road pricing on traffic composition: evidence from a natural experiment in Milan, Italy**. *Transport Pol* 2014, **31**:55−60.

[76]. Poortinga W, Whitaker L: **Promoting the use of reusable * coffee cups through environmental messaging, the provision of alternatives and financial incentives**. *Sustainability* 2018, **10**(3):873.
A field experiment conducted in workplaces cafes to reduce use of disposable coffee cups, finding that environmental messaging, provision of reusable cups, and a charge on disposable cups (but not a discount on reusable cups) changed behaviour. Importantly, effects were additive; that is, behaviour change was greatest when a combination of measures were applied.

[77]. RAE: *Built for Living*. 2015. https://www.raeng.org.uk/publications/reports/built-for-living-understanding-behaviour.

[78]. Marechal K, Lazaric N: **Overcoming inertia: insights from evolutionary economics into improved energy and climate policies**. *Clim Pol* 2011, **10**:103−119.

[79]. Verplanken B, Aarts H, van Knippenberg A: **Habit, information acquisition, and the process of making travel mode choices**. *Eur J Soc Psychol* 1997, **27**:539−560.

[80]. Wood W, Tam L, Guerrero Witt M: **Changing circumstances, disrupting habits**. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2005, **88**:918−933.

[81]. Verplanken B, Walker I, Davis A, Jurasek M: **Context change and travel mode choice: combining the habit discontinuity and self-activation hypotheses**. *J Environ Psychol* 2008, **28**: 121−127.

[82]. Thompson S, Michaelson J, Abdallah S, Johnson V, Morris D, Riley K, Simms A: *Moments of Change as Opportunities for Influencing Behaviour: a Report to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs*. London: The New Economics Foundation. Defra; 2011.

[83]. Capstick S, Lorenzoni I, Corner S, Whitmarsh L: **Social science prospects for radical emissions reduction**. *Carbon Manag* 2014, **4**(5):429−445.

[84]. Graham-Rowe E, Skippon S, Gardner B, Abraham C: **Can we reduce car use and, if so, how? A review of available evidence**. *Transport Res Pol Pract* 2011, **45**(5):401−418.

[85]. Devine-Wright P, Pinto de Carvalho L, Di Masso A, Lewicka M, Manzo L, Williams DR: **"Re-placed" - reconsidering relationships with place and lessons from a pandemic**. *J Environ Psychol* 2020, **72**:101514.

[86]. Birkmann J, Buckle P, Jaeger J, *et al.*: **Extreme events and disasters: a window of opportunity for change? Analysis of organizational, institutional and political changes, formal and informal responses after mega-disasters**. *Nat Hazards* 2010, **55**:637−655.

[87]. Carroll N, Conboy K: **Normalising the "new normal": changing tech-driven work practices under pandemic time pressure**. *Int J Inf Manag* 2020, **55**:102186.

[88]. Verplanken B, Roy D, Whitmarsh L: **Cracks in the wall: habit * discontinuities as vehicles for behavior change**. In *The Psychology of Habit*. Edited by Verplanken B, Springer; 2018.
This chapter reviews the evidence of how habits are disrupted during periods of transition, such as relocation and retirement, and how these periods represent opportunities to more effectively intervene to change behaviour (e.g., towards low-carbon action).

[89]. Marsden G, Anable J, Chatterton T, Docherty I, Faulconbridge J, Murray L, Shires J: **Studying disruptive events: innovations in behaviour, opportunities for lower carbon transport policy?** *Transport Pol*. 2020, **94**:89−101, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2020.04.008.

[90]. Verplanken B, Roy D: **Empowering interventions to promote sustainable lifestyles: testing the habit discontinuity hypothesis in a field experiment**. *J Environ Psychol* 2016, **45**:127−134.

[91]. Ralph KM, Brown AE: **The role of habit and residential location in travel behavior change programs, a field experiment**. *Transportation* 2017, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-017-9842-7.

[92]. Nicolson M, Huebner GM, Shipworth D, Elam S: **Tailored emails prompt electric vehicle owners to engage with tariff switching information**. *Nature Energy* 2017, **2**:17073.