

通过社会规范内化与道德认同理解亲环境行为：综述与整合框架

任梦梦^{1,2}

¹认知与人类行为湖南省重点实验室, 湖南 长沙

²湖南师范大学教育科学学院, 湖南 长沙

收稿日期: 2025年7月24日; 录用日期: 2025年8月28日; 发布日期: 2025年9月16日

摘要

亲环境行为的形成机制是环境心理学领域的重要议题。本文基于社会规范内化理论与道德认同理论, 构建了一个整合外在社会规范、内在个人规范与道德认同的链式中介模型, 旨在系统揭示个体从遵循外在规范到内化为稳定亲环境行为的心理路径。首先, 文章回顾了亲环境行为的测量方式及其多维结构, 强调描述性规范与禁令性规范作为外部引导力量在行为决策中的关键作用。其次, 指出个人规范是社会规范内化的结果, 构成持续践行亲环境行为的重要心理基础。最后, 深入探讨道德认同在社会规范影响个人规范的过程中所发挥的链式中介作用, 强调其在激发个体内在价值一致性与环境责任感中的核心功能。

关键词

亲环境行为, 社会规范, 个人规范, 道德认同

Understanding Pro-Environmental Behavior through Social Norm Internalization and Moral Identity: A Review and Integrative Framework

Mengmeng Ren^{1,2}

¹Cognition and Human Behavior Key Laboratory of Hunan Province, Changsha Hunan

²School of Education Science, Hunan Normal University, Changsha Hunan

Received: Jul. 24th, 2025; accepted: Aug. 28th, 2025; published: Sep. 16th, 2025

文章引用: 任梦梦(2025). 通过社会规范内化与道德认同理解亲环境行为: 综述与整合框架. 心理学进展, 15(9), 333-344. DOI: 10.12677/ap.2025.159524

Abstract

The formation of pro-environmental behavior is a central topic in environmental psychology. Grounded in theories of social norm internalization and moral identity, this study proposes a chain mediation framework that integrates external social norms, internal personal norms, and moral identity. The aim is to systematically reveal the psychological mechanisms through which individuals transform external normative influences into stable pro-environmental behaviors. First, the study reviews the multidimensional structure and measurement approaches of pro-environmental behavior, emphasizing the critical roles of descriptive and injunctive norms as external guiding forces in individual decision-making. Second, it highlights personal norms as internalized outcomes of social norms, serving as the psychological foundation for the sustainability of pro-environmental behavior. Finally, the study explores the chain mediating role of moral identity in the transformation from social to personal norms, underscoring its importance in fostering internal value alignment and a sense of environmental responsibility.

Keywords

Pro-Environmental Behavior, Social Norms, Personal Norms, Moral Identity

Copyright © 2025 by author(s) and Hans Publishers Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

1. 引言

全球气温持续上升对人类社会和生态系统造成了严重影响,实现环境可持续发展已成为亟待解决的核心问题。个体在社会困境中常面临自利与环保之间的矛盾:为环境利益牺牲个人利益即为亲环境行为。已有研究表明,社会规范信息能引导个体优先考虑长远环境利益,但其作为外在“他律”要求,只有内化为个体的“自律”规范,才能更稳定地影响行为。道德认同在这一转化过程中起关键作用:它的激活有助于社会规范内化为个人规范,从而增强亲环境行为。基于此,本研究旨在揭示社会规范影响亲环境行为的内在机制,阐明个人规范和道德认同的作用路径,为推动可持续发展、保护生态环境及促进社会福祉提供实证支持。

2. 社会困境视角下的亲环境行为

2.1. 定义与分类

人类的一些行为正在加剧环境恶化,如垃圾围城与水污染,亟需通过广泛的行为转变来促进环境保护。亲环境行为(pro-environmental behavior)通常被界定为能够产生环境效益的个体行动,包括参与绿色活动、减少或避免对环境的不利影响(魏心妮等, 2023; Lange, 2022; Lange & Dewitte, 2019, 2023; Steg & Vlek, 2009)。其实施往往意味着个体为环境利益牺牲部分个人利益,例如支付更高的价格购买绿色产品或花费更多时间选择绿色出行(钟毅平等, 2022)。

亲环境行为的研究既包括对单一行为的考察,如垃圾分类、绿色消费或绿色出行,也涵盖多维度的划分,如私人领域与公共领域行为,或基于个体付出成本的高成本与低成本行为(钟毅平等, 2022; Farrukh et al., 2022)。总体而言,学界多从私域与公域两个维度展开研究(Stern et al., 1999)。《公民生态环境行为调查

报告(2022 年)》显示, 公众在日常生活中较易践行垃圾分类、绿色出行等私域行为, 但在公域亲环境行为上表现不足。本研究认为, 个体在实施公域亲环境行为时, 往往面临个人利益与环境利益的不一致, 从而陷入社会困境。因此, 本研究拟从社会困境视角探讨个体在践行公域亲环境行为中的心理机制与行为障碍。

2.2. 测量方法与相关理论

亲环境行为的测量方法因研究目的而异。常见方式包括: 问卷测量个体的意图和态度; 新生态范式量表(New Ecological Paradigm Scale, NEP)用于评估生态世界观与环境态度[8]; 绿色购买范式用于探讨绿色消费决策; “亲环境行为任务(pro-environmental behavior test, PEBT)”测量绿色出行选择; “更好物品博弈(Greater Good Games, GGG)”则考察社会困境中的亲环境行为(钟毅平等, 2022; Dunlap, 2000; Klein et al., 2017; Lange & Dewitte, 2023; Ren et al., 2024)。

在理论层面, 学者们多以计划行为理论(Theory of Planned Behavior, TPB; Ajzen, 1991)、规范激活模型(Norm Activation Model, NAM; Schwartz, 1977)与价值-信念-规范理论(Value-Belief-Norm Theory, VBN; Stern et al., 1999)为核心框架, 探讨亲环境行为的心理机制。随着研究的深入, 这些理论不断被修正与拓展(Chen et al., 2022; Zeiske et al., 2021)。

2.3. 亲环境行为的影响因素

亲环境行为受到多层次因素的共同作用, 大体可以归纳为个体特征、心理机制与社会情境三个方面。

(1) 个体特征

性别与年龄是研究中最常见的变量。多数研究发现, 女性在垃圾分类、绿色消费等私人领域的亲环境行为中更积极, 源于其在社会化过程中形成的关怀与合作倾向, 但在参与环保组织、社会运动或公益捐赠等公共领域, 性别差异并不显著(Casaló & Escario, 2018; Hadler & Haller, 2011; Milfont & Sibley, 2016)。年龄差异的研究结果则较为复杂: 有研究认为中老年人更关注环境问题, 但也有证据显示年轻人更倾向于采取共享单车等绿色出行方式(Kurisu & Bortoleto, 2011)。这一差异可能与年轻人的价值观尚未固化、更易受外部信息与社会规范影响有关(Uitto et al., 2015; Bergquist et al., 2019)。

(2) 心理机制

个体内部的心理特质是亲环境行为的重要驱动力。研究表明, 自我认同能有效预测亲环境行为, 绿色认同与节水等具体环保行为密切相关(Nigbur et al., 2010; Whitmarsh & O'Neill, 2010)。此外, 道德责任感与亲环境动机同样促进行为的发生(Boeve-de Pauw & Van Petegem, 2017)。具有利他主义倾向的个体往往因追求社会声誉而更积极地践行环保(Kawamura & Kusumi, 2020)。

(3) 社会情境

社会规范与信息传播等外部因素同样塑造个体的亲环境行为。尤其是年轻人, 更容易受到社会规范和多媒体信息的影响, 从而表现出更高的环保参与度(Jiménez-Castillo & Ortega-Egea, 2015)。

综上所述, 亲环境行为并非单一因素决定, 而是个体特征、心理机制与社会情境的交互结果。

3. 外在社会规范与亲环境行为

3.1. 社会规范的定义与分类

社会规范(Social Norms)指在特定社会或文化中被普遍接受和认可的行为准则, 通过社会制裁而非法律力量来引导个体的社会行为(Cialdini & Trost, 1998)。在社会交往中, 个体不仅被期望遵循规范, 也期待他人遵循(Gavrilets & Richerson, 2017)。社会规范依托于外部力量发挥作用, 如他人的认可或排斥(Andrighetto & Vriens, 2022; Goldberg et al., 2020), 因此可视为一种在特定条件下对个体具有约束性的行为期

望(Ajzen, 1991; Cialdini et al., 1990; Gross & Vostroknutov, 2022)。学者通常将社会规范分为两类：描述性规范与禁令性规范(Cialdini et al., 1990)。描述性规范反映社会群体中大多数人的实际行为，如“大多数人每天都吃水果”，通过“从众”效应引导个体模仿他人行为。禁令性规范则强调社会群体对行为的价值判断，如“大多数人认为你应该每天吃水果”，通过“社会赞许”机制使个体依据他人的赞成或反对而行动(Bergquist & Johansson, 2022; Farrow et al., 2017)。

3.2. 测量方法与理论

社会规范的测量方法主要有两类。其一是现场观察法，通过让个体直接观察他人遵循某种规范的外显行为，从而推断规范对行为的影响(Reno et al., 1993)。其二是信息启发法，即通过传递与社会规范相关的信息，而非直接观察他人行为来影响个体(Smith et al., 2012)。这种方法通常借助反馈激活个体认知网络中的描述性或禁令性规范表征，从而引导行为(陈思静等, 2021; van Valkengoed et al., 2022; Cialdini et al., 1990)。本研究采用信息启发的方式来激活个体的规范认知(Gugenishvili, 2022)。在具体呈现上，文字描述与图文结合均被证实能有效增强社会规范对行为的影响(Bonan et al., 2020; Jachimowicz, 2020; Ren et al., 2024)。

理论上，Cialdini 等人提出的规范焦点理论(the focus theory of normative conduct)指出，社会规范虽能指导行为，但其效力并非普遍存在，而是取决于个体在特定情境中是否被激活(Cialdini et al., 1990; Kallgren et al., 2000)。研究表明，当个体接收到他人的节能行为信息时，其自身更可能采取相应的节能行为(Schultz et al., 2007)。

3.3. 社会规范与亲环境行为的关系

社会规范是影响个体日常行为的重要因素(Reynolds & Ceranic, 2007; Schultz, 2023; Smith et al., 2012)。研究表明，个体往往会根据他人的行为进行从众性调整，如社会规范信息能够提高慈善捐赠(Shang & Croson, 2009)、“提醒客人重复使用浴巾”能促进资源节约(Terrier & Marfaing, 2015)，而规范干预在野外实验中平均可减少约 2% 的能源消耗(Costa & Kahn, 2013)。这些发现表明，社会规范不仅能预测合作行为(Szekely et al., 2021)，还可能比自发利他更有效地促进公益行为(Xu et al., 2023)，其作用机制主要依赖于直观、情绪化的启发式加工(Farrow et al., 2017)。

在类型上，描述性与禁令性社会规范均能抑制自利行为、激励亲社会行为(van Kleef et al., 2019)。研究发现，在认知负荷较高的情况下，个体更易受描述性规范的影响，且描述性规范通常比禁令性规范更能预测亲环境行为(Farrow et al., 2017; Huber et al., 2018; Melnyk et al., 2011)。然而，在独裁者博弈中，禁令性规范也能促进个体做出有利他人的分配(Raihani & McAuliffe, 2014)。社会关系进一步强化了规范的效应。重要他人(如家人和朋友)的行为能显著提升个体的亲环境行为(Culiberg & Elgaied-Gambier, 2016)，且当参照群体与个体社会距离较近时，捐赠水平更高(Sinclair & Agerstrom, 2023)。儿童和青少年尤其容易受到同伴描述性规范的影响，并随着成长逐步将外在规范内化为个人规范。此外，社会比较也会改变个体对规范的认知，从而影响其环保行为(van Valkengoed et al., 2022)。

需要注意的是，规范效应并非在所有情境中都具备一致性。当责任感较低或处于规范宽松的文化环境中时，个体更容易偏离规范(Jetten & Hornsey, 2014; Schultz et al., 2007)。同时，当群体成员普遍支持某种行为时，责任扩散可能削弱个体对禁令性规范的遵循(García-Camino et al., 2008)。

4. 社会规范的内化与个人规范的作用

4.1. 个人规范的定义与测量

Schwartz (1977)指出，个人规范(personal Norms)是个体对履行某种行为的道德义务的信念，体现了对

自身行为的标准要求,而非对他人期望的回应(Kallgren et al., 2000)。与外部规范不同,个人规范源于个体的推理与反思,属于内在动机,强调个体在道德上对某一行为的认可与责任感(Huber et al., 2018)。

在测量方法上,个人规范多通过问卷调查进行评估(Bertoldo & Castro, 2016; D'Arco et al., 2023; de Groot et al., 2021)。例如,郭清卉等(2019)开发的量表包含5个条目,采用李克特5点计分,得分越高代表个体的个人规范水平越强。此外,一些研究也通过信息说服来激活个人规范,即向个体传递具有说服力的规范信息以增强其道德义务感(Bolderdijk et al., 2012)。

4.2. 社会规范与个人规范的关系

个人规范源于个体内在价值观,具有自我约束力(Schwartz, 1977)。研究表明,社会规范与个人规范在行为决策中均发挥作用(Batzke & Ernst, 2022; Whitmarsh & O'Neill, 2010)。二者既有区别也有联系:社会规范来源于他人的情绪与行为,是群体共享的;而个人规范根植于个体的情绪和经验,是个体独有的(Huber et al., 2018)。个体遵循社会规范往往基于对奖惩的感知,而非内化期望。然而,社会规范的持续作用可被个体内化,转化为个人规范,并进一步影响亲环境行为(Esfandiar et al., 2019; Kim & Seock, 2019)。已有研究证实,个人规范在描述性与禁令性社会规范影响亲环境行为的过程中起到中介作用(Helferich et al., 2023)。

价值-身份-个人规范(Value-Identity-Personal Norms, VIP)模型进一步揭示了社会规范与个人规范的关系。该模型认为,个体对亲环境行为的道德义务感可预测其行为,而这一义务感受到环境自我认同和生物圈价值观的影响(Steg & De Groot, 2010)。个体越认同生物圈价值观,越可能将自己视为“环保人士”,从而强化个人规范并付诸行动(van Valkengoed et al., 2022; Zeiske et al., 2021)。此外,自我分类理论同样指出,个体可通过认同社会规范并将其内化为内部动机,从而在价值观和身份认同的作用下形成个人规范并影响行为。

4.3. 个人规范对亲环境行为的影响

研究表明,个人规范是亲环境行为的重要预测因子,与多种亲环境行为呈正相关,包括减少汽车使用、购买环保产品、使用公共交通以及生活垃圾分类(Bamberg et al., 2007; Esfandiar et al., 2019; Nayum & Thøgersen, 2022; Shen et al., 2020)。个人规范还可通过激活和强化个体的道德责任感来促进行为,如游客在公园中的环保行为和自然相关行为(Esfandiar et al., 2021; Pearce et al., 2022)。

相比社会规范,个人规范对环境保护行为的影响更显著,并在社会规范与行为意图之间发挥中介作用(Bai & Bai, 2020; Pristl et al., 2020; Lemmen et al., 2020)。当个体高度认同社会规范时,这些规范被内化为个人规范,从而更有效地指导行为(Chen & Wu, 2022; Huber et al., 2018; Collado et al., 2017)。

个人规范还体现为内在动机,当行为符合个人规范时,个体会感到自豪和道德满足(Balaji et al., 2019; Kim & Seock, 2019)。然而,行为成本会影响其表现:低成本行为几乎人人可行,而高成本行为即使对高个人规范者也可能具有约束力(Keizer et al., 2019)。此外,宗教价值观等外部因素通过同情心和家庭教养间接影响个人规范,从而影响亲环境行为(Filimonau et al., 2023)。组织强调环保目标亦可强化员工的内在环保动机,促进更多自主环保行为,而无需依赖外部奖励或制裁(Sharpe et al., 2022)。

综上,个人规范通过内在动机、道德认同及对社会规范的内化,显著影响个体的多种亲环境行为。

5. 道德认同作为社会规范内化的关键路径

5.1. 道德认同的定义

道德认同(Moral Identity, 又称道德自我认同、道德同一性或道德自我概念)是道德自我的核心内容之

一,反映了个体对自身道德特性和行为标准的认知与重视程度(李红等, 2023; 刘仁贵, 2014; Resende et al., 2023; Pletti et al., 2019)。道德自我包含个体对正确与错误行为的理解,以及内在道德观念如何指导行为的认知过程(李谷等, 2013; 聂衍刚等, 2015; Stanley et al., 2019)。皮亚杰指出,个体在道德发展中经历从“他律”到“自律”的过渡阶段,道德自我在其中起着核心作用。

Blasi (1983)首次提出道德认同的概念,旨在弥合道德认知与道德行为之间的“认知-行为”缺口,将道德纳入个体自我认同结构。此后研究表明,道德认同不仅是一种内在特质,也是个体将道德认知转化为道德行为的自我调节机制(Aquino & Reed, 2002)。通过将外在社会规范内化为个人道德标准,道德认同能够激发个体展现更多道德行为(刘仁贵, 2014),并在社会认知框架下被视为个体对自我道德特性的认知图式(李红等, 2023)。

5.2. 道德认同的测量与理论

道德认同的测量主要以问卷调查为主(李红等, 2023)。Aquino 和 Reed (2002)编制的道德认同量表广泛使用,万增奎(2009)和杨韶刚(2007)对其进行修订,在大学生群体中验证了其信效度,该量表包含 16 个条目,采用李克特 7 点计分,得分越高表示个体道德认同水平越高(李红等, 2023; Christner et al., 2022)。除问卷外,实验方法也被用于操纵或测量道德认同。例如,吴波等(2016)通过提供与道德特质相关的词汇,让被试撰写个人经历以激活道德认同; Cornelissen 等(2013)则采用回忆法,让被试回忆自身道德或不道德行为;丛湘海(2022)利用“混词造句”范式,通过选择含“自我”与“道德”词汇生成句子,以激发道德认同。

理论上,道德阈限模型(Moral Threshold Model)指出,个体维持积极的道德自我需要遵守一定的道德底线。只要行为符合该阈限,个体即可保持正面的道德自我概念;偏离阈限则可能损害自我认知(王修欣, 刘永芳, 2024; Zlatev et al., 2020)。该理论强调,道德认同通过内部标准约束个体行为,是将道德认知转化为实际行为的重要机制。

5.3. 道德认同对亲环境行为的影响

研究表明,道德认同较高的个体更倾向于采取利他与亲社会行为。高道德认同者表现出更强的志愿服务意愿(Aquino & Reed, 2002),并更积极参与慈善捐赠(Reynolds & Ceranic, 2007)和其他利他行为(Hertz & Krettenauer, 2016; Winterich et al., 2013)。实验研究显示,通过激活个体的道德认同能够有效促进利他行为的发生(Aquino et al., 2009)。此外,道德认同还可激发个体为维护自身形象采取积极行为,如捐赠、绿色消费及修复人际关系等(杨焕, 卫旭华, 2022)。总体而言,个体将自己视为具有高道德认同时,更可能采取符合道德标准的行为,例如购买绿色产品(刘建一, 吴建平, 2018; Christner et al., 2022; Prakash et al., 2019)。

6. 总结

个人规范与道德自我概念密切相关,它不仅引导个体做出符合自身道德标准的行为,同时维持积极的道德自我(Schwartz, 1977)。作为社会化个体,人们会将社会规范内化为个人规范,而道德认同是这一内化过程的关键中介,标志着个体自觉地将规范融入自身行为(杨韶刚, 2007; 王修欣, 刘永芳, 2024)。研究表明,个体只需达到一定程度的良好表现即可维持其积极的道德自我,而个人规范作为道德阈限,有助于维持行为底线并强化责任感(Berman et al., 2018; Bolderdijk et al., 2013; Ellemers et al., 2019)。道德和身份被证实是预测亲环境行为的重要动机(Gainsburg et al., 2023)。

高道德认同个体通常持积极人性观,更倾向于在社会困境中合作,并能更有效地内化社会规范以抑

制自私行为(李红等, 2023; Aquino & Reed, 2002; Skarlicki et al., 2016)。神经科学研究也表明, 道德同一性强的个体在接收规范信息时, 大脑相关区域(如 OFC、vmPFC、rTPJ)会被激活, 从而影响信息加工与道德行为(范伟等, 2022; Higgins & Brendl, 1995)。

在亲环境行为的实践中, 内化的个人规范比单纯的社会规范更具预测力。社会规范通过激活个体道德认同内化为个人规范, 从而促进亲环境行为的实施(Kim & Seock, 2019; Bergquist et al., 2020)。个体在社会决策中需要平衡自我利益与他人利益, 这一过程体现了道德自我与自私利益之间的调节机制(王修欣, 刘永芳, 2024)。综上, 社会规范内化的核心机制可能是通过激活道德认同, 将外在规范转化为内在道德品质, 从而引导亲环境行为。

基金项目

感谢湖南省自然科学基金青年项目(项目编号: 2025JJ60210)对本研究的资助支持。

参考文献

- 陈思静, 邢懿琳, 翁异静, 黎常(2021). 第三方惩罚对合作的溢出效应: 基于社会规范的解释. *心理学报*, 53(7), 758-772.
- 丛湘海(2022). *自我损耗对网络攻击行为的影响: 道德认同的调节作用*. 硕士学位论文, 烟台: 鲁东大学.
- 范伟, 任梦梦, 张文洁, 钟毅平(2022). 反馈对自我欺骗的影响: 来自 ERP 的证据. *心理学报*, 54(5), 481-496.
- 郭清卉, 李昊, 李世平, 刘丽(2019). 个人规范对农户亲环境行为的影响分析——基于拓展的规范激活理论框架. *长江流域资源与环境*, 28(5), 1176-1184.
- 李谷, 周晖, 丁如一(2013). 道德自我调节对亲社会行为和违规行为的影响. *心理学报*, 45(6), 672-679.
- 李红, 林嘉浩, 何宁, 王紫祎, 张亮(2023). 社会困境下道德认同对合作行为的影响及其作用机制. *心理与行为研究*, 21(3), 410-417.
- 刘建一, 吴建平(2018). 亲环境行为溢出效应: 类型、机制与影响因素. *心理研究*, 11(3), 267-268.
- 刘仁贵. (2014). 道德认同概念辨析. *伦理学研究*, 74(6), 15-20.
- 聂衍刚, 刘莉, 曾燕玲, 宁志军(2015). 道德自我对利己和利他行为倾向的注意偏向. *心理与行为研究*, 13(5), 678-683.
- 万增奎(2009). 西方心理学道德动机观的研究进程及展望. *黑龙江高教研究*, 187(11), 92-95.
- 王修欣, 刘永芳(2024). 社会决策中道德自我与自利偏好的权衡: 基于自我概念维护理论和道德阈限模型. *心理研究*, 17(1), 54-60.
- 魏心妮, 喻丰, 彭凯平, 钟年(2023). 心理丰富提高亲环境行为意愿. *心理学报*, 55(8), 1330-1343.
- 吴波, 李东进, 王财玉(2016). 基于道德认同理论绿色消费心理机制. *心理科学进展*, 24(12), 1829-1843.
- 杨焕, 卫旭华(2022). 关系型人力资源管理实践对受益人利他行为的影响: 基于道德补偿的视角. *心理学报*, 54(10), 1248-1261.
- 杨韶刚(2007). 从道德阶段理论到道德类型理论——西方道德认知理论的最新发展研究. *教育导刊: 上半月*, (4), 6-9.
- 钟毅平, 李梅, 李璿, 谭敏, 范伟, 李慧娥(2022). “为逐利而追名”: 社会观察和社会距离对亲环境行为的影响. *心理科学*, 45(6), 1398-1406.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-t](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-t)
- Andrighetto, G., & Vriens, E. (2022). A Research Agenda for the Study of Social Norm Change. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 380, Article ID: 20200411. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2020.0411>
- Aquino, K., & Reed, A. (2002). The Self-Importance of Moral Identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1423-1440. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1423>
- Aquino, K., Freeman, D., Reed, A., Lim, V. K. G., & Felps, W. (2009). Testing a Social-Cognitive Model of Moral Behavior: The Interactive Influence of Situations and Moral Identity Centrality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 123-141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015406>

- Bai, G., & Bai, Y. (2020). Voluntary or Forced: Different Effects of Personal and Social Norms on Urban Residents' Environmental Protection Behavior. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17, Article 3525. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17103525>
- Balaji, M. S., Jiang, Y., & Jha, S. (2019). Green Hotel Adoption: A Personal Choice or Social Pressure? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31, 3287-3305. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijchm-09-2018-0742>
- Bamberg, S., Hunecke, M., & Blöbaum, A. (2007). Social Context, Personal Norms and the Use of Public Transportation: Two Field Studies. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 27, 190-203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2007.04.001>
- Batzke, M. C. L., & Ernst, A. (2022). Explaining and Resolving Norm-Behavior Inconsistencies—A Theoretical Agent-Based Model. In M. Czupryna, & B. Kamiński (Eds.), *Advances in Social Simulation* (pp. 41-52). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-92843-8_4
- Bergquist, M., & Johansson, L. (2022). Descriptive Social Norms and Resource Cues Influence Choice by Additive and Separate Effects. *Nordic Psychology*, 75, 243-256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19012276.2022.2078994>
- Bergquist, M., Nilsson, A., & Schultz, W. P. (2019). A Meta-Analysis of Field-Experiments Using Social Norms to Promote Pro-Environmental Behaviors. *Global Environmental Change*, 59, Article ID: 101941. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.101941>
- Bergquist, M., Nyström, L., & Nilsson, A. (2020). Feeling or Following? A Field-Experiment Comparing Social Norms-Based and Emotions-Based Motives Encouraging Pro-Environmental Donations. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 19, 351-358. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1813>
- Berman, J. Z., Barasch, A., Levine, E. E., & Small, D. A. (2018). Impediments to Effective Altruism: The Role of Subjective Preferences in Charitable Giving. *Psychological Science*, 29, 834-844. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617747648>
- Bertoldo, R., & Castro, P. (2016). The Outer Influence Inside Us: Exploring the Relation between Social and Personal Norms. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 112, 45-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.03.020>
- Blasi, A. (1983). Moral Cognition and Moral Action: A Theoretical Perspective. *Developmental Review*, 3, 178-210. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2297\(83\)90029-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2297(83)90029-1)
- Boeve-de Pauw, J., & Van Petegem, P. (2017). Because My Friends Insist or Because It Makes Sense? Adolescents' Motivation Towards the Environment. *Sustainability*, 9, Article 750. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9050750>
- Bolderdijk, J. W., Gorsira, M., Keizer, K., & Steg, L. (2013). Values Determine the (In)effectiveness of Informational Interventions in Promoting Pro-Environmental Behavior. *PLOS ONE*, 8, e83911. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0083911>
- Bolderdijk, J. W., Steg, L., Geller, E. S., Lehman, P. K., & Postmes, T. (2012). Comparing the Effectiveness of Monetary versus Moral Motives in Environmental Campaigning. *Nature Climate Change*, 3, 413-416. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1767>
- Bonan, J., Cattaneo, C., d'Adda, G., & Tavoni, M. (2020). The Interaction of Descriptive and Injunctive Social Norms in Promoting Energy Conservation. *Nature Energy*, 5, 900-909. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-020-00719-z>
- Casaló, L. V., & Escario, J. (2018). Heterogeneity in the Association between Environmental Attitudes and Pro-Environmental Behavior: A Multilevel Regression Approach. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 175, 155-163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.11.237>
- Chen, B., Gong, C., & Li, S. (2022). Looking at Buildings or Trees? Association of Human Nature Relatedness with Eye Movements in Outdoor Space. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 80, Article ID: 101756. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2022.101756>
- Chen, T., & Wu, Z. (2022). Employing a Sort of “we” Based VBN Model to Gauge Chinese Tourists' Intentions to Support Low-Carbon Tourism. *Acta Psychologica*, 230, 103761. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2022.103761>
- Christner, N., Pletti, C., & Paulus, M. (2022). How Does the Moral Self-Concept Relate to Prosocial Behaviour? Investigating the Role of Emotions and Consistency Preference. *Cognition and Emotion*, 36, 894-911. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2022.2067133>
- Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. R. (1998). Social Influence: Social Norms, Conformity and Compliance. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (4th ed., pp. 151-192). McGraw-Hill.
- Cialdini, R. B., Reno, R. R., & Kallgren, C. A. (1990). A Focus Theory of Normative Conduct: Recycling the Concept of Norms to Reduce Littering in Public Places. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 1015-1026. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.6.1015>
- Collado, S., Staats, H., & Sancho, P. (2017). Normative Influences on Adolescents' Self-Reported Pro-Environmental Behaviors: The Role of Parents and Friends. *Environment and Behavior*, 51, 288-314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916517744591>
- Cornelissen, G., Bashshur, M. R., Rode, J., & Le Menestrel, M. (2013). Rules or Consequences? The Role of Ethical Mind-Sets in Moral Dynamics. *Psychological Science*, 24, 482-488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612457376>

- Costa, D. L., & Kahn, M. E. (2013). Energy Conservation “Nudges” and Environmentalist Ideology: Evidence from a Randomized Residential Electricity Field Experiment. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 11, 680-702. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeea.12011>
- Culiberg, B., & Elgaaid-Gambier, L. (2016). Going Green to Fit In—Understanding the Impact of Social Norms on Pro-environmental Behaviour, a Cross-cultural Approach. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 40, 179-185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12241>
- D’Arco, M., Marino, V., & Resciniti, R. (2023). Exploring the Pro-Environmental Behavioral Intention of Generation Z in the Tourism Context: The Role of Injunctive Social Norms and Personal Norms. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 33, 1100-1121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2023.2171049>
- de Groot, J. I. M., Bondy, K., & Schuitema, G. (2021). Listen to Others or Yourself? The Role of Personal Norms on the Effectiveness of Social Norm Interventions to Change Pro-Environmental Behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 78, Article ID: 101688. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2021.101688>
- Dunlap, R. E., Van Liere, K. D., Mertig, A. G., & Jones, R. E. (2000). New Trends in Measuring Environmental Attitudes: Measuring Endorsement of the New Ecological Paradigm: A Revised NEP Scale. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 425-442. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00176>
- Ellemers, N., van der Toorn, J., Paunov, Y., & van Leeuwen, T. (2019). The Psychology of Morality: A Review and Analysis of Empirical Studies Published from 1940 through 2017. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 23, 332-366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868318811759>
- Esfandiari, K., Dowling, R., Pearce, J., & Goh, E. (2019). Personal Norms and the Adoption of Pro-Environmental Binning Behaviour in National Parks: An Integrated Structural Model Approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28, 10-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1663203>
- Esfandiari, K., Dowling, R., Pearce, J., & Goh, E. (2021). What a Load of Rubbish! The Efficacy of Theory of Planned Behaviour and Norm Activation Model in Predicting Visitors’ Binning Behaviour in National Parks. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 46, 304-315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.01.001>
- Farrow, K., Grolleau, G., & Ibanez, L. (2017). Social Norms and Pro-Environmental Behavior: A Review of the Evidence. *Ecological Economics*, 140, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.04.017>
- Farrukh, M., Raza, A., Mansoor, A., Khan, M. S., & Lee, J. W. C. (2022). Trends and Patterns in Pro-Environmental Behaviour Research: A Bibliometric Review and Research Agenda. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 30, 681-696. <https://doi.org/10.1108/bj-10-2020-0521>
- Filimonau, V., Matute, J., Kubal-Czerwińska, M., & Mika, M. (2023). Religious Values and Social Distance as Activators of Norms to Reduce Food Waste When Dining Out. *Science of the Total Environment*, 868, Article ID: 161645. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.161645>
- Gainsburg, I., Roy, S., & Cunningham, J. L. (2023). An Examination of How Six Reasons for Valuing Nature Are Endorsed and Associated with Pro-Environmental Behavior across 12 Countries. *Scientific Reports*, 13, Article No. 8484. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-34338-x>
- García-Camino, A., Rodríguez-Aguilar, J. A., Sierra, C., & Vasconcelos, W. (2008). Constraint Rule-Based Programming of Norms for Electronic Institutions. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 18, 186-217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10458-008-9059-4>
- Gavrilets, S., & Richerson, P. J. (2017). Collective Action and the Evolution of Social Norm Internalization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114, 6068-6073. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1703857114>
- Goldberg, M. H., Gustafson, A., & van der Linden, S. (2020). Leveraging Social Science to Generate Lasting Engagement with Climate Change Solutions. *One Earth*, 3, 314-324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.08.011>
- Gross, J., & Vostroknutov, A. (2022). Why Do People Follow Social Norms? *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 44, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.08.016>
- Gugenishvili, I. (2022). I Was Thinking to Help but Then I Changed My Mind! The Influence of Injunctive and Descriptive Norms on the Donation Intention-Behavior Link. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 35, 308-327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10495142.2022.2066599>
- Hadler, M., & Haller, M. (2011). Global Activism and Nationally Driven Recycling: The Influence of World Society and National Contexts on Public and Private Environmental Behavior. *International Sociology*, 26, 315-345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580910392258>
- Helferich, M., Thøgersen, J., & Bergquist, M. (2023). Direct and Mediated Impacts of Social Norms on Pro-Environmental Behavior. *Global Environmental Change*, 80, Article ID: 102680. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2023.102680>
- Hertz, S. G., & Krettenauer, T. (2016). Does Moral Identity Effectively Predict Moral Behavior? A Meta-Analysis. *Review of General Psychology*, 20, 129-140. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000062>

- Higgins, E. T., & Brendl, C. M. (1995). Accessibility and Applicability: Some “Activation Rules” Influencing Judgment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 31, 218-243. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1995.1011>
- Huber, J., Viscusi, W. K., & Bell, J. (2018). Dynamic Relationships between Social Norms and Pro-Environmental Behavior: Evidence from Household Recycling. *Behavioural Public Policy*, 4, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2017.13>
- Jachimowicz, J. M. (2020). Three Thumbs up for Social Norms. *Nature Energy*, 5, 826-827. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-020-00723-3>
- Jetten, J., & Hornsey, M. J. (2014). Deviance and Dissent in Groups. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 461-485. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115151>
- Jiménez-Castillo, D., & Ortega-Egea, J. M. (2015). Too Positive to Change? Examining Optimism Bias as a Barrier to Media Effects on Environmental Activism. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 43, 216-225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.07.004>
- Kallgren, C. A., Reno, R. R., & Cialdini, R. B. (2000). A Focus Theory of Normative Conduct: When Norms Do and Do Not Affect Behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 1002-1012. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672002610009>
- Kawamura, Y., & Kusumi, T. (2020). Altruism Does Not Always Lead to a Good Reputation: A Normative Explanation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 90, Article ID: 104021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2020.104021>
- Keizer, M., Sargisson, R. J., van Zomeren, M., & Steg, L. (2019). When Personal Norms Predict the Acceptability of Push and Pull Car-Reduction Policies: Testing the ABC Model and Low-Cost Hypothesis. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 64, 413-423. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2019.06.005>
- Kim, S. H., & Seock, Y. (2019). The Roles of Values and Social Norm on Personal Norms and Pro-Environmentally Friendly Apparel Product Purchasing Behavior: The Mediating Role of Personal Norms. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 51, 83-90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.05.023>
- Klein, S. A., Hilbig, B. E., & Heck, D. W. (2017). Which Is the Greater Good? A Social Dilemma Paradigm Disentangling Environmentalism and Cooperation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 53, 40-49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.06.001>
- Kurisu, K. H., & Bortoleto, A. P. (2011). Comparison of Waste Prevention Behaviors among Three Japanese Megacity Regions in the Context of Local Measures and Socio-Demographics. *Waste Management*, 31, 1441-1449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2011.03.008>
- Lange, F. (2022). Behavioral Paradigms for Studying Pro-Environmental Behavior: A Systematic Review. *Behavior Research Methods*, 55, 600-622. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-022-01825-4>
- Lange, F., & Dewitte, S. (2019). Measuring Pro-Environmental Behavior: Review and Recommendations. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 63, 92-100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2019.04.009>
- Lange, F., & Dewitte, S. (2023). Validity and Scope Sensitivity of the Work for Environmental Protection Task. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 86, Article ID: 101967. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2023.101967>
- Lemmen, N., Keizer, K., Bouman, T., & Steg, L. (2020). Convince Yourself to Do the Right Thing: The Effects of Provided versus Self-Generated Arguments on Rule Compliance and Perceived Importance of Socially Desirable Behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 613418. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.613418>
- Melnyk, V., Herpen, E. v., Fischer, A. R. H., & van Trijp, H. C. M. (2011). To Think or Not to Think: The Effect of Cognitive Deliberation on the Influence of Injunctive versus Descriptive Social Norms. *Psychology & Marketing*, 28, 709-729. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20408>
- Milfont, T. L., & Sibley, C. G. (2016). Empathic and Social Dominance Orientations Help Explain Gender Differences in Environmentalism: A One-Year Bayesian Mediation Analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 90, 85-88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.10.044>
- Nayum, A., & Thøgersen, J. (2022). I Did My Bit! the Impact of Electric Vehicle Adoption on Compensatory Beliefs and Norms in Norway. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 89, 102541. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2022.102541>
- Nigbur, D., Lyons, E., & Uzzell, D. (2010). Attitudes, Norms, Identity and Environmental Behaviour: Using an Expanded Theory of Planned Behaviour to Predict Participation in a Kerbside Recycling Programme. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, 259-284. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466609x449395>
- Pearce, J., Huang, S., Dowling, R. K., & Smith, A. J. (2022). Effects of Social and Personal Norms, and Connectedness to Nature, on Pro-Environmental Behavior: A Study of Western Australian Protected Area Visitors. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 42, Article ID: 100966. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2022.100966>
- Pletti, C., Decety, J., & Paulus, M. (2019). Moral Identity Relates to the Neural Processing of Third-Party Moral Behavior. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 14, 435-445. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsz016>
- Prakash, G., Choudhary, S., Kumar, A., Garza-Reyes, J. A., Khan, S. A. R., & Panda, T. K. (2019). Do Altruistic and Egoistic Values Influence Consumers' Attitudes and Purchase Intentions Towards Eco-Friendly Packaged Products? An Empirical

- Investigation. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 50, 163-169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.05.011>
- Pristl, A., Kilian, S., & Mann, A. (2020). When Does a Social Norm Catch the Worm? Disentangling Social Normative Influences on Sustainable Consumption Behaviour. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 20, 635-654. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1890>
- Raihani, N. J., & McAuliffe, K. (2014). Dictator Game Giving: The Importance of Descriptive versus Injunctive Norms. *PLOS ONE*, 9, e113826. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0113826>
- Ren, M., Zhong, B., & Fan, W. (2024). The Impact of Descriptive and Injunctive Social Norms on Pro-Environmental Behavior: A Study Using Eye-Tracking Technology. *Current Psychology*, 43, 34761-34777. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-06909-2>
- Reno, R. R., Cialdini, R. B., & Kallgren, C. A. (1993). The Transsituational Influence of Social Norms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 104-112. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.64.1.104>
- Resende, M. M., Porto, J. B., Gracia, F. J., & Tomás, I. (2023). Unethical Behavior at Work: The Effects of Ethical Culture and Implicit and Explicit Moral Identity. *Ethics & Behavior*, 34, 438-457. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2023.2243632>
- Reynolds, S. J., & Ceranic, T. L. (2007). The Effects of Moral Judgment and Moral Identity on Moral Behavior: An Empirical Examination of the Moral Individual. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1610-1624. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1610>
- Schultz, P. W. (2023). Secret Agents of Influence: Leveraging Social Norms for Good. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 31, 443-450. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214221109572>
- Schultz, P. W., Nolan, J. M., Cialdini, R. B., Goldstein, N. J., & Griskevicius, V. (2007). The Constructive, Destructive, and Reconstructive Power of Social Norms. *Psychological Science*, 18, 429-434. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01917.x>
- Schwartz, S. H. (1977). Normative Influences on Altruism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 221-279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601\(08\)60358-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601(08)60358-5)
- Shang, J., & Croson, R. (2009). A Field Experiment in Charitable Contribution: The Impact of Social Information on the Voluntary Provision of Public Goods. *The Economic Journal*, 119, 1422-1439. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.2009.02267.x>
- Sharpe, E., Ruepert, A., van der Werff, E., & Steg, L. (2022). Corporate Environmental Responsibility Leads to More Pro-Environmental Behavior at Work by Strengthening Intrinsic Pro-Environmental Motivation. *One Earth*, 5, 825-835. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2022.06.006>
- Shen, J., Zheng, D., Zhang, X., & Qu, M. (2020). Investigating Rural Domestic Waste Sorting Intentions Based on an Integrative Framework of Planned Behavior Theory and Normative Activation Models: Evidence from Guanzhong Basin, China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17, Article 4887. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17134887>
- Sinclair, S., & Agerström, J. (2023). Do Social Norms Influence Young People's Willingness to Take the COVID-19 Vaccine? *Health Communication*, 38, 152-159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2021.1937832>
- Skarlicki, D. P., van Jaarsveld, D. D., Shao, R., Song, Y. H., & Wang, M. (2016). Extending the Multifoci Perspective: The Role of Supervisor Justice and Moral Identity in the Relationship between Customer Justice and Customer-Directed Sabotage. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101, 108-121. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000034>
- Smith, J. R., Louis, W. R., Terry, D. J., Greenaway, K. H., Clarke, M. R., & Cheng, X. (2012). Congruent or Conflicted? The Impact of Injunctive and Descriptive Norms on Environmental Intentions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 32, 353-361. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2012.06.001>
- Stanley, M. L., Henne, P., & De Brigard, F. (2019). Remembering Moral and Immoral Actions in Constructing the Self. *Memory & Cognition*, 47, 441-454. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-018-0880-y>
- Steg, L., & de Groot, J. (2010). Explaining Prosocial Intentions: Testing Causal Relationships in the Norm Activation Model. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, 725-743. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466609x477745>
- Steg, L., & Vlek, C. (2009). Encouraging Pro-Environmental Behaviour: An Integrative Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 29, 309-317. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2008.10.004>
- Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., Abel, T., Guagnano, G. A., & Kalof, L. (1999). A Value-Belief-Norm Theory of Support for Social Movements: The Case of Environmentalism. *Human Ecology Review*, 6, 81-97.
- Szekely, A., Lipari, F., Antonioni, A., Paolucci, M., Sánchez, A., Tummolini, L. et al. (2021). Evidence from a Long-Term Experiment That Collective Risks Change Social Norms and Promote Cooperation. *Nature Communications*, 12, Article No. 5452. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-25734-w>
- Terrier, L., & Marfaing, B. (2015). Using Social Norms and Commitment to Promote Pro-Environmental Behavior among Hotel Guests. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 44, 10-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.09.001>

- Uitto, A., Boeve-de Pauw, J., & Saloranta, S. (2015). Participatory School Experiences as Facilitators for Adolescents' Ecological Behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 43, 55-65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.05.007>
- van Kleef, G. A., Gelfand, M. J., & Jetten, J. (2019). The Dynamic Nature of Social Norms: New Perspectives on Norm Development, Impact, Violation, and Enforcement. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 84, Article ID: 103814. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2019.05.002>
- van Valkengoed, A. M., Abrahamse, W., & Steg, L. (2022). To Select Effective Interventions for Pro-Environmental Behaviour Change, We Need to Consider Determinants of Behaviour. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 6, 1482-1492. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01473-w>
- Whitmarsh, L., & O'Neill, S. (2010). Green Identity, Green Living? The Role of Pro-Environmental Self-Identity in Determining Consistency across Diverse Pro-Environmental Behaviours. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30, 305-314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.01.003>
- Winterich, K. P., Aquino, K., Mittal, V., & Swartz, R. (2013). When Moral Identity Symbolization Motivates Prosocial Behavior: The Role of Recognition and Moral Identity Internalization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 759-770. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033177>
- Xu, Q., He, S., Li, Z., Duan, R., & Li, P. (2023). Voluntary or Reluctant? Social Influence in Charitable Giving: An ERP Study. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 18, nsad010. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsad010>
- Zeiske, N., Venhoeven, L., Steg, L., & van der Werff, E. (2021). The Normative Route to a Sustainable Future: Examining Children's Environmental Values, Identity and Personal Norms to Conserve Energy. *Environment and Behavior*, 53, 1118-1139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916520950266>
- Zlatev, J. J., Kupor, D. M., Laurin, K., & Miller, D. T. (2020). Being "Good" or "Good Enough": Prosocial Risk and the Structure of Moral Self-Regard. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 118, 242-253. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000175>