



Research Papers



ISSN 2610-931X

CEIS Tor Vergata

RESEARCH PAPER SERIES

Vol. 22, Issue 5, No. 583 – October 2024

Biases and Nudges in the Circular Economy: A Review

Luca Congiu, Enrico Botta, Mariangela Zoli

Biases and Nudges in the Circular Economy: A Review

Luca Congiu^{*} Enrico Botta[†] Mariangela Zoli[‡]

This version: January 23, 2024

Abstract

The circular economy transition requires consumers to make further efforts in their waste disposal behaviors, by increasing waste sorting, repairing and reusing products, and reducing the amount of waste produced. The literature has identified several barriers to consumers' adoption of these practices. In this paper, we posit that such barriers can be ultimately linked to well-known decisional biases and proceed to offer a review. In doing so, we categorize biases into “cognitive”, referring to deviations from normatively correct behavior, and “motivational”, encompassing behavior driven by desirability concerns. We also survey the existing behavioral policies addressing the identified biases, focusing on “nudges”, that is, interventions leveraging biases to improve welfare. In our review, we call attention to the importance of recognizing the relevant bias behind specific behaviors to identify the best interventions to implement. By offering a conceptual link between biases and circular economy practices, we also lay the groundwork for future experimental investigation.

Keywords: cognitive bias · motivational bias · nudge · circular economy · second-hand · review

JEL Codes: D01 · D04 · D91 · M31

^{*} Department of Economics and Finance, Tor Vergata University of Rome; email: luca.congiu@uniroma2.it.

[†] Green Growth and Global Relations Division, Environment Directorate, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD); email: enrico.botta@oecd.org.

[‡] Department of Economics and Finance, Tor Vergata University of Rome, and Center for Economic and International Studies (CEIS), Tor Vergata University of Rome; email: zoli@uniroma2.it (corresponding author).

1 Introduction

The ecological transition implies reconciling economic growth and environmental preservation, with the core objective of providing benefits to all while remaining within the planet’s ecological limits. Different approaches have been proposed to maintain the use of natural resources at a sustainable level (Figge and Thorpe, 2023). Among them, the circular economy (CE) paradigm aligns with the objectives of the ecological transition by closing resource loops through the repeated use of resources, which in turn minimizes the necessity for virgin materials and ideally creates no waste (Korhonen et al., 2018; Rotondo et al., 2022; Chembessi et al., 2023). Specifically, the CE aims to shift the current linear economy, based on the take–make–dispose concept, toward a circular model that reduces material resources consumption by recovering materials from waste for recycling or reuse, using products longer, and harnessing the potential of the sharing and services economy.¹

Achieving the CE transition requires huge efforts from all different economic actors, including consumers, that are urged to make further endeavors in performing actions they already make, such as reducing waste production and improving waste sorting; in some cases, consumers are required to change their attitudes and behaviors, such as when the adoption of new and alternative models of consumption is implied. Increasing attention in recent years has been devoted to understanding how individual behaviors can influence the transition toward a CE society and what barriers (drivers) may hinder (encourage) the adoption of circular practices.

Non-monetary motivations are now recognized as relevant as monetary ones in stimulating individuals to engage in pro-environmental behaviors, paving the way for the design of policy instruments alternative to traditional economic interventions such as taxes and regulations. In the context of waste management behaviors, policy design is particularly challenging since pro-environmental actions in this domain are characterized by high benefits for society but low private benefits and high private opportunity costs. Sorting waste materials for recycling, for instance, provides huge social benefits, reducing resource losses and the adverse environmental and health impacts of landfills, but it costs more to households in terms of individual effort and time than unsorted waste disposal. From a policy perspective, identifying factors that may motivate individuals to act in ways that go against their self-interest is crucial and opens new opportunities for intervention.

In this paper, we posit that the diverse motivations underlying CE practices can ultimately be linked to well-known decisional biases and offer a review of their nature and impact on the design of policy interventions. Broadly speaking, “biases” entail systematic departures from the prescriptions of standard economic theory due to cognitive, social, or emotional motives (e.g., Tversky and Kahneman, 1974; Camerer and Thaler, 1995). We argue that understanding the specific biases behind CE behaviors is essential to designing well-tailored policy interventions.

Our review fits in a rich literature on the impact of biases on many diverse decision-making domains, but which at present seem to lack a comprehensive review of biases underlying CE practices.² Close to the theme of our paper, but not focusing on biases specifically, are the systematic

¹ <https://www.oecd.org/environment/trade-resource-efficiency-circular-economy.htm>

² A non-exhaustive sample of the most recent contributions is provided in the following. Caputo (2013) surveys the cognitive biases that underlie negotiation processes. The systematic review by Kumar and Goyal (2015) identifies biases in investment decision-making, whereas the one by Saposnik et al. (2016) focuses on cognitive biases in medical decision-making, such as those leading to inaccurate diagnoses on the part of physicians. Wat-

reviews by Kirakozian (2016) and Li et al. (2019).

The first contribution reviews the literature assessing the effectiveness of the main incentive-based and behavioral policies on recycling behaviors, concluding that combining both instruments is required to change individual preferences toward more environmentally friendly actions. Li et al. (2019) build on the major socio-psychological theories, such as the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991) and norm activation theory (Schwartz, 1973), to survey the determinants of pro-environmental behavior. While they provide a comprehensive list ranging from sociodemographic variables to values, environmental awareness, norms, beliefs, and attitudes, their review does not specifically address biases. Therefore, we believe our review to be the first to address the literature gap on the impact of biases and nudges on CE practices. Notably, we also include the latest contributions on reuse and second-hand consumption — a domain that has received less attention than sorting and waste prevention — while also distinguishing diverse materials and products (e.g., clothing vs. electronic devices) that may be affected by different biases.

To structure our review, we adopt the taxonomy that classifies biases as “cognitive” or “motivational” (Montibeller and von Winterfeldt, 2015). Roughly speaking, “cognitive biases” denote deviations from normatively correct judgment or behavior, that is, one that accords with the laws of logic, probability, and statistics; “motivational biases” refer to situations in which judgment or behavior is distorted by concerns of desirability or undesirability with respect to the decision outcomes.³

In addition to reviewing decisional biases, we also survey the behavioral policies that can address them. In doing so, we focus on “nudges”, that is, interventions in the choice context that leverage biases to lead the decision-maker toward welfare-improving decisions (Thaler and Sunstein, 2009; Hansen, 2016). Our paper is not alone in this endeavor (see, e.g., Parajuly et al., 2020; Congiu and Moscati, 2022; Lindstrom et al., 2023; Kuyser and Gordijn, 2023; Mancinelli and Zoli, 2023; Nurchis et al., 2023). However, it is the first to focus on nudges that promote CE practices. In this respect, the closest contributions to the present one are the reviews by Parajuly et al. (2020) and Mancinelli and Zoli (2023), together with the already mentioned Kirakozian (2016). Nonetheless, these contributions focus on interventions designed for a subset of CE practices and do not discuss the decisional biases behind them.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the main cognitive biases underlying CE behaviors and the nudges that can address them. Section 3 similarly reviews motivational biases and related nudges. Section 4 draws some conclusions from the literature review and suggests potential avenues for future research.

tanacharoensil and La-ornual (2019) provide a systematic literature review of the main cognitive biases affecting tourism decisions, such as trip planning and travel modalities. Recently, Gagliardi (2023) reviews the literature on cognitive biases underlying the formation and updating of conspiracy beliefs.

³ Biases can be classified in several ways, each serving its specific purpose. Some contributions separate the activity of “judgment” from the one of “decision” (or “behavior”) and implicitly do the same for the biases underlying either activity, such as the behavioral economics textbook by Angner (2021) and, to a lesser extent, that by (Dhami, 2020, volume 5). Gagliardi (2023) focuses on judgment biases and distinguishes them between those involved in “belief formation,” and those in “belief updating”. Mullainathan and Thaler (2000) advance a tripartite classification based on whether biases refer to cognitive limitations (“bounded rationality”), lack of self-control (“bounded willpower”), and other-regarding preferences (“bounded self-interest”). We believe the classification by Montibeller and von Winterfeldt (2015) is better suited for understanding CE behaviors.

2 Cognitive biases and nudges

Cognitive biases involve deviations from judgments and behaviors that would be normatively correct, i.e., consistent with what the laws of logic, mathematics, and statistics prescribe (Montibeller and von Winterfeldt, 2015). We proceed to review the main cognitive biases and highlight their role in explaining some CE behaviors. Then, we survey the behavioral interventions that target these biases.

2.1 Anchoring and reference points

The “anchoring bias” (Tversky and Kahneman, 1974) is the tendency of individuals to take a situation or stimulus as a reference point (“anchor”) and make their choice by adjusting from that. An anchor can be set either by a relevant piece of information or by a physical aspect of one’s decisional context (see, e.g., Congiu and Moscati, 2020).

Informational anchors and feedback

In the case of waste separation behavior, anchors can be set by information about one’s past behavior and/or goals to be reached (i.e., feedback). For instance, Meineri et al. (2021) show that households that received information about their waste generation rate and the target of the local authorities for this figure significantly reduced the amount of waste they generated as compared to a control group that received no such information. The very recent study by Ishimura et al. (2024), involving 1660 Japanese municipalities, sheds further light on the power of goal setting. The authors show that a policy setting food waste reduction goals led to a decrease in the annual waste generation by around 3.38 kg per capita, equating to an economic gain of \$689 million per year.

Anchors can also be set by information about others’ conduct. When the received information is positive, i.e., the surrounding environment is characterized by good waste sorting, individuals are more willing to participate in the waste collection (Zhang et al., 2017). On the contrary, individuals lose the motivation to actively engage in waste separation when the information is negative, fostering the individual’s belief that waste separation is either meaningless or unattainable (Hou et al., 2020).

Physical anchors

The effect of “physical anchors” is evident in the case of food waste. Several studies show that people base the quantity of food they consume on the size of plates or cups (e.g., Kallbekken and Sælen, 2013; Wansink and van Ittersum, 2013). Specifically, it appears that larger containers increase food intake, not only because they can contain more food but because people use the dimension of the container as a reference to judge the quantity of their intake, and, in larger containers, the same quantity appears lower than in small containers. This bias may lead to increased food waste: if consumers underestimate the quantity of food on a plate, they may fill the plate with a higher quantity than the amount that would satiate them, thereby generating leftovers. In an observational study, Wansink and van Ittersum (2013) show that, when faced with the option to select plates with different sizes (26.5 vs. 21 cm diameter), diners who selected the

larger plate served themselves, ate, and wasted (52%, 45%, and 135% respectively) more total food than those with smaller plates.

Clearly, these findings suggest a straightforward nudge to reduce food waste: a plate size reduction. In effect, there is a rich literature on nudges acting on physical anchors to affect food-related decisions (e.g., [Kallbekken and Sælen, 2013](#); [Petit et al., 2018](#); see also the systematic review of [Lindstrom et al., 2023](#), and the meta-analysis by [Zhang et al., 2023](#)). To provide an example, [Kallbekken and Sælen \(2013\)](#), in a field experiment run in 52 hotels from a hotel chain, tested the impact of reducing the plate size (from 24 to 21 cm), finding a food waste reduction by 19.5% in treated hotels with respect to those in the control group.

Decoys

Anchors can also be set by designing certain options so that they can serve as a reference when evaluating alternatives. The most prominent form of such options is the “decoy”. A decoy is an option in the choice set that is inferior in at least one feature with respect to another option (typically named “target”) and whose purpose is to increase the attractiveness of the target option. Experimental results typically confirm that the target option is more likely to be chosen when a decoy is present (e.g., [Kivetz et al., 2004](#); [Ariely, 2009](#)).

[Stefansdotter et al. \(2016\)](#) provide an example of decoys designed to increase the choice of leased or refurbished smartphones among young people (aged 19 to 28). In their survey experiment, the authors present respondents with choice sets containing a new smartphone and two or more “green” smartphones that were either refurbished or available for lease, depending on the treatment. In each choice set, one of the two green smartphones was older and had a slightly higher price than the other, thus serving as a decoy. The authors show that adding the decoy increased the selection rate of leased smartphones from 38% to 62%. Interestingly, when the decoy involved a refurbished smartphone, it did not work as intended: the selection rate for these products reduced to 48% compared to the 52% recorded in the control with no decoy, but the difference is not statistically significant. The result may be driven by a potential crowding out of economic incentives on environmental considerations. However, the authors suggest being cautious in interpreting the results, as the study was conducted in a simulated setting and not in a real purchase situation.

2.2 Loss aversion and endowment effect

“Loss aversion” ([Kahneman and Tversky, 1979](#)) refers to the tendency to suffer from a loss more than one rejoices from a gain of the same magnitude. Fundamentally, loss aversion implies that decision-makers will strive more to avoid a loss than to pursue a potential gain. A related implication is that decision-makers may experience inertia when considering changing their status quo: even though adopting an alternative would yield a gain, the higher weight placed on potential losses might prevent decision-makers from switching to it ([Samuelson and Zeckhauser, 1988](#)). An example of loss aversion is testified by [Homonoff \(2018\)](#), who compares the impact of a tax on the use of a disposable bag with that of a bonus for a reusable bag of the same amount (\$0.05). The empirical analysis exploited the introduction of a plastic bag tax in Washington, DC, and is based on the observed shopping behavior of more than 16,000 customers in grocery stores. Results show that the tax significantly reduced the proportion of customers using disposable bags (by 42

percentage points), while the bonus had no effect.

The “endowment effect” (Thaler, 1980) is closely related to loss aversion. It refers to the fact that decision-makers value an asset more when it is part of their endowment than when it has to be acquired. For example, in the market experiment that popularized it (Kahneman et al., 1990), participants charged a higher price to part from the mug they owned than the price they were willing to pay to acquire it when they did not own it. Thus, similarly to loss aversion, it involves an asymmetry between losing and gaining an asset.

Loss aversion and the endowment effect might explain consumers’ preference for new products over second-hand or refurbished ones. As argued, decision-makers may suffer from inertia when faced with the possibility of switching to an option they are not currently adopting, such as buying a second-hand product over a new one, because they respond more intensely to losses than potential gains. Since the status quo of a typical consumer is buying new products, consumers may prefer maintaining their status quo instead of switching to a second-hand product and eventually experiencing a loss because, for instance, the product is defective or has a lower performance than expected.

The endowment effect in the second-hand market for defective and non-defective products has been investigated by Botchway et al. (2023). The authors conducted an online survey experiment where 422 participants were randomly assigned the role of buyer or seller and were presented with products that were either not defective, defective, defective with a repair paid by the buyer, defective with a repair paid by the seller. Results confirm a significant endowment effect for non-defective and defective products when repair is available, in that sellers stated a higher evaluation for the product than buyers. However, the endowment effect vanishes for defective goods without repair. This suggests that in the case of defective products, only the availability of repair increases sellers’ evaluation of them and hence drives the endowment effect, as buyers instead raise their evaluations only slightly.

Relatedly, loss aversion and the endowment effect can also account for the evidence that consumers tend to stockpile their old mobile phones at home instead of taking them to recycling facilities (Ylä-Mella et al., 2015; Echegaray and Hansstein, 2017; Wilson et al., 2017). Some of the recurring motivations found in the literature are that consumers feel that their used mobile phone is valuable because it is part of their endowment, and parting from it is perceived as a loss.⁴

Defaults

Loss aversion can be harnessed by setting defaults. A “default” is an option automatically enforced on the decision-maker unless she actively chooses otherwise (Johnson and Goldstein, 2003). Examples of defaults are automatic enrollment in saving plans (Thaler and Benartzi, 2004) or energy plans based on renewable resources (Ghesla et al., 2020). In these cases, people tend to comply with the default because they perceive it as a recommendation set in their best interest, overvalue potential losses from noncompliance, and experience decisional inertia (see above).

Defaults are widely used to reduce waste generation (e.g., Ebeling and Lotz, 2015; Mundt et al., 2020; Giaccherini et al., 2021). As a real-world application, consider the change of default consent in the reception of unaddressed mail, introduced by the municipality of Amsterdam in January

⁴Other recurrent reasons for stockpiling phones relate to emotional attachment and guilt associated with their disposal; nonetheless, these are motivational biases and will be discussed in Section 3.3

2018. Before the change, citizens were assumed to consent to receiving unaddressed correspondence by default. By contrast, the new default requires citizens to explicitly consent by attaching a sticker to their mailbox. The default change led to a reduction in paper waste from 1.85kg per person to 1.60kg, leading to an overall reduction of around 17-20%, equating to a saving of €500,000 in administrative costs (Endendijk and Botzen, 2023).

The experiment by Mundt et al. (2020) tests a change of default in the provision of plastic straws in beverage cups in cafeterias. Specifically, half of the cups already had a plastic straw in the control condition, whereas the remainder did not. In the treatment, all cups were provided with no straws, but these could be picked up from a coverless box placed near them, implying that they were still available in the decision-maker’s choice set. Results show a statistically significant reduction in straw consumption between treatment (60%) and control (30%).

Framing

“Framing” (Tversky and Kahneman, 1981) refers to how a choice situation is presented (or “framed”) to the decision-maker, including its contextualization (e.g., investment vs. donation) and the aspects that are emphasized (e.g., benefits vs. harms). To be considered as framing, how a choice scenario is presented must emphasize certain aspects of the situation without altering the substance of the options, that is, the outcomes and their probabilities (if any). In other words, alternative framings involve logically equivalent presentations of the same choice scenario.

The archetypical example of framing involves emphasizing losses or downsides in place of gains or upsides, thereby leveraging loss aversion (Tversky and Kahneman, 1981; for a review of its applications in pro-environmental behavior, see Homar and Cvelbar, 2021). The experiment by Nelson et al. (2021) illustrates loss framing for messages addressing marine pollution caused by plastic waste. Specifically, the experimenters displayed a sign at the counter of a convenience store in Indonesia, framed either in positive or negative terms, and tracked the number of plastic bags demanded by consumers ($N = 721$). The positively framed message read: “Do you really need a plastic bag? Refuse it and you will save the ocean!”, whereas the negatively framed counterpart stated: “Do you really need a plastic bag? Refuse it or you will destroy the ocean!”. Contrary to expectations, although the differences are not statistically significant, the positively worded message elicited the highest rate of plastic bag avoidance (50%) compared to the negatively worded one (45%). However, both signs significantly raised plastic bag avoidance with respect to the control with no sign (30%).

Another example of framing is related to waste prevention by choosing to refill exhausted containers for liquids rather than buying them anew (Bashir et al., 2020). In a survey experiment, a group of respondents was presented with a message emphasizing the safety aspects of various refill solutions; a second group with a message emphasizing environmental benefits; a third group with a message emphasizing both aspects; and a fourth group acted as a control and received plain information about cleaning. Results show that a framing that jointly emphasizes safety and environmental benefits increased stated intention to adopt refill behaviors, measured on an average scale of 1 to 7, by 0.64 units. By contrast, framings that emphasized either benefit individually proved ineffective.

2.3 Certainty effect, disappointment, and regret

The “certainty effect” refers to the decision-maker’s tendency to overvalue outcomes considered certain relative to those that are merely probable (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979; Tversky and Kahneman, 1981; Cohen and Jaffray, 1988). Specifically, individuals tend to exhibit risk aversion with respect to sure outcomes but become considerably less risk averse as probabilities move away from certainty.

There are several explanations for this phenomenon. First, decision-makers subjectively distort probabilities (Prelec, 1998) and are highly sensitive to changes in probability at the boundaries of the probability space (i.e., 0 and 1) than in any other point (e.g., 0.6). Second, decision-makers may be averse to disappointment and regret (Feldman and Ferraro, 2023). According to this explanation, decision-makers tend to select sure options because they anticipate the disappointment they would feel if the risky option led to an unfavorable outcome rather than a favorable one (Bell, 1985; Gul, 1991) and anticipate the regret of not having chosen the sure option (Loomes and Sugden, 1982; Zeelenberg, 1999).

The certainty effect may account for several concerns that consumers generally report in relation to second-hand consumption, specifically those about the product’s quality, safety, and hygiene. Quality concerns relate to the fact that second-hand products may have unobservable defects that adversely affect their performance (e.g., Fernando et al., 2018). For instance, the adoption of refurbished mobile phones is hindered by concerns about the phone having lower functionalities or unexpected contingencies that force the consumer to lose time to repair or substitute the product (van Weelden et al., 2019; Wilson et al., 2017). Such concerns can be linked to a certainty effect. In comparing new and second-hand products, consumers may contrast the risks of defects or malfunctions posed by second-hand products with their absence in the case of new products. Since consumers overvalue certainty, they may be more prone to opt for the more expensive but safer option (the new product) over the risky but cheaper second-hand option. In addition, consumers may be reluctant to purchase a second-hand product because they anticipate their disappointment and regret if they end up dissatisfied with its performance (e.g., Mugge et al., 2017; Kurniawati, 2019).

The certainty effect can also explain safety and hygiene concerns for certain categories of products, such as second-hand clothing and furniture (Yan et al., 2015; Edbring et al., 2016; Hur, 2020; Silva et al., 2021; Colasante and D’Adamo, 2021). Specifically, consumers often fear “contamination” if they touch clothes and furniture previously owned by others (Yan et al., 2015; Ackerman and Hu, 2017) without considering that sanitizing procedures eliminate health risks equally for both new and second-hand products. This suggests that consumers might overestimate the probability of harm connected with adopting second-hand goods because they contrast it with the perceived safety of new goods and prefer the latter option.

Even though the certainty effect, disappointment, and regret are relevant biases in second-hand consumption, the literature lacks experimental contributions testing behavioral interventions that can correct the misperception of risk for second-hand products.

2.4 Habit, limited attention, and forgetfulness

Prior habits may hinder sustainable behavior. It is known that repeated behavior may generate patterns that are likely to be exhibited automatically in the future (Aarts et al., 1998; Ouellette and Wood, 1998). The implication of habit for CE is straightforward: consumers are used to linear consumption models, and such habit constrains the substitution of current practices with CE ones (Jayaraman et al., 2011; Parajuly et al., 2020). For example, consumers tend to shop using disposable plastic bags, have coffee in single-use cups, or drink a beverage out of a straw because they are used to doing so (Jayaraman et al., 2011). Similarly, people tend to ignore logos and recycling information about how to dispose of compostable plastics and adopt the default behavior of discarding them with conventional plastic waste (Ansink et al., 2022). These findings confirm that adopting a contrasting behavior may be effortful once a habit is established, especially considering that habituation tends to involve automatic and unconscious information processing rather than cognitive deliberation (Aarts et al., 1998).

In addition to habit, sustainable behavior can also be constrained by people’s selective attention. Individuals can direct their attention to just a subset of the elements of their decisional context, be they pieces of information or visual cues. Typically, attention is paid to those elements of the choice environment that stand out from the rest for some reason, that is, that are prominent or “salient” (Bordalo et al., 2022). Evidence shows that salient aspects are more likely to capture the decision-maker’s attention and be processed when making a decision, whereas less salient ones might be ignored altogether (for a review, see Bordalo et al., 2022).

The fact that individuals process a limited set of contextual elements and selectively direct their attention to the most salient ones has two important implications. First, salient contextual cues play a role in the activation of one’s prospective memory, which is the type of memory engaged with performing the actions that have been planned (Einstein and McDaniel, 2005; Smith et al., 2007). Thus, if decision-makers set themselves to adopt CE behavior but do not find in their choice environment salient cues that activate prospective memory, they may forget to exhibit the behavior when the time comes (Jayaraman et al., 2011; O’Brien and Thondhlana, 2019; Essl et al., 2021). For example, consumers may persevere in using plastic bags when shopping because their environment does not prompt them to adopt reusable bags (O’Brien and Thondhlana, 2019; Gonzalez-Arcos et al., 2021).

Second, as documented by marketing and consumer behavior studies, salience effects may influence consumption choices (Janiszewski et al., 2013; Kim et al., 2019). Specifically, evidence shows that products that are more salient in one’s choice set because they are placed at the beginning of a shelf and/or at eye level in stores are more likely to be selected (Foster et al., 2014; Reijnen et al., 2019). Intuitively, applied to the second-hand market, the salience bias could imply that the choice of used products may depend on the prominence with which they are displayed relative to that of new products.

In sum, the literature on habit and selective attention suggests that deploying carefully designed cues in the decision-maker’s choice environment could break habits, steer consumption patterns, and activate prospective memory for CE practices. Nudges that can do so rely on salience, accessibility, and commitment mechanisms. In the following, we review these three types of behavioral instruments.

Salience nudges

An example of a salience nudge is the provision of reminders in the form of visual cues. In the field experiment conducted by [Essl et al. \(2021\)](#), reminders are used to stimulate customers of a Swiss agricultural association that delivers food in plastic bags to return them for reuse. Two kinds of reminders were used: a flyer attached to the external food box and a sticker attached directly to the plastic bag in the box. The sticker on the bag worked as an action-close reminder, that is, customers could notice the reminder when deciding whether to reuse or discard the bag, while the flyer on the box worked as an action-distant reminder. Results show that, compared to the control group that received no reminder, the provision of salient reminders increased the reuse of plastic bags by around 80%. However, the probability of reusing a bag marked with the sticker was 58% higher than that of an unmarked bag and 41% higher than that recorded in the flyer treatment, suggesting that the proximity of the reminder to the related action may further reinforce its impact. This is also coherent with the findings of [Egebark and Ekström \(2016\)](#) and [Chakravarty and Mishra \(2019\)](#), who tested the impact of an appeal to paper conservation. In the first case, the appeal, sent by email to university employees and inviting them to limit printing and resort to double-sided printing, had a negligible effect. In the second example, the conservation nudge presented on a poster pasted directly on the printer significantly reduced paper consumption.

Examples of salient cues can also be found for recycling. Some contributions show that differentiating bins by color or attaching stickers to them can increase the frequency of waste sorting (e.g., [Shearer et al., 2017](#); [Zhang and Wang, 2020](#)). For instance, in the large field experiment by [Shearer et al. \(2017\)](#), involving more than 60,000 households in an English county (Surrey), sticker prompts were attached to refuse bins of the treated households to remind them to use the food waste recycling service. The authors find a significant increase of about 20% in food recycling in the treated households as compared to the households that received no treatment. Even the quality of the separate collection can be improved by visual nudges that increase the salience of recycling instructions. [Lotti et al. \(2023\)](#), in a field experiment run in two buildings on a large university campus, found that showing watching eyes in combination with recycling instructions reduced sorting errors by 7 percentage points compared to showing recycling instructions only. The authors interpret this result as driven by increased attention toward instructions, considering that showing only watching eyes without recycling information increased sorting mistakes by 4.5 percentage points.

Accessibility nudges

The case of the “Drink Local” program, initiated by Princeton University in 2009, provides an example of an accessibility nudge ([Santos and van der Linden, 2016](#)). The program endowed a group of students ($N = 881$) with reusable bottles. Compared to a control that did not receive any ($N = 421$), students endowed with a reusable bottle reported lower frequencies in purchasing bottled water, and the differences are statistically significant. For instance, 66.5% of respondents in the treatment group stated they had never bought bottled water since receiving the reusable bottle, while in the control group this share was 57%. Moreover, respondents in the treatment group were also more likely to support a campus-wide ban on bottled water (around 57% vs. 49% in the control).

For the specific case of reuse, [Frick et al. \(2021\)](#) run an online experiment (Study 2; $N = 881$) in which they test the effectiveness of an accessibility nudge through a social media campaign to promote the repair of clothing. In one treatment, participants were presented with posts stressing the easiness with which jeans can be repaired (“Torn jeans? It’s easy to repair them”). In the control, participants received neutral communication (“Jeans – they always fit”). At the end of the experiment, participants were offered the possibility to enter a raffle to win a €10 coupon to be spent either at a second-hand online shop or a traditional retail shop; this choice maps the participant’s intention to purchase second-hand products in the future. Results show that participants presented with posts promoting jeans repair were 1.5 times more likely to choose the coupon for the second-hand shop.

The survey experiment by [Stefansdotter et al. \(2016\)](#) shows an application of the accessibility effect to the case of second-hand and repaired smartphones. The authors present a sample of young consumers with hypothetical choices between new smartphones. In the treatment, second-hand smartphones were presented alongside the new ones, that is, were actively offered. In the control, used alternatives were not actively offered and could be accessed by clicking on a link located in a separate menu. The authors find that 29% of respondents opted for the used smartphone when this was actively offered, whereas only 4% did so in the control; the difference is statistically significant. Interestingly, this trend also holds when the used option is substituted by the possibility of repairing one’s smartphone: although the majority of respondents opted for the repair option in the control (67%), a larger share (87%) did so when this alternative was more accessible; also this difference is statistically significant.

Commitments

The adverse effects of habit and forgetfulness can also be addressed through commitment plans. A “commitment” involves a pledge on the part of the decision-maker to carry out a specific behavior. At a basic level, a commitment works because it sets the decision-maker’s mind (or “primes” it) towards the action to be exhibited, thus overcoming inattention and habit. Other underlying factors may determine its effectiveness depending on the type of commitment made. For instance, commitments can be “soft” or “hard”. If a decision-maker subscribes to a soft commitment, she cannot be punished in any way for failing to honor the pledge, whereas in the hard version, individuals can “bet” an amount of money that will be lost in case of failure (e.g., a sum of money to be donated to a charity). Moreover, commitments are either “private” or “public”. A private commitment is made with oneself and targets one’s pride or ego; by contrast, publicly made commitments leverage social mechanisms such as social approval and shame avoidance. Hence, commitments may also leverage motivational biases, and not only a priming effect.

At any rate, commitments have been frequently used to foster waste sorting ([Katzev and Pardini, 1987](#); [Wang and Katzev, 1990](#); [Cobern et al., 1995](#)). In the field experiment by [Alonso-Pauli et al. \(2022\)](#), involving 1,500 households in Palma de Mallorca (Spain), randomly selected participants in the treated group were allowed to sign a soft commitment consisting of a pledge to sort bio-waste. Compared to the control group of participants without intervention, the soft commitment increased regular participation in biowaste sorting by 23%, and the effect persisted over time.

3 Motivational biases and nudges

Motivational biases underlie situations in which judgment or behavior deviates from the prescriptions of standard economic theory due to concerns of social and emotional desirability associated with the options and their outcomes (Montibeller and von Winterfeldt, 2015). These biases largely pertain to affective, moral, or social considerations influencing behavior and judgment. We call attention to three broad sources of motivational biases that may be particularly relevant for CE behaviors: conformity to social norms; concerns about self-image and identity; and emotions. In keeping with what was done in Section 2, we also review the nudges that can address these biases.

3.1 Social norms

“Social norms” can be defined as unwritten rules of social conduct. Specifically, social norms refer to how people behave and expect others to behave in social contexts (see, e.g., Cialdini and Trost, 1998, McDonald and Crandall, 2015; Keizer and Schultz, 2018). The literature on social norms distinguishes between “descriptive” norms, which provide a description of how others typically behave (e.g., “my neighbors recycle their waste”); “injunctive”, which refer to conducts that are expected or approved of by others (e.g., “my neighbors expect me to reduce the production of waste”); and “moral”, based on what is perceived to be “right” (e.g., “I must keep the environment clean”). Social norms can also be categorized based on whether they suggest that a certain behavior is exhibited (as in the examples provided above) or avoided (e.g., “I should *not* litter the environment”). The former kind of norm is termed “prescriptive” or “positive”, whereas the latter is termed “proscriptive” or “negative” (on the classification of social norms, see Anderson and Dunning, 2014).

There is consolidated evidence in the literature that social norms drive waste-sorting choices (e.g., Nyborg et al., 2006; Brekke et al., 2010; Thomas and Sharp, 2013; D’Amato et al., 2016; Massarutto et al., 2019). Czajkowski et al. (2017), in a survey administered to a sample of Polish households, find that about 75% of respondents declared that sorting waste was a moral duty and “something everyone should do”. Interestingly, around 25% of respondents stated that they would feel negatively judged if they did not sort waste, and around 50% agreed that they would negatively judge people who do not sort waste, ultimately suggesting the presence of injunctive norms.

Social norms are also relevant in motivating waste reduction (e.g., Abbott et al., 2013; Borg et al., 2020; Salazar et al., 2021). In a survey conducted on Australian respondents, Borg et al. (2020) find that self-reported avoidance of plastic items (bags, straws, coffee cups, and food containers), as well as the intention to avoid their use, correlate positively with the perception about the extent to which others avoid plastic items (descriptive norm) and approve of plastic avoidance (injunctive norm). Even though the evidence concerning the impact of social norms on repair and reuse practices is still scarce, some studies suggest a potential positive effect. For instance, Parajuly et al. (2023), surveying intention to repair among 992 volunteer repairers across European countries, find injunctive social norms as the main predictors of this practice, but only if carried out at public events.

Despite the robust evidence in their support, three aspects need to be considered when assessing the influence of social norms. First, whether a social norm promotes or impedes waste-related behavior depends on how the norm is interpreted. For instance, Corrado et al. (2022) show that

recycling rates decrease when citizens see their environment as degraded because it conveys a descriptive norm suggesting that most people do not properly sort waste. Similarly, [Brekke et al. \(2010\)](#) warn that the duty orientation to recycle may be eroded by the perception that others are not recycling and thus do not share the same moral norm.

Second, the impact of social norms varies depending on the type of material and behavior under consideration. For instance, while there is a social norm to recycle one’s domestic waste, such as organic, plastic, and paper, there seems to be the opposite social norm for waste from electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE). We have already noted that the evidence suggests that households generally stockpile electronic equipment or dispose of it improperly. For instance, the survey by [Ylä-Mella et al. \(2015\)](#) reports that 85% of Finnish consumers store their unused mobile phones at home (see also [Casey et al., 2019](#)).

Finally, the perception of social norms depends on the degree of visibility of the behavior in question. For instance, solid waste recycling typically has a high degree of visibility since it can be observed “every time someone puts their container at the curbside” ([McKenzie-Mohr, 2011](#), p. 78). By contrast, waste reduction practices, such as buying products with less packaging or adopting refurbished appliances, may be characterized by a lower degree of visibility since it is hardly the case that such decisions are broadcast to others ([Barr, 2007](#); [Cecere et al., 2014](#)). Less visible actions may then be driven primarily by other considerations, such as maintaining a positive self-image (see [Section 3.2](#)).

Conveying social norms through messages

People feel pressure to conform to social norms, whether descriptive, injunctive, or moral. If an individual behaves in a way that is not consistent with a social norm, she can be made aware of the existence of that norm and the conduct it suggests. Typically, awareness about social norms is raised through written messages, for instance by displaying signs in the decision environment. Alternatively, social norms can be conveyed by designing the environment so that the decision-maker can observe others’ behavior, and social norms can be inferred by the context (on the distinction between verbal and nonverbal nudges, see [Congiu and Moscati, 2020](#)).

Starting with the former channel, numerous studies have tested the impact of social-norm messages on waste sorting and reduction (e.g., [Chakravarty and Mishra, 2019](#); [Meineri et al., 2021](#); [Chandra, 2023](#)). For example, in the field experiment conducted by [Salazar et al. \(2021\)](#) in a marine park in South Portugal, signs were displayed at a concession stand cashier, close to a paper straw dispenser, to reduce the demand for straws when buying a beverage. Results show that the straw-to-cup ratio was the lowest (0.111) when it was displayed the sign conveying a positive injunctive norm (“Choose to drink directly from the cap or can. The planet thanks you!”) compared to the 0.172 registered in the control. Similarly, [Loschelder et al. \(2019\)](#) find that consumption of disposable to-go cups for hot beverages can be significantly decreased by conveying a “dynamic” descriptive norm, which refers to how one’s peers’ behavior changes over time. In their field experiment conducted at a university cafeteria, the authors affixed a sign informing customers, “Our guests are changing their behavior: More and more are switching from the to-go-cup to a sustainable alternative [i.e., a reusable mug]”. The sign reduced consumption of disposable to-go cups for beverages by 17% on average over the intervention period, from 27.8% to 23.7% of the baseline with no sign.

Normative feedback stimulating social comparisons has been proven effective in improving waste sorting, both with respect to increasing diversion rates (e.g., [Schultz, 1999](#); [Nomura et al., 2011](#); [Mertens and Schultz, 2021](#)) and improving the quality of the separate collection ([Timlett and Williams, 2008](#); [Dupré and Meineri, 2016](#)). In a large-scale field experiment involving two Swedish municipalities, [Ek and Söderberg \(2021\)](#) evaluate the impact of different types of feedback on the amount of households’ residual waste. In a treatment group, households received static information on the average amount of waste produced by the household itself, by a reference group of households, and by a subset of efficient neighbors, i.e., in the bottom 20 percentiles of the waste weight distribution. In another treatment, households received dynamic feedback, i.e., informing how waste behavior had changed since receiving the last letter. Both types of feedback induced significant waste reduction (7-12%), which persisted after the end of the intervention.

Conveying social norms by increasing action visibility

The second channel to convey social norms involves designing the context so that social norms and behavioral deviations from them are made visible to everyone involved. For instance, in the framed field experiment by [Alpizar and Gsottbauer \(2015\)](#), participants were asked to play a threshold public goods game in which they were endowed with five tokens, representing units of time and effort, and asked to choose how much of the endowment to dedicate to recycling. The public good (waste separation by the municipality) was obtained only if the total effort devoted by the group exceeded a given threshold. In one treatment, participants who contributed below the individual optimal threshold were given red flags that publicly exposed their free riding to the other participants, thus leveraging social disapproval and embarrassment; in another treatment, participants who contributed above the individual optimal threshold were assigned green flags, leveraging social approval and pride. Both mechanisms were effective in raising contributions: with respect to the average individual contribution recorded in the control (1.86), the green flag increased individual contribution by 21% (2.25) and the red flag by 39% (2.58). These findings suggest that visual cues can act as public feedback mechanisms that expose one’s deviation from a norm and that people are more sensitive to social disapproval than approval.

A similar idea underlies the “Clear Bag Policy” introduced in a medium-sized city in Canada in 2015, whose effects have been studied by [Akbulut-Yuksel and Boulatoff \(2021\)](#). Under this policy, households were mandated to adopt transparent bags for all waste destined for landfills, instead of traditional black bags (still, one dark bag per household was permitted for waste that posed privacy concerns). Transparent bags make it evident to everyone in the neighborhood whether a household fails to properly sort its waste, thus exposing it to potential social disapproval. In effect, the analysis by [Akbulut-Yuksel and Boulatoff \(2021\)](#) shows that clear bags increased recycling by 15%. Besides, the intervention increased the rate of donations of clothing and small appliances to local charities, likely because households could not dispose of such products in their bags. This suggests that policies of this kind could have positive spillover effects for reuse, even though further research is needed to draw definitive conclusions on such effects.

The finding that the visibility of individual actions is relevant to encouraging sorting behaviors is also confirmed by [Buccioli et al. \(2019\)](#), using administrative data on unsorted waste bin emptying at the household level in the province of Treviso (Italy). In this context, the waste tariff (Pay-As-You-Throw) paid by each household is based on the amount of unsorted waste produced, but

the waste bins may be assigned to one, two, or more households due to logistical reasons. The authors show that when the bin is shared by two households, the production of unsorted waste is significantly lower (around -23%) than when the bin is associated with only one household. Interestingly, when more than two households share the same bin, the waste production is not statistically different from that with single-bin households. These findings can be explained by the different degree of visibility of the sorting behavior under these alternative bin-sharing policies. When the bin is shared by two households, for each household discarding the unsorted waste becomes a visible action that may stimulate feelings of shame; when more households share the same bin, peer monitoring becomes more difficult, and no shame arises from misconduct.

Ultimately, these contributions indicate that showing what other people do or approve of can lead individuals to conform to social norms without the need to convey them verbally. It also calls attention to the importance of designing decisional contexts to broadcast virtuous behavior to others. In the specific case of repair and reuse, social media appear to be interesting avenues for exploiting the influence of social norms. The study by [Frick et al. \(2021\)](#), mentioned above, also tests the impact of peer endorsement for posts suggesting jeans repair on the participant's intention to favor second-hand products. However, the study finds no statistically significant effects of peer endorsement, and thus injunctive social norms, on intention to repair.

3.2 Self-concept, self-image, and identity

Another source of motivational biases pertains to how one perceives and conceptualizes oneself, that is, one's "self-concept" ([Bailey, 2003](#)). As the psychological literature suggests, the self-concept encompasses a variety of constructs, notably self-image and identity (see, e.g., [Oyserman et al., 2012](#)).

"Self-image" can be defined as the mental picture depicting how one perceives oneself. More specifically, self-image includes "(measurable) concretes about what one does (e.g., achieving work products, like sports records), measurable aspects of how one appears (e.g., one's body proportions) and material things one has" ([Bailey, 2003](#), p. 385).

"Identity" refers to who the individual is in terms of the groups to which she belongs. It can be defined as "those aspects of a person's self-concept based upon their group memberships together with their emotional, evaluative, and other psychological correlates" ([Turner and Oakes, 1986](#), p. 240). Clearly, an individual may belong to several different social groups and thus may have diverse identities. The impact of one's identity in a given choice context depends on how strongly one identifies with a group and how relevant the identity is in that context. It also depends on whether the identity is subjected to stigma, that is, socially devalued by being associated with negative beliefs and stereotypes ([Crocker et al., 1998](#)).

How one conceives of, perceives, and identifies oneself may drive one's decision to engage in CE behaviors. For instance, several studies show that maintaining a positive self-image and having a "green" identity prove important determinants of recycling behavior (e.g., [Brekke et al., 2003](#); [Mannetti et al., 2004](#); [Binder and Blankenberg, 2017](#)). The rationale is that an individual forms an idea of the person she wants to be, such as a socially or environmentally responsible citizen, and carries out a behavior she deems representative of such idea, in this case, recycling.

Similarly, self-image and identity become relevant for repair and reuse, especially for clothing.

It is believed that clothing contributes to constructing and broadcasting one’s identity and is a way to signal one’s social status, gender, and age (Armstrong et al., 2015; Hur, 2020). In effect, numerous surveys indicate that consumers are reluctant to purchase second-hand clothing due to concerns about embarrassment, potential identification with people of low socioeconomic status, and related stigma (Laitala and Klepp, 2018; Lo et al., 2019; Silva et al., 2021). Potential stigma can also impede repair practices because damaged and repaired products may be associated with economic hardship (Terzioğlu, 2021).

In other cases, adopting second-hand or refurbished products may strengthen one’s identity and self-concept. For instance, Mugge et al. (2017) provide evidence that certain types of consumers may conceive of their refurbished smartphones as a means to express themselves and communicate their environmental consciousness to their peers. Similarly, Terzioğlu (2021) finds evidence that individuals can experience pride and social approval when they repair their damaged products.

As already discussed in the case of social norms, there is reason to believe that action visibility may affect the relevance of self-image and identity concerns for repair and reuse. Adopting second-hand clothing or electronic devices such as smartphones is a visible behavior, and, for these products, identity concerns might thus become particularly relevant. By contrast, purchasing second-hand appliances or furniture is a less visible action, since such goods typically remain in the privacy of one’s dwelling, and their adoption might be thus more related to considerations about one’s self-image. However, how the different visibility of CE actions may impact actual behaviors and how behavioral interventions can leverage visibility remains an underexplored issue worthy of further investigation.

Nudges addressing image and identity concerns

To date we know of only one experiment that tests the impact of leveraging self-image and identity to promote pro-environmental behaviors—the one by Gosnell (2018). By partnering with a renewable energy supplier in the UK serving more than 38,000 customers, the author tests whether an email promoting the adoption of paperless billing would be more effective when it addressed the recipient as “an environmental steward” for being a customer of a sustainable company. At its core, the message works as it urges the customer to behave consistently with the image and identity of an “environmental steward”, and thus avoid paper billing. Besides, it leverages “cognitive dissonance”, that is, the discomfort caused by finding oneself adopting a behavior that is inconsistent with one’s preexisting beliefs and attitudes (Festinger, 1957). The author finds that, compared to the control condition, the treatment wording increases the adoption of paperless billing by 1.2 percentage points per week. Interestingly, the intervention backfires among a subgroup of highly educated customers, for whom the wording decreases the adoption rate of paperless billing by 6.2 percentage points with respect to the control.

For those pro-environmental behaviors that are subjected to potential stigma, such as the adoption of second-hand clothing, the nudge literature does not report specific interventions to overcome the related image and identity concerns. Nonetheless, defaults and social-norm messages can still address these motivational biases. More specifically, image and identity concerns for sustainable behaviors can be ameliorated by setting such behaviors as defaults and highlighting the existence of social norms pointing to their appropriateness.

An example of such interventions is offered by the study of Giaccherini et al. (2021), which

focuses on increasing the request for doggy bags in restaurants. Diners tend not to ask for a doggy bag because they fear it may signal an unfortunate financial situation, even though doing so contributes to reducing food waste. The authors run a field experiment, involving 14 restaurants and 23,600 customers in Italy, in which they test a default change and a dynamic social norm related to the request for doggy bags. In one treatment, diners were informed that they would be automatically provided with a doggy bag at the end of their meal unless they actively refused. In another treatment, diners were informed that an increasing number of customers were asking waiters for a doggy bag in case of leftovers. Both nudges were communicated through messages displayed via table tents. Compared to a control condition with no intervention, exposure to the dynamic social norm doubled the number of doggy bags requested on average by diners (from 0.5 to 1 per day). By contrast, providing the doggy bag by default did not raise the number of doggy bags requested, but increased the likelihood that a diner consumed her entire meal (of 2.7%). This finding can be explained by assuming that diners interpreted the default as conveying information about the desirability of avoiding wasting food rather than asking for a doggy bag, thus favoring the former action.

3.3 Affects and emotions

Finally, decisions can also be driven by how the decision-maker “feels” about the choice situation. More specifically, an individual is more likely to choose an option if she feels more positive emotions about it, and less likely if she feels more negative emotions (e.g., [Mellers et al., 1999](#); [Bagozzi et al., 2016](#)). Moreover, emotions may be instrumental in deciding in situations where the problem is too cognitively demanding to be based on a precise calculation of costs and benefits. This is the idea underlying the “affect heuristic” ([Slovic et al., 2007](#)), according to which we choose an option just because we “feel good” about it or we “like” it ([Zajonc, 1980](#)), irrespective of many other factors that might be relevant for the decision.

Empirical research shows that emotions influence decisions to engage in a wide range of pro-social and pro-environmental actions ([van der Schalk et al., 2012](#); [Bissing-Olson et al., 2016](#)), including waste-related behaviors. Anticipated guilt, for instance, appears to influence recycling behavior, mediating the relationship between individual environmental concerns and the intention to recycle ([Elgaaied, 2012](#)). Emotions are also relevant drivers behind food waste intentions and behaviors. Negative emotions arising from the guilt of wasting food can motivate individuals to avoid food waste ([Graham-Rowe et al., 2014](#); [Carrus et al., 2008](#)), even though stated intentions may not always translate into the corresponding behaviors ([Russell et al., 2017](#)).

Positive emotions connected with the ownership of a product may explain why people are often reluctant to dispose of it. This is particularly evident in the case of used smartphones ([Wilson et al., 2017](#)). In fact, the literature indicates that people may develop a particularly strong attachment to their smartphone because it is linked to the owner’s personal history and memories (e.g., [Sohn et al., 2022](#)). Accordingly, they prefer conserving them at home instead of recycling them, reducing the possibility of recovering and reusing the rare and valuable resources they contain.

Nudges evoking emotions

Several studies have tested the impact of emotional involvement in various environmental domains and behaviors (Chakravarty and Mishra, 2019; Truelove and Nugent, 2020; Wensing et al., 2020; Chatterjee and Barbhuiya, 2021; Luo et al., 2022). Generally, these contributions elicit involvement through exposure to vivid pictures or videos.

For instance, in an experiment run in an office building of a Canadian company, Luo et al. (2022) show that adding a picture of a marine animal trapped in plastic debris on top of informational signs about waste sorting significantly reduces plastic waste (by 17%). Similarly, in the study by Chatterjee and Barbhuiya (2021), respondents presented with a picture depicting a forest littered with plastic, aimed at eliciting a negative emotion towards plastic pollution, declared a higher willingness to pay for an environmental tax on bottled water than participants presented with a neutral picture.

Septianto et al. (2020) evaluate the effect of stimulating a positive emotion toward food waste reduction through a gratitude appeal. Specifically, in their online survey, the authors administer two messages conveying either gratitude for having food (“be grateful you have food on your table”) or gratitude for not starving (“be grateful you don’t go hungry”). Moreover, their implications were conveyed in a loss (gain) frame, highlighting increased (decreased) environmental damage. Results show that the stated intention to reduce food waste increases significantly with a message eliciting gratitude for having food paired with an emphasis on the decrease in environmental damage and with a message eliciting gratitude for not starving paired with an emphasis on the increase in environmental damage. Both gratitude-eliciting messages proved also more effective than a control with no emotional appeal.

Ultimately, this literature shows that eliciting strong emotions can be a promising intervention to foster circular behaviors.

4 Concluding remarks

In this work, we have reviewed the main cognitive and motivational biases behind individual behaviors relevant to the CE transition, specifically waste reduction, reuse and repair, and recycling, as well as the behavioral interventions that have been tested to address these biases.

As the literature review has shown, recognizing the relevant bias behind certain behaviors is crucial to identifying the best interventions to implement. For instance, the desire to adhere to social norms has been found to be relevant in driving visible behaviors, stimulating people to behave as most others do or as they expect others would like them to do. Accordingly, interventions that convey social norms can successfully increase waste sorting and reduction when these actions can be seen by relevant others, such as food waste avoidance in public places or the avoidance of using plastic bags, cups, and straws in shops and cafés. This kind of nudge, instead, is not expected to be effective in correcting individual actions that others cannot observe. In those cases, behavioral interventions should consider other leverages, such as those related to individual self-image and identity. Analogously, interventions through reminders have proven effective in encouraging proper waste disposal in situations where improper disposal is a habitual behavior resulting from inattention.

Overall, we can then conclude that while the evidence presented supports the effectiveness of specific nudge interventions for specific behaviors, it also implicitly suggests that it is crucial to assess their impact on a case-by-case basis. The beneficial effects of these interventions are not equal in all contexts and thus they cannot be considered universally applicable.

Indeed, behavioral interventions may fail to achieve their intended effects and can even have adverse consequences (the so-called “boomerang effect”) when applied in an inappropriate context. For instance, in a deteriorated environment where citizens are not actively engaged in proper waste sorting, and/or where the collection system is inefficient, a nudge emphasizing a descriptive social norm could potentially worsen the existing negative behavior and impede the adoption of the desired behavior. Similarly, interventions based on stimulating conformity with the prevailing social norm may have adverse effects, discouraging the adoption of sustainable practices, like wearing second-hand clothes in contexts where it is not a common habit.

We have also shown that behavioral interventions should be tailored to the specific waste behavior, and strategies that prove effective in addressing a particular behavior may not necessarily be successful in influencing others. This suggests the need to conduct experiments to evaluate the impact of these interventions, especially for those practices that are still widely underexplored, like reuse and repair.

A quite neglected aspect of the literature, which should merit further investigation, is related to the potentially heterogeneous impact of behavioral interventions across different social groups. The use of second-hand items is illustrative in this respect. Fostering consumption of second-hand products, for instance, through nudges that promote one’s image as an environmentally friendly person, may be effective for wealthier people, but it may be less impactful for lower-income individuals to the extent they perceive the possession of new goods as a signal to enhance their social image.

Ultimately, our review suggests potential research avenues at the intersection between behavioral and environmental economics. By advancing a conceptual link between the concerns associated with some CE behaviors and well-known decisional biases, we have laid some groundwork for experimental investigation into the influence of specific biases and interventions on these practices. We hope that our review may assist interested researchers in this endeavor.

References

- Aarts, H., Verplanken, B., and Van Knippenberg, A. (1998). Predicting behavior from actions in the past: Repeated decision making or a matter of habit? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(15):1355–1374.
- Abbott, A., Nandeibam, S., and O’Shea, L. (2013). Recycling: Social norms and warm-glow revisited. *Ecological Economics*, 90:10–18.
- Ackerman, D. S. and Hu, J. (2017). Assuring me that it is as ‘Good as New’ just makes me think about how someone else used it. Examining consumer reaction toward marketer-provided information about secondhand goods. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 16(3):233–241.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2):179–211.

- Akbulut-Yuksel, M. and Boulatoff, C. (2021). The effects of a green nudge on municipal solid waste: Evidence from a clear bag policy. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 106:102404.
- Alonso-Pauli, E., Balart, P., Ezquerra, L., and Hernández Arenaz, Í. (2022). Understanding soft commitment: Evidence from a field experiment on recycling. Working Paper. <https://academic.e.unavarra.es/bitstream/handle/2454/42515/WP2201.pdf>.
- Alpizar, F. and Gsottbauer, E. (2015). Reputation and household recycling practices: Field experiments in costa rica. *Ecological Economics*, 120:366–375.
- Anderson, J. E. and Dunning, D. (2014). Behavioral norms: Variants and their identification. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 8(12):721–738.
- Angner, E. (2021). *A course in behavioral economics*. Red Globe Press.
- Ansink, E., Wijk, L., and Zuidmeer, F. (2022). No clue about bioplastics. *Ecological Economics*, 191:107245.
- Ariely, D. (2009). *Predictably irrational: The hidden forces that shape our decisions*. Harper Collins.
- Armstrong, C. M., Niinimäki, K., Kujala, S., Karell, E., and Lang, C. (2015). Sustainable product-service systems for clothing: Exploring consumer perceptions of consumption alternatives in finland. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 97:30–39.
- Bagozzi, R. P., Belanche, D., Casaló, L. V., and Flavián, C. (2016). The role of anticipated emotions in purchase intentions. *Psychology and Marketing*, 33(8):629–645.
- Bailey, J. A. (2003). Self-image, self-concept, and self-identity revisited. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 95(5):383–386.
- Barr, S. (2007). Factors influencing environmental attitudes and behaviors: A UK case study of household waste management. *Environment and Behavior*, 39(4):435–473.
- Bashir, H., Jørgensen, S., Pedersen, L. J. T., and Skard, S. (2020). Experimenting with sustainable business models in fast moving consumer goods. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 270:122302.
- Bell, D. E. (1985). Disappointment in decision making under uncertainty. *Operations Research*, 33(1):1–27.
- Binder, M. and Blankenberg, A.-K. (2017). Green lifestyles and subjective well-being: More about self-image than actual behavior? *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 137:304–323.
- Bissing-Olson, M. J., Fielding, K. S., and Iyer, A. (2016). Experiences of pride, not guilt, predict pro-environmental behavior when pro-environmental descriptive norms are more positive. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 45:145–153.
- Bordalo, P., Gennaioli, N., and Shleifer, A. (2022). Salience. *Annual Review of Economics*, 14:521–544.
- Borg, K., Curtis, J., and Lindsay, J. (2020). Social norms and plastic avoidance: Testing the theory of normative social behaviour on an environmental behaviour. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 19(6):594–607.
- Botchway, E., Verpooten, J., van der Beken, I., Baršytė, J., and Dewitte, S. (2023). The endowment

- effect in the circular economy: Do broken products face less of a trading barrier than intact or repaired ones? *Sustainability*, 15(15):11813.
- Brekke, K. A., Kipperberg, G., and Nyborg, K. (2010). Social interaction in responsibility ascription: The case of household recycling. *Land Economics*, 86(4):766–784.
- Brekke, K. A., Kverndokk, S., and Nyborg, K. (2003). An economic model of moral motivation. *Journal of Public Economics*, 87(9-10):1967–1983.
- Buccioli, A., Montinari, N., and Piovesan, M. (2019). It wasn’t me! Visibility and free riding in waste disposal. *Ecological Economics*, 157:394–401.
- Camerer, C. and Thaler, R. H. (1995). Anomalies: Ultimatums, dictators and manners. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(2):209–219.
- Caputo, A. (2013). A literature review of cognitive biases in negotiation processes. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 24(4):374–398.
- Carrus, G., Passafaro, P., and Bonnes, M. (2008). Emotions, habits and rational choices in ecological behaviours: The case of recycling and use of public transportation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 28(1):51–62.
- Casey, K., Lichrou, M., and Fitzpatrick, C. (2019). Treasured trash? A consumer perspective on small waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) divestment in Ireland. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 145:179–189.
- Cecere, G., Mancinelli, S., and Mazzanti, M. (2014). Waste prevention and social preferences: The role of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. *Ecological Economics*, 107:163–176.
- Chakravarty, S. and Mishra, R. (2019). Using social norms to reduce paper waste: Results from a field experiment in the Indian information technology sector. *Ecological Economics*, 164:106356.
- Chandra, G. (2023). Non-monetary intervention to discourage consumption of single-use plastic bags. *Behavioural Public Policy*, 7(1):143–156.
- Chatterjee, D. and Barbhuiya, M. R. (2021). Bottled water usage and willingness to pay among Indian tourists: Visual nudges and the theory of planned behaviour. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 21(5):531–549.
- Chembessi, C., Beaurain, C., and Cloutier, G. (2023). Narrating the interplay between circular economy (ce) and ecological transition: a social and cultural perspective from ce experiments in Kamouraska (Quebec) and La Rochelle (France). *Circular Economy*, 1(2):1–27.
- Cialdini, R. B. and Trost, M. R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance. In Gilbert, D. T., Fiske, S. T., and Lindzey, G., editors, *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, chapter 22, pages 151–192. McGraw-Hill.
- Cobern, M. K., Porter, B. E., Leeming, F. C., and Dwyer, W. O. (1995). The effect of commitment on adoption and diffusion of grass cycling. *Environment and Behavior*, 27(2):213–232.
- Cohen, M. and Jaffray, J. Y. (1988). Certainty effect versus probability distortion: An experimental analysis of decision making under risk. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 14(4):554–560.
- Colasante, A. and D’Adamo, I. (2021). The circular economy and bioeconomy in the fashion sector: Emergence of a “sustainability bias”. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 329:129774.

- Congiu, L. and Moscati, I. (2020). Message and Environment: A framework for nudges and choice architecture. *Behavioural Public Policy*, 4(1):71–87.
- Congiu, L. and Moscati, I. (2022). A review of nudges: Definitions, justifications, effectiveness. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 36(1):188–213.
- Corrado, L., Fazio, A., and Pelloni, A. (2022). Pro-environmental attitudes, local environmental conditions and recycling behavior. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 362:132399.
- Crocker, J., Major, B., and Steele, C. M. (1998). Social stigma. In D. Gilbert, S. T. F. and Lindzey, G., editors, *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, chapter 28, pages 504–553. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Czajkowski, M., Hanley, N., and Nyborg, K. (2017). Social norms, morals and self-interest as determinants of pro-environment behaviours: The case of household recycling. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 66(4):647–670.
- D’Amato, A., Mancinelli, S., and Zoli, M. (2016). Complementarity vs substitutability in waste management behaviors. *Ecological Economics*, 123:84–94.
- Dhami, S. (2020). *The foundations of behavioral economic analysis*, volume 5. Oxford University Press.
- Dupré, M. and Meineri, S. (2016). Increasing recycling through displaying feedback and social comparative feedback. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 48:101–107.
- Ebeling, F. and Lotz, S. (2015). Domestic uptake of green energy promoted by opt-out tariffs. *Nature Climate Change*, 5(9):868–871.
- Echegaray, F. and Hansstein, F. V. (2017). Assessing the intention-behavior gap in electronic waste recycling: The case of Brazil. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 142:180–190.
- Edbring, E. G., Lehner, M., and Mont, O. (2016). Exploring consumer attitudes to alternative models of consumption: Motivations and barriers. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 123:5–15.
- Egebark, J. and Ekström, M. (2016). Can indifference make the world greener? *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 76:1–13.
- Einstein, G. O. and McDaniel, M. A. (2005). Prospective memory: Multiple retrieval processes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14(6):286–290.
- Ek, C. and Söderberg, M. (2021). Norm-based feedback on household waste large-scale field experiments in two Swedish municipalities. CeCAR Working Paper Series No. 12. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3876029>.
- Elgaaied, L. (2012). Exploring the role of anticipated guilt on pro-environmental behavior — a suggested typology of residents in France based on their recycling patterns. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 29(5):369–377.
- Endendijk, T. and Botzen, W. W. (2023). A default nudge in waste management: Assessing the impact of explicit consent for unaddressed mail. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy*, pages 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21606544.2023.2166129>.
- Essl, A., Steffen, A., and Staehle, M. (2021). Choose to reuse! The effect of action-close reminders on pro-environmental behavior. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 110:102539.

- Feldman, P. J. and Ferraro, P. J. (2023). A certainty effect for preference reversals under risk: Experiment and theory. Working paper. <https://www.pauljerraro.com/s/Feldman-Ferraro-Certainty-Effect-Preference-Reversals-5-March-2023.pdf>.
- Fernando, A. G., Sivakumaran, B., and Suganthi, L. (2018). Comparison of perceived acquisition value sought by online second-hand and new goods shoppers. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52(7-8):1412–1438.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford University Press.
- Figge, F. and Thorpe, A. S. (2023). Circular economy, operational eco-efficiency, and sufficiency. an integrated view. *Ecological Economics*, 204:107692.
- Foster, G. D., Karpyn, A., Wojtanowski, A. C., Davis, E., Weiss, S., Brensinger, C., Tierney, A., Guo, W., Brown, J., Spross, C., Leuchten, D., Burns, P. J., and Glanz, K. (2014). Placement and promotion strategies to increase sales of healthier products in supermarkets in low-income, ethnically diverse neighborhoods: A randomized controlled trial. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 99(6):1359–1368.
- Frick, V., Gossen, M., Santarius, T., and Geiger, S. (2021). When your shop says #lessismore. on-line communication interventions for clothing sufficiency. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 75:101595.
- Gagliardi, L. (2023). The role of cognitive biases in conspiracy beliefs: A literature review. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, pages 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12604>.
- Ghesla, C., Grieder, M., and Schubert, R. (2020). Nudging the poor and the rich—a field study on the distributional effects of green electricity defaults. *Energy Economics*, 86:104616.
- Giaccherini, M., Gilli, M., Mancinelli, S., and Zoli, M. (2021). Nudging food waste decisions at restaurants. *European Economic Review*, 135:103722.
- Gonzalez-Arcos, C., Joubert, A. M., Scaraboto, D., Guesalaga, R., and Sandberg, J. (2021). “How do I carry all this now?” Understanding consumer resistance to sustainability interventions. *Journal of Marketing*, 85(3):44–61.
- Gosnell, G. K. (2018). Communicating resourcefully: A natural field experiment on environmental framing and cognitive dissonance in going paperless. *Ecological Economics*, 154:128–144.
- Graham-Rowe, E., Jessop, D. C., and Sparks, P. (2014). Identifying motivations and barriers to minimising household food waste. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 84:15–23.
- Gul, F. (1991). A theory of disappointment aversion. *Econometrica*, 59(3):667–686.
- Hansen, P. G. (2016). The definition of nudge and libertarian paternalism: Does the hand fit the glove? *European Journal of Risk Regulation*, 7(1):155–174.
- Homar, A. R. and Cvelbar, L. K. (2021). The effects of framing on environmental decisions: A systematic literature review. *Ecological Economics*, 183:106950.
- Homonoff, T. A. (2018). Can small incentives have large effects? The impact of taxes versus bonuses on disposable bag use. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 10(4):177–210.
- Hou, J., Jin, Y., and Chen, F. (2020). Should waste separation be mandatory? A study on public’s response to the policies in china. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(12).

- Hur, E. (2020). Rebirth fashion: Secondhand clothing consumption values and perceived risks. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 273:122951.
- Ishimura, Y., Shinkuma, T., Takeuchi, K., and Hosoda, E. (2024). The effects of regional goal setting on household waste. *Ecological Economics*, 215:108015.
- Janiszewski, C., Kuo, A., and Tavassoli, N. T. (2013). The influence of selective attention and inattention to products on subsequent choice. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39:1258–1274.
- Jayaraman, K., Haron, H., Sung, G. B., and Lin, S. K. (2011). Consumer reflections on the usage of plastic bags to parcel hot edible items: An empirical study in Malaysia. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 19(13):1527–1535.
- Johnson, E. J. and Goldstein, D. (2003). Do defaults save lives? *Science*, 302(5649):1338–1339.
- Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L., and Thaler, R. H. (1990). Experimental tests of the endowment effect and the Coase theorem. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(6):1325–1348.
- Kahneman, D. and Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decisions under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2):263–291.
- Kallbekken, S. and Sælen, H. (2013). ‘Nudging’ hotel guests to reduce food waste as a win-win environmental measure. *Economics Letters*, 119(3):325–327.
- Katzev, R. D. and Pardini, A. U. (1987). The comparative effectiveness of reward and commitment approaches in motivating community recycling. *Journal of Environmental Systems*, 17(2):93–114.
- Keizer, K. and Schultz, P. W. (2018). Social norms and pro-environmental behaviour. In Steg, L. and de Groot, J. I. M., editors, *Environmental Psychology: An Introduction*, pages 179–188. John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Kim, J., Hwang, E., Park, J., Lee, J. C., and Park, J. (2019). Position effects of menu item displays in consumer choices: Comparisons of horizontal versus vertical displays. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 60(2):116–124.
- Kirakozian, A. (2016). One without the other? Behavioural and incentive policies for household waste management. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 30(3):526–551.
- Kivetz, R., Netzer, O., and Srinivasan, V. (2004). Extending compromise effect models to complex buying situations and other context effects. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 41(3):262–268.
- Korhonen, J., Honkasalo, A., and Seppälä, J. (2018). Circular economy: the concept and its limitations. *Ecological economics*, 143:37–46.
- Kumar, S. and Goyal, N. (2015). Behavioural biases in investment decision making — a systematic literature review. *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets*, 7(1):88–108.
- Kurniawati, M. (2019). Anticipated regret in the purchase of secondhand and counterfeit product. *Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen*, 10(2):197–204.
- Kuyer, P. and Gordijn, B. (2023). Nudge in perspective: A systematic literature review on the ethical issues with nudging. *Rationality and Society*, 35(2):191–230.
- Laitala, K. and Klepp, I. G. (2018). Motivations for and against second-hand clothing acquisition. *Clothing Cultures*, 5(2):247–262.

- Li, D., Zhao, L., Ma, S., Shao, S., and Zhang, L. (2019). What influences an individual's pro-environmental behavior? A literature review. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 146:28–34.
- Lindstrom, K. N., Tucker, J. A., and McVay, M. (2023). Nudges and choice architecture to promote healthy food purchases in adults: A systematized review. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 37(1):87–103.
- Lo, C. J., Tsarenko, Y., and Tojib, D. (2019). To tell or not to tell? The roles of perceived norms and self-consciousness in understanding consumers' willingness to recommend online secondhand apparel shopping. *Psychology and Marketing*, 36(4):287–304.
- Loomes, G. and Sugden, R. (1982). Regret theory: An alternative theory of rational choice under uncertainty. *Economic Journal*, 92(368):805–824.
- Loschelder, D. D., Siepelmeyer, H., Fischer, D., and Rubel, J. A. (2019). Dynamic norms drive sustainable consumption: Norm-based nudging helps café customers to avoid disposable to-go-cups. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 75:102146.
- Lotti, L., Barile, L., and Manfredi, G. (2023). Improving recycling sorting behaviour with human eye nudges. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):10127.
- Luo, Y., Douglas, J., Pahl, S., and Zhao, J. (2022). Reducing plastic waste by visualizing marine consequences. *Environment and Behavior*, 54(4):809–832.
- Mancinelli, S. and Zoli, M. (2023). On the use of behavioural instruments to affect individual waste production and disposal decisions. In Bucciol, A., Tavoni, A., and Veronesi, M., editors, *Behavioral Economics and the Environment*, pages 247–264. Routledge.
- Mannetti, L., Pierro, A., and Livi, S. (2004). Recycling: Planned and self-expressive behaviour. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 24(2):227–236.
- Massarutto, A., Marangon, F., Troiano, S., and Favot, M. (2019). Moral duty, warm glow or self-interest? A choice experiment study on motivations for domestic garbage sorting in Italy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 208:916–923.
- McDonald, R. I. and Crandall, C. S. (2015). Social norms and social influence. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 3:147–151.
- McKenzie-Mohr, D. (2011). *Fostering sustainable behavior: An introduction to community-based social marketing*. New society publishers.
- Meineri, S., Dangeard, I., and Dupré, M. (2021). The long-lasting impact of long-term feedback on waste management. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 61(3):182–197.
- Mellers, B., Schwartz, A., and Ritov, I. (1999). Emotion-based choice. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 128(3):332–345.
- Mertens, S. N. and Schultz, P. W. (2021). Referent group specificity: Optimizing normative feedback to increase residential recycling. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 73:101541.
- Montibeller, G. and von Winterfeldt, D. (2015). Cognitive and motivational biases in decision and risk analysis. *Risk Analysis*, 35(7):1230–1251.
- Mugge, R., Jockin, B., and Bocken, N. (2017). How to sell refurbished smartphones? An investigation of different customer groups and appropriate incentives. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 147:284–296.

- Mullainathan, S. and Thaler, R. H. (2000). Behavioral economics. NBER Working Paper. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w7948>.
- Mundt, D., Carl, S., and Harhoff, N. (2020). A field experiment on reducing drinking straw consumption by default. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11:2266.
- Nelson, K. M., Bauer, M. K., and Partelow, S. (2021). Informational nudges to encourage pro-environmental behavior: Examining differences in message framing and human interaction. *Frontiers in Communication*, 5:610186.
- Nomura, H., John, P. C., and Cotterill, S. (2011). The use of feedback to enhance environmental outcomes: A randomised controlled trial of a food waste scheme. *Local Environment*, 16(7):637–653.
- Nurchis, M. C., Pumpo, M. D., Perilli, A., Greco, G., and Damiani, G. (2023). Nudging interventions on alcohol and tobacco consumption in adults: A scoping review of the literature. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(3).
- Nyborg, K., Howarth, R. B., and Brekke, K. A. (2006). Green consumers and public policy: On socially contingent moral motivation. *Resource and Energy Economics*, 28(4):351–366.
- O’Brien, J. and Thondhlana, G. (2019). Plastic bag use in south africa: Perceptions, practices and potential intervention strategies. *Waste Management*, 84:320–328.
- Ouellette, J. A. and Wood, W. (1998). Habit and intention in everyday life: The multiple processes by which past behavior predicts future behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(1):54–74.
- Oyserman, D., Elmore, K., and Smith, G. (2012). Self, self-concept, and identity. In Leary, M. R. and Tangney, J. P., editors, *Handbook of Self and Identity*, pages 69–104. Guilford Press.
- Parajuly, K., Fitzpatrick, C., Muldoon, O., and Kuehr, R. (2020). Behavioral change for the circular economy: A review with focus on electronic waste management in the EU. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling: X*, 6:100035.
- Parajuly, K., Green, J., Richter, J., Johnson, M., Rückschloss, J., Peeters, J., Kuehr, R., and Fitzpatrick, C. (2023). Product repair in a circular economy: Exploring public repair behavior from a systems perspective. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, pages 1–13. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdfdirect/10.1111/jiec.13451>.
- Petit, O., Velasco, C., and Spence, C. (2018). Are large portions always bad? Using the Delboeuf illusion on food packaging to nudge consumer behavior. *Marketing Letters*, 29(4):435–449.
- Prelec, D. (1998). The probability weighting function. *Econometrica*, 66(3):497–527.
- Reijnen, E., Kühne, S. J., von Gugelberg, H. M., and Cramer, A. (2019). Nudged to a menu position: The role of “I’m loving it”! *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 42(3):441–453.
- Rotondo, F., Perchinunno, P., L’Abbate, S., and Mongelli, L. (2022). Ecological transition and sustainable development: Integrated statistical indicators to support public policies. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):18513.
- Russell, S. V., Young, C. W., Unsworth, K. L., and Robinson, C. (2017). Bringing habits and emotions into food waste behaviour. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 125:107–114.
- Salazar, G., Neves, J., Alves, V., Silva, B., Giger, J. C., and Verissimo, D. (2021). The effectiveness

- and efficiency of using normative messages to reduce waste: A real world experiment. *PLoS ONE*, 16(12):e0261734.
- Samuelson, W. and Zeckhauser, R. (1988). Status quo bias in decision making. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 1:7–59.
- Santos, J. M. and van der Linden, S. (2016). Changing norms by changing behavior: The Princeton Drink Local Program. *Environmental Practice*, 18(2):116–122.
- Saposnik, G., Redelmeier, D., Ruff, C. C., and Tobler, P. N. (2016). Cognitive biases associated with medical decisions: A systematic review. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 16(1):1–14.
- Schultz, P. W. (1999). Changing behavior with normative feedback interventions: A field experiment on curbside recycling. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 21(1):25–36.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1973). Normative explanations of helping behavior: A critique, proposal, and empirical test. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 9(4):349–364.
- Septianto, F., Kemper, J. A., and Northey, G. (2020). Thanks, but no thanks: The influence of gratitude on consumer awareness of food waste. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 258:120591.
- Shearer, L., Gatersleben, B., Morse, S., Smyth, M., and Hunt, S. (2017). A problem unstuck? Evaluating the effectiveness of sticker prompts for encouraging household food waste recycling behaviour. *Waste Management*, 60:164–172.
- Silva, S. C., Santos, A., Duarte, P., and Vlačić, B. (2021). The role of social embarrassment, sustainability, familiarity and perception of hygiene in second-hand clothing purchase experience. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 49(6):717–734.
- Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., and MacGregor, D. G. (2007). The affect heuristic. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 177(3):1333–1352.
- Smith, R. E., Hunt, R. R., McVay, J. C., and McConnell, M. D. (2007). The cost of event-based prospective memory: Salient target events. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition*, 33(4):734–746.
- Sohn, S., Karampournioti, E., Wiedmann, K. P., and Fritz, W. (2022). The sources of the many faces of consumer smartphone attachment: A value-in-use perspective. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 46(4):1399–1412.
- Stefansdotter, A., Steen-Knudsen, J., Flack, M., and Hansen, P. G. (2016). Nudging for sustainable consumption of electronics. Summary Report. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:943627/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- Terzioğlu, N. (2021). Repair motivation and barriers model: Investigating user perspectives related to product repair towards a circular economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 289:125644.
- Thaler, R. H. (1980). Toward a positive theory of consumer choice. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 1(1):39–60.
- Thaler, R. H. and Benartzi, S. (2004). Save More Tomorrow: Using behavioral economics to increase employee saving. *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(1).
- Thaler, R. H. and Sunstein, C. R. (2009). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Penguin.

- Thomas, C. and Sharp, V. (2013). Understanding the normalisation of recycling behaviour and its implications for other pro-environmental behaviours: A review of social norms and recycling. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 79:11–20.
- Timlett, R. E. and Williams, I. D. (2008). Public participation and recycling performance in England: A comparison of tools for behaviour change. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 52(4):622–634.
- Truelove, H. B. and Nugent, M. R. (2020). Straw wars: Pro-environmental spillover following a guilt appeal. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 72:101521.
- Turner, J. C. and Oakes, P. J. (1986). The significance of the social identity concept for social psychology with reference to individualism, interactionism and social influence. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 25(3):237–252.
- Tversky, A. and Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185(4157):1124–1131.
- Tversky, A. and Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211(4481):453–458.
- van der Schalk, J., Bruder, M., and Manstead, A. (2012). Regulating emotion in the context of interpersonal decisions: The role of anticipated pride and regret. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3:513.
- van Weelden, E., Mugge, R., and Bakker, C. (2019). Paving the way towards circular consumption: Exploring consumer acceptance of refurbished mobile phones in the Dutch market. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 113:743–754.
- Wang, T. H. and Katzev, R. D. (1990). Group commitment and resource conservation: Two field experiments on promoting recycling. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 20(4):265–275.
- Wansink, B. and van Ittersum, K. (2013). Portion size me: Plate-size induced consumption norms and win-win solutions for reducing food intake and waste. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 19(4):320–332.
- Wattanacharoensil, W. and La-ornual, D. (2019). A systematic review of cognitive biases in tourist decisions. *Tourism Management*, 75:353–369.
- Wensing, J., Caputo, V., Carraresi, L., and Bröring, S. (2020). The effects of green nudges on consumer valuation of bio-based plastic packaging. *Ecological Economics*, 178:106783.
- Wilson, G. T., Smalley, G., Suckling, J. R., Lilley, D., Lee, J., and Mawle, R. (2017). The hibernating mobile phone: Dead storage as a barrier to efficient electronic waste recovery. *Waste Management*, 60:521–533.
- Yan, R. N., Bae, S. Y., and Xu, H. (2015). Second-hand clothing shopping among college students: The role of psychographic characteristics. *Young Consumers*, 16(1):85–98.
- Ylä-Mella, J., Keiski, R. L., and Pongrácz, E. (2015). Electronic waste recovery in Finland: Consumers’ perceptions towards recycling and re-use of mobile phones. *Waste Management*, 45:374–384.
- Zajonc, R. B. (1980). Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. *American Psychologist*, 35(2):151–175.

- Zeelenberg, M. (1999). Anticipated regret, expected feedback and behavioral decision making. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 12(2):93–106.
- Zhang, H., Liu, J., guo Wen, Z., and Chen, Y.-X. (2017). College students’ municipal solid waste source separation behavior and its influential factors: A case study in beijing, china. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 164:444–454.
- Zhang, J., Huang, Y., Zhu, J., and Zhao, L. (2023). A meta-analysis on the effectiveness of food-waste reducing nudges. *Food Policy*, 120:102480.
- Zhang, Z. and Wang, X. (2020). Nudging to promote household waste source separation: Mechanisms and spillover effects. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 162:105054.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS BY *CEIS Tor Vergata*

Energy Shocks, Pandemics and the Macroeconomy

Luisa Corrado, Stefano Grassi, Aldo Paolillo and Francesco Ravazzolo

CEIS Research Paper, 582 August 2024

The Multivariate Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Process

Ranieri Dugo, Giacomo Giorgio and Paolo Pigato

CEIS Research Paper, 581 August 2024

The Macro Neutrality of Exchange-Rate Regimes in the presence of Exporter-Importer Firms

Cosimo Petracchi

CEIS Research Paper, 580 July 2024

Monetary Regimes and Real Exchange Rates: Long-Run Evidence at the Product Level

Jason Kim, Marco Mello and Cosimo Petracchi

CEIS Research Paper, 579 June 2024

On the Output Effect of Fiscal Consolidation Plans: A Causal Analysis

Lorenzo Carbonari, Alessio Farcomeni, Filippo Maurici and Giovanni Trovato

CEIS Research Paper, 578 May 2024

Ordered Correlation Forest

Riccardo Di Francesco

CEIS Research Paper, 577 May 2024

Ups and (Draw)Downs

Tommaso Proietti

CEIS Research Paper, 576 May 2024

Human Capital-based Growth with Depopulation and Class-size Effects: Theory and Empirics

Alberto Bucci, Lorenzo Carbonari, Giovanni Trovato and Pedro Trivin

CEIS Research Paper, 575 April 2024

Optimization of the Generalized Covariance Estimator in Noncausal Processes

Gianluca Cubadda, Francesco Giancaterini, Alain Hecq and Joann Jasiak

CEIS Research Paper, 574 April 2024

Caring Connections: Immigrant Caregivers and Long-Term Elderly Care in Italy

Lisa Capretti, Joanna A. Kopinska, Rama Dasi Mariani and Furio Camillo Rosati

CEIS Research Paper, 573 April 2024

DISTRIBUTION

Our publications are available online at www.ceistorvergata.it

DISCLAIMER

The opinions expressed in these publications are the authors' alone and therefore do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the supporters, staff, or boards of CEIS Tor Vergata.

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2024 by authors. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief passages quoted in critical articles and reviews.

MEDIA INQUIRIES AND INFORMATION

For media inquiries, please contact Barbara Piazzzi at +39 06 72595652/01 or by e-mail at piazzzi@ceis.uniroma2.it. Our web site, www.ceistorvergata.it, contains more information about Center's events, publications, and staff.

DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT

For information about contributing to CEIS Tor Vergata, please contact at +39 06 72595601 or by e-mail at segr.ceis@economia.uniroma2.it