Mairaj
Vol 5, Issue 1
https://www.mairaj.pk editor.mairaj@gmail.com
ISSN Online 2959-2089 ISSN Print 2959-2070

Rizwana Wajid
Research Fellow Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi

Beyond Awareness: A Critical Secondary-Data Review Of Behaviour Change For Recycling And Resource Conservation

Abstract
Public awareness has been routinely treated as a key solution to low recycling and conservation performance, but decades of behavioural research demonstrate that knowledge is neither necessary nor adequate explanations for action. Critically, the secondary evidence of environmental psychology, behavioural economy, conservative research, waste management studies, meta-analyses, and international policy reports are summarised in this article. It examines the continuing gap between awareness-raising and behaviour, as well as its most effective ways of transforming concern into lasting action. Evidence suggests that behaviour is comprised of the interaction between motivating and contextual determinants, including attitudes, personal and social norms, perceived control, habit, identity, convenience, service design, pricing, and trust. Meta-analytic recycling and plastic reduction studies show that contextual opportunities and behavior-specific variables often predict observed behaviour better than overall environmental problems. Social norms, feedback, environmental restructuring, and well-designed incentives can be effective. However, their impacts are heterogeneous and may collapse upon the termination of interventions. It also presents a major measurement problem: a major part of the literature is based on intention and self-reported behaviour that can overestimate the impact on the real world. Thus, public awareness reaches its highest value if it is embedded in systems that make the desired behaviour easy, visible, credible, and socially improved. The paper proposes an integrated awareness-capability-opportunity-motivation framework and argues that reputable policy evaluation should measure actual material outcomes, persistence, spillover, distributional effects, and unintended consequences rather than campaign reach alone.

Keywords: Public Awareness; Recycling; Conservation; Pro-Environmental Behaviour; Behaviour Change; Secondary Data

1. Introduction

Authorities, local governments, universities, and environmental organisations often respond to low recycling or conservation rates through information campaigns. A basic model is simple: people can not act because they do not know enough, and better understanding must make a better attitude happen. The model is intuitively appealing, but empirically incomplete. The classic environmental behaviour literature has repeatedly identified an attitude or knowledge-action gap that reflects concern, while continuing practice that is helpful, traditional, cheap, or institutionally supported (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Steg & Vlek, 2009; White et al., 2019).

This gap is important, as raising awareness could misdiagnose the problem and shift responsibilities from systems to individuals. Recycling's environmental value can be understood in households, but there is a shortage of reliable waste management services. A tenant might want to save energy but has no control over equipment or heating. Consumers can intend to return electronic waste, but they are faced with an uncomfortable discharge point, uncertain data

security, or poor confidence in the disposal system. Under these circumstances, another message on environmental responsibility adds knowledge without changing the capacity or ability.

This paper aims to bring together critical secondary information on public awareness and changes in behaviour in recycling and conservation of resources. There are four questions: How well does awareness forecast behaviour, which psychological and contextual mechanisms are the most important, which intervention strategies have been best proven, and what methodological weaknesses limit the field? The central argument is that awareness is best understood as one of the elements of a wider pattern of behaviour. Effective policy aligns awareness with social standards, presumed effectiveness, convenient infrastructure, economic signals, and environments that support habit.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Foundations and Their Limits

The theory of planned behaviour (TPB) proposes that the intent is marked by attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control, with purpose and control, which contribute to behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). The TPB has been applied in a large manner to behaviour conducive to environmental protection and continues to distinguish useful because between motivation and supposed capability. However, surveys show that researchers often expand the model with moral norms, identity, past conduct, environmental concerns, or habits, as the initial designs do not fully reflect sustainable actions (Bamberg & Moser, 2007; Syed et al., 2024). A better model for application is therefore a diagnostic structure than an entire environmental action theory.

Value-Belief-Norm theory highlights another mechanism. Environmental values and beliefs activate personal norms when people feel exposed, responsible, or reactive (Stern et al., 1999; Stern, 2000). This provides a justification for moral obligations that can predict recycling and retention, even when the direct material benefit is weak. The limitation is that moral motivations may be overestimated by the cost of the situation. Strong personal norms do not establish recycling facilities, reduce the distance to the e-waste centre, and do not provide renter control, in comparison with the energy systems of the buildings.

The COM-B and Behaviour Change Wheel model add the logic of actual intervention: behaviour requires power, capability, and motivation, and activities should focus on the component that inhibits action (Michie et al., 2011). This approach was used by Allison et al. (2022) in a meta-analysis of plastic waste behaviour, realizing that being able to take the opportunity and motivation were all important, while interventions with the activation and the environmental restructuring were among the ones which entailed a stronger behavioural shift. Because this perspective prevents awareness campaigns from being automatically chosen when the real barrier is physical opportunities, this is primarily useful.

2.2 The Awareness-Behaviour Gap

Awareness can affect behaviour in multiple ways. This may enhance acceptance of the issues, reinforce approaches, enhance expected impacts, and improve the validity of behavioural options. Recent research conducted in the context of a circular economy indicates that awareness can contribute to the positive assessment of sustained policies (Godinho Filho et al., 2024). However, the impact of awareness is often indirect. For example, e-waste information can influence attitudes and ethics without directly altering behaviour for waste disposal. Puzzo and Prati (2024) have created strong bonds with attitude, efficiency of politics, convenience, and intent for e-waste recycling and emphasised the importance of context in addition to cognitive development.

Meta-analytical evidence of recycling extends to the same point. Geiger et al. (2019) found specific behavioural factors such as self-identification, personal standards, past recycling, and intended control of behaviour to be more closely associated with recycling than general knowledge or general relationship to the environment. What is vital is that intention's forecasts were generally stronger than those for the observed recycling. This is a major challenge for awareness-based programmes, since campaign evaluation often measures knowledge, willingness, or self-reported participation. Such outcomes were easier to obtain, but they could give an overestimating of the environmental impact.

Therefore, a gap between awareness and action is not merely hypocrisy, and it often reflects bounded control. Leisure, frequency of service, room for sorting, clarity of regulation, housing ownership, price signals, and time and trust can determine the actions of a motivated person. Macklin et al. (2023) identified a wide range of factors affecting household recycling at different levels and suggested that personal psychology had too much focus in that area. Such criticisms are important because interventions geared solely towards attitudes, particularly those in which structural barriers are greatest, can be the least effective.

3. Methodology

3.1 Integrative Review of Secondary Evidence

This research uses structured integrative reviews of secondary sources. It is based on important behaviour theories, meta-analyses, systematic and scoring reviews, field experiments, and policy reports relevant to household recycling, plastic reduction, energy and resource conservation, electronic waste management, and sustainable consumption. The basic theory has been retained in places where it is a key element in current intervention design, while recent reviews of evidence for the effectiveness and behaviour of intervention have been highlighted.

This review is based on the critical distinction between determinants and interventions. This recycling variable, such as environmental issues, is not the automatic target for effective intervention. Conversely, contextual change, such as more convenient collection, can modify behaviour without considerably changing the settings. The evidence was therefore assessed based on the outcome whether intention, self-reported actions, observed actions, or material outcomes, and whether the effects only during were measured for intervention or after it was concluded. As psychological intent is often regarded in the literature as equivalent to avoiding waste or preserving resources, this is important.

3.2 Measurement Problems and Evidence-Quality Limitations

The evidence base is based on four repeated methodological weaknesses. First, cross-sectional surveys dominate a variety of domains, making it difficult to distinguish cause and consistency biases. Since conduct shapes both beliefs and vice versa, those already engaged in recycling can report more stringent standards and attitudes. Second, self-reported conduct is vulnerable to social desirability and recall errors. Lange (2023) stressed the need for more consistent and observed behaviour in environmental studies was stressed by Lange (2023).

Third, there is often not enough time to follow up on intervention studies. Behaviour may vary temporarily as participants are aware of being watched, whether incentives are active or if the intervention is new. Long-term persistence is more important for policymaking than immediate response. Because they examined the persistence of energy reporting effects while many recycling studies measure the outcomes of only during treatment, Allcott and Rogers (2014) share an influence.

Fourth, many studies measure the frequency of behaviour instead of its impact on the environment. The recycling of a lightweight product can be calculated in the same way as

preventing a much greater quantity of waste. A reduction in one type of consumption can be offset by rebound elsewhere. Dietz et al. (2009) emphasised the potential for emissions from household action, a principle that would make waste policy general. Evaluations should, therefore, include kilograms of material diversion, pollution levels, energy saving, water savings, or emissions prevention where possible, and not only the relationship and participation rates.

4. Findings

4.1 Social Norms, Feedback, and Social Influence

Social norms are one of the most consistent behavioural levers. Cialdini, Reno and Kallgren (1990) clearly differentiate between descriptive standards, what people do, and injunctive norms, what people approve. Schultz et al. (2007) have shown that normative feedback can reduce household power consumption for high users and can also produce a boomerang effect for already efficient households, unless approval queues are added. Nolan et al. (2008) have also demonstrated that people can be influenced by normative information even if they underestimate it.

Field studies attract social norms practitioners because of their relatively low costs. Goldstein, Cialdini, and Griskevicius (2008) demonstrated that norm-based messages could influence the re-use of hotel towels, while Allcott (2011) and Allcott and Rogers (2014) observed that reports of home energy using comparative feedback can reduce electricity consumption over time with some perseverance. Abraham and Steg (2013) concluded in a meta-analysis that social influence approaches could contribute to resource conservation, although their effects vary from technology to target group.

It is a critical limitation that normative intervention is context-sensitive. A descriptive norm may reverse when unwanted behaviour is usual because telling people that many others can not recycle may i_manage non-compliance. Norm notification can also create superficial compliance without altering the underlying infrastructure or consumption. The most extensive use of such services is thus part of the package where the desired behaviour is feasible and when credible peer comparisons enhance rather than substitute for service structure.

4.2 Habit, Identity, and Behavioural Spillover

Habit explains why knowledge cannot function. Repeated actions in stable circumstances become less dependent on deliberate discussion, which means individuals may continue to review, drive, or consume by means of trusted means despite changes in mindsets. White et al. (2019) therefore include the formation of habits as an important part of the SHIFT framework for sustainable consumption. Behavioural interventions will persist rather than require repeated moral efforts when creating steady signals and routines.

Identity is related but distinct from other concepts. People who see themselves as recyclers or environmentally friendly consumers may aspire to consistency between actions, but the evidence of spillover is mixed. Truelove et al. (2014) warned that any beneficial environmental activity might lead to positive spillover, not spillover, or even negative spillover through moral licencing. While its effect on de facto behaviour and policy support was near zero or negative, Maki et al. (2019) considered spillover to be positive but minor for intentions. This means that programs should not assume that participation in recycling automatically results in wider environmental behaviour.

The implication is to design specific behaviour instead of abstract ecological friendliness. Steg and Vlek (2009) claim that intervention planning must start with the identification of the behaviour and its determinants. Campaigns against pollution from recycling within households must be different from those aimed at dealing with food waste disposal, the return of e-waste,

water consumption, or domestic energy demand. General slogans such as "save the planet" can increase salience but offer little behavioural orientation.

4.3 Interventions Which Change Behaviour

Information remains useful when people do not have any procedural knowledge. However, the intervention literature does not support information-only strategies as a universal solution. Abrahamse et al. (2005) found that energy measures in the household differ considerably in terms of their efficacy, and many studies have not demonstrated the existence of sustainable or isolated causal mechanisms. Delmas Fischlein and Asensio (2013) also demonstrated that information strategies can reduce energy consumption, but effect sizes vary from design to type. Thus, awareness should be accompanied by feedback, goals, incentives, commitments, or changes in choice, as appropriate.

Regarding recycling, Varotto and Spagnolli (2017) evaluated verified field interventions and identified social modelling and environmental change as the most effective strategies. Geiger et al. (2019) strengthened the significance of contextual factors, whereas Allison et al. (2022) demonstrated the importance of physical options for plastic waste behaviour. The practical lesson is simple: convenient containers, predictable collection, clear markings, accessible returns, and reduced efforts may be far beyond the additional information when residents are already aware that recycling is desirable.

Incentives can accelerate behavioural change, but they should be carefully designed. Financial rewards can work while they are at the stage of being present but weaken intrinsic motivation or disappear when payments stop. Prices may also be regressive if homes with fewer alternatives bear higher costs. The behaviour economy therefore contributes most if it improves standard options, salience, feedback, and friction instead of assuming that all environmental decisions can only be solved by means of pricing. Byerly et al. (2018) examined a number of experiments and concluded that social influences and adaptations in decision settings can affect pro-environmental choices, but also identified large gaps in terms of durability and external validity.

Education will play a longer-term role, mainly for children, but the evidence once again warns against bringing awareness into line with action. Liu and Green (2024) felt that the literature on pro-environment behaviour of children is dominated by observation designs and self-reported action, with a relatively limited number of longitudinal studies. Environmental education can produce values and self-efficacy, but credible assessments should show whether its effects persist and turn into observed behaviour.

Table 1. Behaviour-change strategies and critical conditions for effectiveness

Strategy	Likely mechanism	Strength	Key limitation
Information and awareness	Knowledge, salience, risk understanding	Useful when procedural knowledge is missing	Weak when opportunity or motivation is the binding constraint
Social norms and comparison	Descriptive and injunctive influence	Can shift energy and conservation behaviour	Can backfire when undesirable behaviour is common
Feedback and prompts	Attention, self-regulation, habit cues	Useful for repeated behaviours	Effects may decay without continued feedback

Strategy	Likely mechanism	Strength	Key limitation
Infrastructure and environmental restructuring	Reduces effort and increases opportunity	Often essential for recycling and waste prevention	Requires capital, service quality, and maintenance
Financial incentives or pricing	Changes relative costs and benefits	Can produce rapid response	May be regressive or fade after incentives stop

4.4 Equity, Trust, and Structural Constraints

A behavioural change program can be technically effective and unjust. Recycling and conservation often require the provision of space, time, transport, digital access, or investment in advance. Housing in small dwellings may require smaller space for several containers. Rural and peri-urban residents may experience longer journeys to the recycling area. Low-income households may not be able to acquire more efficient appliances even if they realise that they save money during their lifetime. Residents may be in poor control of insulation, heating systems, or waste infrastructure.

Because awareness-raising campaigns can moralise structurally limited attitudes, these restrictions are essential. Residents can be accused of being irresponsible for low recycling when the collection system is unreliable or is required to conserve energy in inefficient and uncontrolled housing. A fair approach separates the willingness to offer capacities and focuses political attention on the provision of services and infrastructure. The COM B focus on opportunities can be useful here in turning social inequalities into a demand for intervention, and not a variable of demographic control.

Trust is another structural factor. People are less likely to sort waste very carefully if they assume that the material will be subsequently mixed, dumped into landfills, or exported without oversight. For this reason, transparent reporting on the destination of materials, pollution, and recycling could be as important as general environmental messages. Public consciousness is strongest when communicating not only what residents have to do but also what settings will do to the material and how performance will be verified.

4.5 An Integrated Awareness-Capability-Opportunity-Motivation Framework

The data reviewed form the basis of an integrated awareness-capability-opportunity-motivation system. Awareness brings insight into the issue, desired behaviour, and expected effects, and capability encompasses practical skills and expertise, such as understanding sorting rules. Opportunities include infrastructure, comfort, affordability, time, and institutional access. Motivation includes attitudes, norms, identity, emotion, habits, effectiveness, and confidence. Behaviour is very likely when these elements are aligned.

This framework explains why conflicting research may seem to be correct. Information can have a large effect in a setting because knowledge is the binding restriction. The same information failed because the collection was difficult in another. Thirdly, the infrastructure is sufficient, but participation will continue to be low because there are weak standards and trust. Behaviour diagnosis should therefore precede intervention selection. Campaign budgets should not be used primarily for communication, simply because they are visual and are administratively easy to communicate.

For policy design, the sequence should be as follows: define the specific behaviour and environmental outcome; identify the dominant barriers using behavioural and service data; remove major opportunity constraints; provide clear procedural information; use social norms and feedback where appropriate; make the desired action easy and salient; and evaluate observed

behaviour over time. This approach shifts the "raising awareness" goal to measurable and sustainable environmental outcomes.

5. Discussion

The main conclusion is that the public is aware but seldom isolated. The most influential theories and meta-analyses converge on the importance of behaviour-specific motivation and contextual opportunity. Such convergence has two effects on the research. First, models must prevent more psychological variables from being added without investigating the infrastructure and institutional conditions. Second, intervention research should move from a deliberate declaration of differences to verification of cause and effect changes in actual behaviour and material outcomes.

Second, the credibility of the policy is related. Repeated awareness campaigns can reduce the confidence of residents in changing their behaviour, as they do not respond to visible system failures. In contrast, investment in infrastructure may not be efficient enough when users do not understand how they use the system or believe that their efforts are useless. Therefore, an incorrect choice between "education" and "infrastructure" should be rejected. These findings support coordinated intervention packages where communication systems that are actually usable are explained and reinforced.

Third, sustainable behaviour should not be assessed only at the individual level. Household recycling can serve as a policy substitute for production design at the top, the responsibility of manufacturers, the reduction of packaging, and the effectiveness of industrial materials. OECD (2022) and UNEP (2024) have highlighted the systemic challenges of waste generation and plastics. Therefore, changes in conduct should be nested in a circular economy policy, which should reduce unnecessary material flows instead of relying on consumers to manage waste, as products have been designed and sold.

6. Conclusion

The evidence does not warrant notification to the public as a standalone theory of change for recycling and conservation. Awareness can improve knowledge, attitudes, and salience, but behaviour depends on perceived control, standards, identity, habits, convenience, trust, and physical possibilities. Meta analyses show that behavior-specific and contextual factors often exceed general environmental concerns when predictors of observed action, and intervention effects are often heterogeneous and short-lived.

A stronger policy model combines knowledge with opportunities, capabilities, and motivation. Institutions should first make sustainable behaviour viable and easy, and then use clear information, secure social norms, feedback, and targeted incentives to strengthen it. Evaluation should prioritise perceived behaviour, material outcomes, persistence, justice, and spill-over rather than self-reported intention. Regarding research on publication quality, the next point is not another demonstration that people care for the environment, but convincing evidence of how behavioural and structural activities interact between times and within an unequal social context.

References

Abrahamse, W., & Steg, L. (2013). Social influence approaches to encourage resource conservation: A meta-analysis. Global Environmental Change, 23(6), 1773-1785. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.07.029

Abrahamse, W., Steg, L., Vlek, C., & Rothengatter, T. (2005). A review of intervention studies aimed at household energy conservation. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 25(3), 273-291. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2005.08.002

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179-211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
Allcott, H. (2011). Social norms and energy conservation. Journal of Public Economics, 95(9-10), 1082-1095. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2011.03.003
Allcott, H., & Rogers, T. (2014). The short-run and long-run effects of behavioral interventions: Experimental evidence from energy conservation. American Economic Review, 104(10), 3003-3037. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.104.10.3003
Allison, A. L., Baird, H. M., Lorencatto, F., Webb, T. L., & Michie, S. (2022). Reducing plastic waste: A meta-analysis of influences on behaviour and interventions. Journal of Cleaner Production, 380, 134860. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.134860
Bamberg, S., & Moser, G. (2007). Twenty years after Hines, Hungerford, and Tomera: A new meta-analysis of psycho-social determinants of pro-environmental behaviour. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 27(1), 14-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2006.12.002
Barr, S. (2007). Factors influencing environmental attitudes and behaviors: A U.K. case study of household waste management. Environment and Behavior, 39(4), 435-473. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916505283421
Byerly, H., Balmford, A., Ferraro, P. J., Hammond Wagner, C., Palchak, E., Polasky, S., Ricketts, T. H., Schwartz, A. J., & Fisher, B. (2018). Nudging pro-environmental behavior: Evidence and opportunities. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 16(3), 159-168. https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.1777
Cialdini, R. B. (2003). Crafting normative messages to protect the environment. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 12(4), 105-109. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.01242
Cialdini, R. B., Reno, R. R., & Kallgren, C. A. (1990). A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58(6), 1015-1026. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.6.1015
Delmas, M. A., Fischlein, M., & Asensio, O. I. (2013). Information strategies and energy conservation behavior: A meta-analysis of experimental studies from 1975 to 2012. Energy Policy, 61, 729-739. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.05.109
Dietz, T., Gardner, G. T., Gilligan, J., Stern, P. C., & Vandenbergh, M. P. (2009). Household actions can provide a behavioral wedge to rapidly reduce US carbon emissions. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 106(44), 18452-18456. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0908738106
Geiger, J. L., Steg, L., van der Werff, E., & Unal, A. B. (2019). A meta-analysis of factors related to recycling. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 64, 78-97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2019.05.004
Gifford, R. (2011). The dragons of inaction: Psychological barriers that limit climate change mitigation and adaptation. American Psychologist, 66(4), 290-302. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023566
Godinho Filho, M., Gonella, J. S. L., Latan, H., & Ganga, G. M. D. (2024). Awareness as a catalyst for sustainable behaviors: A theoretical exploration of planned behavior and value-belief-norms in the circular economy. Journal of Environmental Management, 368, 122181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2024.122181
Goldstein, N. J., Cialdini, R. B., & Griskevicius, V. (2008). A room with a viewpoint: Using social norms to motivate environmental conservation in hotels. Journal of Consumer Research, 35(3), 472-482. https://doi.org/10.1086/586910

Hornik, J., Cherian, J., Madansky, M., & Narayana, C. (1995). Determinants of recycling behavior: A synthesis of research results. Journal of Socio-Economics, 24(1), 105-127. https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-5357(95)90032-2

Kollmuss, A., & Agyeman, J. (2002). Mind the gap: Why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior? Environmental Education Research, 8(3), 239-260. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620220145401

Lange, F. (2023). Behavioral paradigms for studying pro-environmental behavior: A systematic review. Behavior Research Methods, 55(2), 600-622. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-022-01825-4

Liu, J., & Green, R. J. (2024). Children's pro-environmental behaviour: A systematic review of the literature. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 205, 107524. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2024.107524

Macklin, J., Curtis, J., & Smith, L. (2023). Interdisciplinary, systematic review found influences on household recycling behaviour are many and multifaceted, requiring a multi-level approach. Resources, Conservation and Recycling Advances, 18, 200152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcradv.2023.200152

Maki, A., Carrico, A. R., Raimi, K. T., Truelove, H. B., Araujo, B., & Yeung, K. L. (2019). Meta-analysis of pro-environmental behaviour spillover. Nature Sustainability, 2, 307-315. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0263-9

Michie, S., van Stralen, M. M., & West, R. (2011). The behaviour change wheel: A new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. Implementation Science, 6, 42. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-6-42

Nolan, J. M., Schultz, P. W., Cialdini, R. B., Goldstein, N. J., & Griskevicius, V. (2008). Normative social influence is underdetected. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34(7), 913-923. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208316691

Nolan, J. M. (2021). Social norm interventions as a tool for pro-climate change. Current Opinion in Psychology, 42, 120-125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.06.001

OECD. (2022). Global plastics outlook: Economic drivers, environmental impacts and policy options. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/de747aef-en

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

Puzzo, G., & Prati, G. (2024). Psychological correlates of e-waste recycling intentions and behaviors: A meta-analysis. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 204, 107462. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2024.107462

Saphores, J.-D. M., Ogunseitan, O. A., & Shapiro, A. A. (2012). Willingness to engage in a pro-environmental behavior: An analysis of e-waste recycling based on a national survey of U.S. households. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 60, 49-63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2011.12.003

Schultz, P. W., Oskamp, S., & Mainieri, T. (1995). Who recycles and when? A review of personal and situational factors. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 15(2), 105-121. https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-4944(95)90019-5

Schultz, P. W., Nolan, J. M., Cialdini, R. B., Goldstein, N. J., & Griskevicius, V. (2007). The constructive, destructive, and reconstructive power of social norms. Psychological Science, 18(5), 429-434. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01917.x

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

Stern, P. C. (2000). New environmental theories: Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 56(3), 407-424. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00175

Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., Abel, T., Guagnano, G. A., & Kalof, L. (1999). A value-belief-norm theory of support for social movements: The case of environmentalism. Human Ecology Review, 6(2), 81-97.

Syed, S., Acquaye, A., Khalfan, M. M., Obuobisa-Darko, T., & Yamoah, F. A. (2024). Decoding sustainable consumption behavior: A systematic review of theories and models and provision of a guidance framework. Resources, Conservation and Recycling Advances, 23, 200232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcradv.2024.200232

Tonglet, M., Phillips, P. S., & Read, A. D. (2004). Determining the drivers for householder pro-environmental behaviour: Waste minimisation compared to recycling. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 42(1), 27-48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2004.02.001

Truelove, H. B., Carrico, A. R., Weber, E. U., Raimi, K. T., & Vandenbergh, M. P. (2014). Positive and negative spillover of pro-environmental behavior: An integrative review and theoretical framework. Global Environmental Change, 29, 127-138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.09.004

United Nations Environment Programme. (2024). Global waste management outlook 2024: Beyond an age of waste, turning rubbish into a resource. United Nations Environment Programme.

Varotto, A., & Spagnolli, A. (2017). Psychological strategies to promote household recycling: A systematic review with meta-analysis of validated field interventions. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 51, 168-188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.03.011

Verplanken, B., & Wood, W. (2006). Interventions to break and create consumer habits. Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 25(1), 90-103. https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.25.1.90

White, K., Habib, R., & Hardisty, D. J. (2019). How to SHIFT consumer behaviors to be more sustainable: A literature review and guiding framework. Journal of Marketing, 83(3), 22-49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242919825649

Whitmarsh, L., & O'Neill, S. (2010). Green identity, green living? The role of pro-environmental self-identity in determining consistency across diverse pro-environmental behaviours. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 30(3), 305-314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.01.003