



Understanding individual and collective response to climate change: The role of a self-other mismatch

Rosie Harrington, Armelle Nugier, Kamilla Khamzina, Serge Guimond,
Sophie Monceau, Michel Streith

► To cite this version:

Rosie Harrington, Armelle Nugier, Kamilla Khamzina, Serge Guimond, Sophie Monceau, et al.. Understanding individual and collective response to climate change: The role of a self-other mismatch. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2022, 13, 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.935209 . hal-03883012

HAL Id: hal-03883012

<https://hal.science/hal-03883012>

Submitted on 2 Dec 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

Christopher John Bryant,
University of Bath, United Kingdom

REVIEWED BY

Kathryn T. Stevenson,
North Carolina State University,
United States
Gemma Sharp,
Monash University, Australia
Gerhard Reese,
University of Koblenz and Landau,
Germany

*CORRESPONDENCE

Rosie Harrington
rose.harrington@uca.fr
Armelle Nugier
armelle.nugier@uca.fr

SPECIALTY SECTION

This article was submitted to
Personality and Social Psychology,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Psychology

RECEIVED 03 May 2022

ACCEPTED 26 August 2022

PUBLISHED 29 September 2022

CITATION

Harrington R, Nugier A, Khamzina K,
Guimond S, Monceau S and Streith M
(2022) Understanding individual and
collective response to climate
change: The role of a self-other
mismatch.
Front. Psychol. 13:935209.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.935209

COPYRIGHT

© 2022 Harrington, Nugier, Khamzina,
Guimond, Monceau and Streith. This is
an open-access article distributed
under the terms of the [Creative
Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](#).
The use, distribution or reproduction in
other forums is permitted, provided
the original author(s) and the copyright
owner(s) are credited and that the
original publication in this journal is
cited, in accordance with accepted
academic practice. No use, distribution
or reproduction is permitted which
does not comply with these terms.

Understanding individual and collective response to climate change: The role of a self-other mismatch

Rosie Harrington^{1*}, Armelle Nugier^{1*}, Kamilla Khamzina²,
Serge Guimond¹, Sophie Monceau¹ and Michel Streith¹

¹LAPSCO (Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale et Cognitive), Université Clermont Auvergne et CNRS, Clermont-Ferrand, France, ²PSITEC-ULR 4072, Psychologie: Interactions, Temps, Emotions, Cognition, Lille, France

Several scientists have shown the importance of mitigating global warming and have highlighted a need for major social change, particularly when it comes to meat consumption and collective engagement. In the present study ($N = 486$), we conducted a cross-sectional study to test the mismatch model, which aims at explaining what motivates individuals to participate in normative change. This model stipulates that perceiving a self–other difference in pro-environmental attitudes is the starting point and can motivate people to have high pro-environmental intentions. This mismatch effect is explained by participants' willingness to participate in normative and social change: people that perceive a gap between their personal attitude and the social norm should be more willing to participate in normative change. This should then motivate them to have high pro-environmental intentions on an individual and group level. The results confirm the hypothesized model on an individual and group level and explain how people can be motivated to participate in normative change. Implications of these findings and the need for further studies are discussed.

KEYWORDS

norms, mismatch, veganism, behavioral intentions, collective engagement

Introduction

The intergovernmental panel on climate change's (IPCC, 2021) sixth Assessment Report explains that “human influence has warmed the climate at a rate that is unprecedented in at least the last 2000 years” and that climate change has already had a visible impact on the average weather and climate conditions in every part of the world. For example, the number of heat waves, droughts, and tropical cyclones caused by human influence has increased since the fifth assessment report that was published only 7 years ago. In this report, IPCC also simulated different possibilities for what is to come and their results show that even if the optimistic option plays out (for which

we would have to drastically reduce our CO₂ and other greenhouse gas emissions), the global surface temperature will continue to rise until the mid-century mark. As the global temperature rises, these extreme meteorological conditions (heat waves, droughts, etc.) will occur more frequently and intensely.

Combined with other similar studies relating the negative impact of human-induced climate change on accessible resources (Watson et al., 1998; Christensen et al., 2004) and biodiversity (Willis and Bhagwat, 2009; Bellard et al., 2012), these results show how important it is to change how we interact with our environment. Indeed, mitigating the effects of climate change could somewhat help to avoid the disastrous effects of this phenomenon on our day-to-day lives. Different actions are possible to participate in the mitigation of climate change with some of them being more efficient and easily accessible than others. According to Wynes and Nicholas (2017), for example, following a plant-based diet (i.e., being vegetarian or vegan) is one of the most impactful individual behaviours in terms of climate change mitigation, with having one less child or using renewable energies (see also Barma et al., 2017), and public transport or walking (see also Fuglestad et al., 2008), compared to other repeated behaviours like recycling, washing clothes in cold water or even using led lightbulbs. Aside from acting on an individual level, people can also act on a societal level. Indeed, they can vote for green party politicians, organise, and/or participate in protests calling for more governmental action (see Aldy et al., 2001; Adger, 2003; Fritzsche et al., 2011). Of importance, and according to Wullenkord and Hamann (2021), see also (Schulte et al., 2021), acting on an individual and group level is complementary and equally important for overcoming the effects of climate change.

Even if these different possibilities exist, and society acknowledges them (see Steg, 2018), a lot of people—including climate change deniers as well as those who are more aware of climate change—still do not necessarily behave pro-environmentally (Whitmarsh and Capstick, 2018). Thus, part of climate change mitigation has now started to include research on what motivates these behaviours and how social change can occur. In this article, we empirically test the mismatch model (Khamzina et al., 2021; Deffuant et al., 2022) to explain what can motivate individuals to act pro-environmentally on a group and individual level, and participate in normative change.

The mismatch effect on pro-environmental intentions

Social psychology is one of the many fields that offer explanations for why people act in various ways and throughout the different theories and studies, two behavioural predictors seem essential to understanding pro-environmental action: social norms and attitudes (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1977; Ajzen,

1991). Attitudes are generally considered to be an evaluation of a certain object, concept, or person, which ranges from extremely negative to extremely positive (Bohner and Dickel, 2011). Ajzen (1991) and Ajzen et al. (2018) then offers a more detailed definition with two main components: an affective dimension that focuses on what an individual personally believes about the behaviour, and a cognitive dimension that is more about what we think the consequences of said behaviour are. Researchers secondly define social norms as a 'collective awareness about the preferred, and appropriate behaviours among a certain group of people' (Chung and Rimal, 2016). Different theories then explain that different types of norms exist. For example, Cialdini et al. (1990) theory offer two types of norms: descriptive norms and injunctive norms. Descriptive norms represent how people in a specific group actually behave, and injunctive norms are standards that members of the group are expected to follow and expect others to follow in a given social situation. These norms indicate whether behaviour is approved of or frowned upon, whereas descriptive norms concern what people are actually doing.

Multiple studies have shown that attitudes and social norms play an important role in predicting intentions to act pro-environmentally (Fife-Schaw et al., 2007; Krispenz and Bertrams, 2020; Niemiec et al., 2020). Most of these studies and the underlying theories consider attitudes and social norms to be independent concepts, with independent effects on intentions and behaviour (Bagozzi and Schneiditz, 1985; Ajzen, 1988, 1991). Nevertheless, the few studies that have tested the interaction effect of attitudes and norms found that it significantly affects the participants' intentions to engage in a particular behaviour (Grube and Morgan, 1990; Prentice and Miller, 1993; Fife-Schaw et al., 2007), notably when the two variables are mismatched—when one is in favour of the behaviour and the other one is against. Researchers first hypothesized that when an individual disagrees with public opinion, they would rather conform to what others believe rather than go against said social norm (Asch, 1951; Noelle-Neumann, 1974, 1993). Thus, people would tend to change their behaviour to fit with those of others (i.e., a normative influence hypothesis; Asch, 1951; Acock and DeFleur, 1972; Grube and Morgan, 1990). Studies testing Noelle-Neumann's spiral of silence theory have, however, mixed results and often find a weak correlation between majority support and the expression of personal opinions (Scheufele and Moy, 2000; Katz and Fialkoff, 2017). The mixed results could be due to the theory not applying to all situations. For example, it does not explain how and why societies evolve and change over time: normative change cannot happen if people always conform to the social norm. Therefore, some researchers have hypothesized that people sometimes share their dissident opinion and that minorities can significantly influence opinions (Moscovici et al., 1969; Moscovici, 1991). Others have also suggested that observing a difference between one's personal attitude and perceived social

norms is the starting point and can make us stand more strongly in our position and not conform to social norms (Khamzina et al., 2021; Deffuant et al., 2022).

Khamzina et al. (2021), see also Deffuant et al. (2022) call this interaction effect and its predictions “the mismatch hypothesis.” The first central idea in this hypothesis is that the mismatch between perceived social norms and personal attitudes can be a source of motivation to have high intentions to act pro-environmentally—notably when the individual perceived their personal attitude to be in favour of the behaviour but not the social norm. In a series of studies, Khamzina et al. (2021) effectively confirm this hypothesis: intentions to convert to organic farming were significantly higher when the farmers’ attitudes and perceived social norms were mismatched (with the personal attitude being in favour and perceived norms being against), compared to the other possibilities. This mismatch effect is not simply people ignoring the social norm because they do not identify with the social group: people who identify as a member of the said group can also be motivated to act against social norms (Packer, 2009; Packer and Chasteen, 2010). These studies stem from the normative conflict model that states that ‘strongly identified members are attentive to group-related problems and perceptions that the status quo is harmful to the collective may trigger expression of dissenting opinions’ (Packer, 2008, pp.1). On this basis, a second central part of this mismatch model theorised by Khamzina et al. (2021) is that the mismatch effect is rooted in wanting to change the group for the better and pushing for social change. Khamzina and collaborators, therefore, suggest, although do not test, that the mismatch effect on intentions can be explained by a willingness to change social norms. They suggest that when individuals perceive a mismatch between the social norm and their own personal attitude, they will want to change this social norm to make better the group, and this should result in more pro-environmental behaviours. This willingness to change norms would then push people to have a level of pro-environmental intentions that coincides with their own personal attitude.

Study overview

The main goal of this article is to investigate the theorized mismatch model and the key component of willingness to change social norms that, according to our knowledge, has yet to be empirically tested. We built our study on a specific environmental challenge: meat consumption. Given that meat consumption explains a significant part of greenhouse gas emissions due to human activity (Tukker and Jansen, 2006; Aubin, 2014), reducing our dietary intake of meat would contribute considerably to the fight against climate change (Salonen and Helne, 2012; Chai et al., 2019). In France and most western societies, however, diets with low or no meat intake are rare (Sanchez-Sabate and Sabaté, 2019) and there is often a strong national fightback when it is the case (Cholezy, 2021;

Schittly, 2021). People acting pro-environmentally, in this sense, are part of a minority in France. Hence, this is an area in which social change is crucial from a climate change mitigation perspective. As the mismatch model might explain individual behaviour in times of social change, vegetarians’ behaviour could, therefore, be explained by the mismatch model. Indeed, previous literature shows that being part of a minority can make minority members feel different and distant from other members of the group (Hassouneh et al., 2014; Gutmann-Kahn and Lindstrom, 2015), whether it stems from having a different identity or even believing to have diverging opinions from majority members. Even if being vegetarian or vegan is not quite the same as other marginalized groups because they are a minority group based on choice not by biological trait, research shows that similar processes of distance and stigmatization still occur (Bresnahan et al., 2016; Markowski and Roxburgh, 2019). For example, vegetarianism is often treated as a deviant practice that requires explanation (Wilson et al., 2004; de Groot et al., 2021). For these reasons, vegetarians could perceive a bigger self—other difference than non-vegetarians, and this could then activate the mismatch pattern. In the present study, we, therefore, compare vegetarians and vegans (i.e., veg*ns) to people who still eat meat to see if it is effectively the case.

We first hypothesized that veg*ns would feel more strongly in mismatch, with their personal attitude higher than the social norms, compared to participants who still eat meat regularly (H1). We also predict that veg*ns will have higher pro-environmental intentions than non-veg*ns, at an individual level (H2a). While studies on non-conformism have mainly looked at individual action, we also wanted to extend these results to group-level action: as vegetarians are more highly in mismatch, we predict veg*ns should also have higher group level intentions than non-veg*ns (H2b). Finally, to provide a test of the mechanism underlying the impact of mismatch on pro-environmental intentions, we hypothesized that the relation between mismatch and pro-environmental intentions will be mediated by the willingness of participants to change social norms. More precisely, we tested a serial mediation model in which veg*ns participants should be more highly in mismatch, which then heightens their willingness to change norms. The latter then increases intentions to behave pro-environmentally at an individual level (H3a) and group level (H3b).

Materials and methods

Participants

The final sample comprised 486 volunteers (97,3% French native; 78% women, 21 % men, 1% others) who ranged from 18 to 76 years ($M_{age} = 34.84$, $SD = 12.80$). Most of the participants had a university education (96,5%). Two hundred forty participants (49,4 %) declared themselves as vegetarian or vegan and 246 (50,6%) still eat meat (see [Supplementary materials](#) for

additional information). This online study was conducted from 26 July to 9 September 2021.

Procedure

We approached potential participants on a variety of social network groups and proceeded through snowball sampling. As the aim of the study was to compare two sub-groups of the French population that either act pro-environmentally (vegans) or do not (omnivores), we reached out to as many veg*n and non-veg*n groups as possible. Consequently, we had well-balanced groups, which was ideal for the planned statistical analysis. The study was presented as an online study on global warming and meat consumption. After briefing about the purpose of the study, participants answered the questionnaire and were then, debriefed and thanked.

Measures

All answers were given on 9-point Likert scales, ranging from (1) “*strongly disagree*” to (9) “*strongly agree*.” Participants’ composite scores for each measure were averaged.

Attitudes toward eating less meat in order to reduce global warming were measured using four statements inspired by Wan et al. (2017). We adapted their questions on attitudes toward recycling to our target behaviour (changed “recycling is rewarding” to “eating less meat is rewarding” for example), $\alpha = 0.88$, $M = 7.24$, $SD = 2.05$. Perceived *social norms* in France were measured using the Guimond et al. (2013, 2015) method where we replace “I think that” of each item that measured attitudes with “Most French people think that” (e.g., “Most French people think that eating less meat is a good idea in order to reduce global warming”), $\alpha = 0.90$, $M = 4.44$, $SD = 2.00$. The two measures were counterbalanced (see Guimond et al., 2013, 2015). A mismatch index was created by subtracting ratings of social norms from ratings of attitudes. A high score on this measure indicates a level of mismatch in favour of personal attitudes. Participants’ *willingness to participate in normative change* was measured with one statement (e.g., “I would like to participate in the changing of the meat-consumption norm in France”), $M = 7.31$, $SD = 2.25$. *Individual-level intention* to act against global warming by eating less meat was assessed with four statements (e.g., “To fight against climate change, as an alternative to meat products, I intend to eat more legumes, cereals, or plant-based proteins) (e.g., tofu, red beans, lentils, chickpeas, etc.”), $\alpha = 0.83$, $M = 7.43$, $SD = 1.92$. *Group-level intention* to act against global warming was assessed with two statements (e.g., “During the next presidential elections, I intend to vote for a political party, whose program would be very protective of the environment”; “I plan to participate in upcoming regional or national climate events”), $r = 0.41$, $p < 0.001$, $M = 5.33$, $SD = 2.25$. These two levels of intentions are positively correlated ($r = 0.47$, $p < 0.001$).


Demographic and dispositional variables

Participants answered socio-demographic questions relating to their gender, age, country of birth, country of residence, education level, diet (ie., veg*ns or not), political orientation [assessed by indicating their position on a scale ranging from (1) extreme left-wing to (9) extreme right-wing, $M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.59$], identification as a national (French) citizen [assessed by indicating their position on a scale ranging from (1) “*not at all*” to (9) “*extremely*,” $M = 6.58$, $SD = 2.05$], and the perception of themselves as an environmental activist [assessed by indicating their position on a scale ranging from (1) “*not at all*” to (9) “*extremely*,” $M = 4.38$, $SD = 1.67$]. Supplementary analyses controlling these factors were conducted and the results remained unchanged.

Results

Attitudes and perceived group norm: A significant mismatch

We conducted a 2 (Diet: veg*ns vs. non-veg*ns) $\times$ 2 (Type of measure: personal attitude vs. social norm) mixed ANOVA with the last variable as a within-participant factor. All reported effects are significant at $p < 0.001$ except where it is mentioned. We observed a main effect of type of measures [$F(1, 484) = 713.37$, $\eta^2_p = 0.59$], yielding a significant difference between personal attitudes and perceived social norms. Overall, participants had a more favourable attitude toward the reduction of meat consumption as a means to fight against global warming ($M = 7.24$, $SD = 2.05$) than what they perceived as the social norm in France ($M = 4.44$, $SD = 2.00$). As predicted, this main effect was qualified by a significant interaction with the participants diet [$F(1, 484) = 171.79$, $\eta^2_p = 0.26$, see Figure 1]. Veg*n participants were more positive toward the reduction of meat consumption as a mean to fight against global warming ($M = 8.35$, $SE = 0.11$) than non-veg*n participants [$M = 6.16$, $SE = 0.11$, $F(1, 484) = 194.90$, $\eta^2_p = 0.29$]. They perceived slightly less ($M = 4.15$, $SE = 0.13$) than non-veg*n participants ($M = 4.73$, $SE = 0.12$) that French people are favourable toward the reduction of meat consumption as a mean to fight against global warming [$F(1, 484) = 10.36$, $\eta^2_p = 0.02$]. Of interest, the perceived difference between attitude and social norms was greater for participants that follow a veg*n diet [mean difference = 4.21, $SE = 0.15$; $F(1, 484) = 782.99$, $\eta^2_p = 0.62$] compared with participants who still eat meat [mean difference = 1.44, $SE = 0.15$; $F(1, 484) = 93.66$, $\eta^2_p = 0.16$]. Thus, H1 was confirmed: veg*ns of our sample were more strongly in mismatch, with their attitude higher than the perceived social norms, compared to participants who still eat meat regularly.



Testing our model: Mediations on individual and group pro-environmental intentions

To test whether participants' diet indirectly influenced their tendencies to act pro-environmentally at an individual (Model A) and group level (Model B) through causally linked multiple mediators of mismatch and willingness to participate in normative change, two serial mediation analyses (Model 6 in PROCESS, 5000 percentile bootstrap) were conducted with the bootstrap method (Hayes, 2014). The paths for the full process model are shown in Figure 2 and their corresponding coefficients and 95% CIs are shown in Tables 1, 2 (see Supplementary materials for an extended description). Figure 2 shows the serial mediations.

As predicted, it was found that participants' diet significantly predicted the mismatch perception ($b = -2.77$, 95%CI [-3.19; -2.36]). Participants' diet ($b = -1.13$, 95%CI [-1.50; -0.75]) and mismatch perception ($b = 0.35$, 95%CI [0.28; 0.42]) also significantly predicted the willingness to participate in normative change. For the Model A and Model B, both the total effect of diet on intention to act at an individual or a group level against climate change (Model A: $b = -1.76$, 95%CI [-2.07; -1.46]; $R^2 = 0.21$; Model B: $b = -1.51$, 95%CI [-1.89; -1.13], $R^2 = 0.11$) and the total direct effects when controlling for the mediators were significant (Model A: $b = -0.34$, 95%CI [-0.61; -0.08]; and Model B: $b = -0.60$, 95%CI [-1.03; -0.18]¹).

¹ This path became nonsignificant when we included covariates in the model: $b = -0.13$, $SE = 0.19$, $t = -0.68$, $p = 0.49$, 95%CI [-0.51; 0.25]). Other unstandardized Betas slightly changed due to the addition of parameters in the model, but no large fluctuation toward p-values was observed. In other words, with the exception of path c' in model B which became nonsignificant, all other paths, for both models A and B are broadly the same as those described here.

Of importance, H3a and H3b were supported. For both Model A and Model B, the total indirect effects were significant (Model A: $effect = -1.42$, 95%CI [-1.70; -1.14], and Model B: $effect = -0.90$, 95%CI [-1.17; -0.65]), with a significant serial mediation effect being observed from participant's diet via mismatch perception and willingness to participate in normative change in intention to act at an individual level (Model A: $effect = -0.50$, 95%CI [-0.67; -0.36]) and to intention to act against climate change at a group level (Model B: $effect = -0.35$, 95%CI [-0.49; -0.23]). The specific indirect effect through mismatch only was significant for Model A ($effect = -0.32$, 95%CI [-0.49; -0.17]) but not for Model B ($effect = -0.14$, 95%CI [-0.38; 0.10]) whereas the specific indirect effect through willingness to participate in normative change only was significant for both Model A ($effect = -0.59$, 95%CI [-0.80; -0.39]) and model B ($effect = -0.41$, 95%CI [-0.59; -0.26]).

Overall, these findings indicate that veg*ns participants have a strong intention to behave pro-environmentally at both individual level (i.e., eating no meat, H3a) and group level (i.e., voting for a green political party or participating in climate events, H3b), because the perceived mismatch between their attitude and social norms is associated with their willingness to change social norms toward meat consumption.

Discussion

In this study, we investigated the mismatch model by applying it to a minority that already acts pro-environmentally (i.e., veg*ns). We compared vegetarians and vegans to omnivores to see if the mismatch between personal attitudes and perceived social norms can explain how a minority maintains its high pro-environmental intentions on an individual level. Our second goal was to see if this same model can also motivate other levels of pro-environmental intentions (i.e., on a group level). When testing the model on pro-environmental intentions on an individual and group level, each path of the mediation is significant and confirmed our expectations—even when controlling for demographic and dispositional variables. First, vegetarians and vegans are significantly more in mismatch with their personal attitudes higher than the perceived social norm, compared to non-veg*ns. These results reflect previous research on minorities and how they differ from other members of the group (Hassounieh et al., 2014; Gutmann-Kahn and Lindstrom, 2015): being part of a minority does, indeed, accentuate the belief that one's personal attitude is different from the social norm. It does so not only by polarizing minorities' attitudes (i.e., in our sample veg*ns have stronger attitudes than others) but also by changing group members' perception of social norms (i.e., veg*ns perceived the social norm to be less in favour of eating less meat than omnivores). This confirms the biased perception of the social norm found in previous studies: group members do not estimate accurately the actual social

TABLE 1 Direct, indirect, and total effects of the hypothesized model A.

Model pathways	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	LL95%CI	UL95%CI
Direct and total effects						
Diet → Mismatch	−2.77	0.21	−13.10	0.001	−3.19	−2.36
Diet → Willingness	−1.13	0.19	−5.86	0.001	−1.50	−0.75
Mismatch → Willingness	0.35	0.03	9.81	0.001	0.28	0.42
Mismatch → Individual level intention	0.11	0.02	4.42	0.001	0.06	0.17
Willingness → Individual level intention	0.52	0.03	16.95	0.001	0.46	0.58
Total model effect	−1.76	0.15	−11.38	0.001	−2.07	−1.46
Direct effect	−0.34	0.13	−2.55	0.011	−0.61	−0.08
Indirect effects						
Total	−1.42	0.14			−1.70	−1.14
Diet → Mismatch → Individual level intention	−0.32	0.08			−0.49	−0.17
Diet → Willingness → Individual level intention	−0.59	0.10			−0.80	−0.39
Diet → Mismatch → Willingness → Individual level intention	−0.50	0.08			−0.67	−0.36

b = unstandardized coefficients.

TABLE 2 Direct, indirect, and total effects of the hypothesized model B.


Model pathways	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	LL 95%CI	UL 95%CI
Direct and total effects						
Diet → Mismatch	−2.77	0.21	−13.10	0.001	−3.19	−2.36
Diet → Willingness	−1.13	0.19	−5.86	0.001	−1.50	−0.75
Mismatch → Willingness	0.35	0.03	9.81	0.001	0.28	0.42
Mismatch → Group level intention	0.05	0.04	1.22	0.224	−0.03	0.13
Willingness → Group level intention	0.36	0.05	7.41	0.001	0.26	0.46
Total model effect	−1.51	0.19	−7.80	0.001	−1.89	−1.13
Direct effect	−0.60	0.21	−2.81	0.005	−1.03	−0.18
Indirect effects						
Total	−0.90	0.13			−1.17	−0.65
Diet → Mismatch → Group level intention	−0.14	0.12			−0.38	0.10
Diet → Willingness → Group level intention	−0.41	0.08			−0.59	−0.26
Diet → Mismatch → Willingness → Group level intention	−0.35	0.06			−0.49	−0.23

b = unstandardized coefficients.

norm (Prentice and Miller, 1993; Guimond et al., 2015; Geiger and Swim, 2016). Our results, however, go one step further by showing that different group members do not necessarily misestimate the social norm in the same way.

The results also confirm the mismatch models' effect on individual and group level intentions: self-other mismatch significantly explains vegetarians' intentions to continue to act on an individual level and to participate in group actions. First, vegetarians continuing to have high individual intentions are, indeed, linked to the difference in personal opinion compared to other group members, and their higher levels of willingness to participate in normative change. These results are consistent

with those found in previous studies (Falomir-Pichastor et al., 2008; Lalot et al., 2018) and can effectively explain how minorities fight the pressure to conform to social norms. Second, while the specific indirect effect “diet—mismatch—group level intentions” was nonsignificant, the total direct and indirect effects of the model were significant: being part of a minority accentuates intentions to act on a group-level (participating in demonstrations and voting for a green political party). This effect is significantly mediated by participants' mismatch perception and their willingness to participate in normative change. The model, therefore, does not only explain how minorities maintain their original pro-environmental



action: consistent with previous literature (Lalot et al., 2018) it can also motivate people to act pro-environmentally in ways they were not necessarily doing before.

Theoretical and applied implications

These results have multiple theoretical and applied implications. From a theoretical perspective, this study shows the need to refine certain theories in social psychology. Indeed, the present study can first be used to nuance the current literature on normative influence. Previously, deviance was originally considered as behaviour that negatively impacts the group and that should be avoided (Sherif, 1936; Asch, 1956). So, conformism was thought to be the be-all and end-all for group members, when they were faced with a social norm. It is not, however, necessarily the case: when group members are exposed to a social norm, they can also be part of an active minority that expresses a deviating opinion with the aim of changing and bettering the group. Indeed, a panel of previous real-life events and studies show that social change does not happen by conforming to social norms: social change is more often than not only possible with the efforts of minority groups and isolated individuals (Mugny et al., 1983; Lalot et al., 2018). For example, Moscovici et al. (1969), Moscovici and Lage (1976), and Moscovici (1991) shows that minorities drive social change by expressing their non-conformist opinions and that they have a latent influence on others. Unlike majorities that cause temporary public attitudinal and behavioural change (i.e., “manifest influence”), minorities influence others more slowly and privately. With this latent influence, minorities inspire and gradually motivate other group members to change by exposing them to opinions and behaviours that are different and non-conformist (Bolderdijk and Jans, 2021; Nardini et al., 2021). This dissident behaviour can, therefore, have a positive

effect on society and is what some researchers call constructive deviance (Packer, 2008; Galperin, 2012; Vadera et al., 2013). This study contributes to this line of research firstly by confirming that certain group members do practice dissident behaviours, and secondly by showing that minorities actively participate in non-conformist actions in the specific aims to provoke social change. Social change is not an unwanted consequence of their actions but seems to actually be part of their motivation to act.

Of course, even if we cannot claim why people are vegetarian (indeed, multiple factors can be involved in eating preferences, see Symmank et al., 2017 for a review), our results suggest that vegetarians having high individual and group level intentions can be partly explained by their heightened “self-other” mismatch and their higher willingness to change the social norm. It seems like they manage to maintain their intentions because they perceive a bigger self-other gap and they want to change the social norm, compared to non-vegetarians. As a logical part of future research, motivation to be vegetarian and to encourage others to reduce their meat consumption should be examined more deeply. For example, future research could extend these results by seeing whether vegetarians continue their meat-free diet once the social change has been achieved: would they maintain their polarized, almost extreme level, of pro-environmental intentions once most group members are doing their part to help the planet? Or would they no longer feel the need to do so and shift to a less restrictive diet (i.e., eating meat at most once a day)?

Our results can secondly shed some light on limitations to the theory of planned behaviour that has been discussed in prior research. Recent studies show that attitudes do not have as much influence on intentions and behaviour as previously suggested and that a positive attitude does not always finish in actual behaviour. This is known as the attitude-behaviour gap (Aschemann-Witzel and Niebuhr Aagaard, 2014; Farjam et al., 2019). This can partly explain why a significant amount of

studies and interventions (notably communication campaigns) have solely relied on majority normative influence to motivate pro-environmental behaviours (Bergquist and Nilsson, 2016; Niemiec et al., 2020; Salazar et al., 2021). While this attitude-behaviour gap does effectively exist, it can be reduced by several means, notably by considering moderating variables (Conner et al., 2002; Farjam et al., 2019). For example, Conner et al. (2002) show that the attitude-behaviour gap is reduced when the individual's attitude is not ambivalent. On a similar note, our results also show that individuals' attitudes can have a more significant role in motivating pro-environmental behaviour when they do not match with the actual norm. These results, therefore, also join a second criticism brought forward concerning the theory of planned behaviour and the stipulated independence between personal attitudes and social norms. Indeed, models like the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1977), further extended within the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991), suggest that while social norms and personal attitudes can often predict intentions and behaviour, they always do so independently (Ajzen, 1988). The present study concludes, however, that considering the interactive effect between social norms and personal attitudes can improve the understanding of what motivates intentions and behaviours: if people's personal attitudes do not match social norms, then their intentions are affected differently, compared to when they are matched. Including the interaction between social norms and personal attitudes significantly predicts intentions and therefore improves the understanding of what motivates intentions and behaviours.

Another theoretical question emerges from our results: would we find the same 'attitude – social norms' mismatch effect on intentions when taking into account the perceived descriptive or prescriptive characteristics of norms rather than the perceived general attitude of the group (i.e., the social norm in general)? Would a disagreement with an injunctive norm (what others believe is right/wrong) have a different effect than a disagreement with a descriptive norm (what others do)? Previous studies (Khamzina et al., 2021) show that different types of norms can effectively interact differently with personal attitudes. They find that perceived group norms (PGNs, which focus on attitudes of others) interact more with participants' attitudes than subjective norms (norms that focus on 'important' others) do. This can be due to the fact that there is a bigger perception bias for perceived group norms than for subjective norms (Deffuant et al., 2022): people tend to perceive others' far attitudes (PGN) further than they actually are and close attitudes closer to theirs than they really are. This is less the case for subjective norms. As subjective norms are conceptually closer to injunctive norms (see Thøgersen, 2006 for a review), the mismatch effect could also have a bigger effect when considering descriptive norms, rather than injunctive norms. Further studies empirically testing these hypotheses are, however, still needed in this area.

Finally, our results could be used during the creation of behavioural change interventions. Indeed, many studies have found a positive impact of interventions aimed at either changing the TPB variables and thus indirectly changing intentions and behaviour, or using these variables to directly change intentions and behaviours (Steinmetz et al., 2016). Ajzen and Schmidt (2020), therefore, recommend designing interventions that influence these variables because they could produce substantial changes in behaviour. When creating and testing future interventions aiming for behavioural change, researchers could use our results to nuance and adapt these interventions to target a larger sample of individuals (i.e., by accentuating the idea that people can lead normative change by following their more favourable attitudes). For example, using informational strategies (see Steg and Vlek, 2009, for a review on informational strategies) that broadcast normative messages could remind individuals that the social norm is less favourable than they would like, and consequently activate their willingness to change social norms. This would push them to participate more in environmental action (i.e., eat less meat, or participate in collective action). This intervention would, however, only heighten environmental behaviours for participants that perceive a mismatch with their attitudes higher than the norm.

Limitations and future directions

Despite providing empirical support for the mismatch model and having important implications, this study presents some limitations—notably the experimental design. Since this study is cross-sectional, the pathways in the mediation analysis can only be considered correlational and not to be causal links. While this study is a first step toward explaining the mismatch effect on pro-environmental intentions and how minorities maintain their pro-environmental intentions, further studies need to be conducted with an experimental design capable of testing the causal pathways of this model (i.e., manipulating the self-other difference in pro-environmental attitudes). A second limitation concerns the sampling strategy. In this study, we aimed to test the mismatch model presented in the introduction by comparing people who already act pro-environmentally in real life (i.e., vegetarians and vegans by eating no meat) and those who do not yet (i.e., people who still eat meat). Comparing these two existing sub-groups in the French population offered initial evidence supporting the mismatch model as hypotheses are confirmed. Indeed, veg*ns had much higher scores on each mismatch variable. While we compare statistically balanced groups, our participants had to volunteer to take part in the research which may have been creating a self-selection sampling bias. Thus, one can argue that this could have led to participants with only certain

characteristics wanting to participate in the study, and therefore not providing a representative sample for the study (see Sharma, 2017). This is a common bias for all the studies that use, as we did, volunteer procedures of recruitment and snowball sampling for the study of ‘hard-to-reach’ populations such as veg*ns. This limit should be considered when interpreting the presented results.

A third limit is that we focused on only one of the various behaviours that can be used to mitigate climate change (see Wynes and Nicholas, 2017). Indeed, we generally wanted to study behaviour that contributes to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and reducing one’s meat consumption does so significantly (see Tukker and Jansen, 2006; Aubin, 2014). Further research could reinforce our results by conducting conceptual replications with other pro-environmental behaviours. If the mismatch model does effectively explain social change, a “self-other” difference should also explain people’s behavioural intentions in others areas where social change is also needed (using eco-transports rather than a car alone, reducing energy and water consumption for example). Moreover, we did not consider other important factors that could intervene and extend the understanding of individual dynamics that are involved in the motivation to participate in social change. For example, it could be interesting to examine the role of people’s perceptions of climate change because this could play an important role in whether they support climate policies, and act to mitigate and/or adapt to climate change. Indeed, people may hold different beliefs about the extent to which climate change is caused by humans and what consequences it will have, where, and when (Van Valkengoed et al., 2021). For example, believers should be more inclined to behave in a pro-environmental way, and even more so if they perceived that this is not the case for general others. Indeed, as they should perceive the highest urgency to react against climate change, they also should be more motivated to change social norms with regard to pro-environmental behaviours. Other variables could also moderate the mismatch model. For example, depending on the person’s perceived behavioural control (PBC, Fife-Schaw et al., 2007; La Barbera and Ajzen, 2020) on the target behaviour, and the perceived electability of the political party (Abramowitz, 1989; Sandri and Seddone, 2015; Mildenerger and Tingley, 2017), their individual and group level intentions may not be the same. The classic hypothesis for PBC would be that perceiving low behavioural control would reduce the beneficial effect of a ‘self-other’ difference on individual pro-environmental intentions (see Ajzen and Schmidt, 2020 for a review). But a recent study conducted by Khamzina et al. (2021), see also Deffuant et al. (2022) shows that the mismatch effect only influences peoples’ behaviour with low PBC—as if high PBC sufficed in motivating action but when perceived control is low, other factors need to

come into play. These results concur with other studies (Guagnano et al., 1995) that show that attitudes predict behaviour less when behaviour is easily feasible. As for the perceived electability of the political party, perceiving a political party as unlikely to be elected could reduce the beneficial effects of the mismatch effect on voting for a said political party. It might not, however, have an effect on other group-level actions (i.e., participating in demonstrations and protests). So, while this study’s main focus was the interactive effect between social norms and personal attitudes drawn from the theory of planned behaviour, future studies could include measures of perceived control and perceived electability to see how they specifically influence the mismatch model.

Finally, only pro-environmental intentions were measured and not actual pro-environmental behaviour. Despite their importance in predicting action (Armitage and Conner, 2001; Riebl et al., 2015), intentions cannot be fully equated with actual behaviour. Therefore, future research needs to assess the mismatch model by measuring, or even observing pro-environmental actions.

Conclusion

This research contributes to the literature on social change and provides a better understanding of how vegetarians maintain their pro-environmental intentions, despite the social pressure to do otherwise. Indeed, our findings suggest that they perceive a gap between their attitude and the social norms, and this motivates them to change the current social norm. This willingness to participate in normative change is what then leads to vegetarians maintaining their individual intentions, and even having higher levels of group-level pro-environmental intentions. Future behavioural change interventions should, therefore, consider these results to better support active minorities and to also lead others into participating in normative change.

Data availability statement

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation. Materials and data are available at OSF at: <https://osf.io/unmc8>.

Ethics statement

All procedures performed were in accordance with the ethical standards of the Clermont Université Auvergne Research Ethics Committee (IRB-UCA REC) and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical

standards. Ethical permission to conduct this research was granted by the IRB-UCA REC Protocol N° IRB00011540-2021-53. Written informed consent for participation was not required for this study in accordance with the national legislation and the institutional requirements.

Author contributions

RH, AN, KK, SG, SM, and MS: conceptualization. RH and AN: material development, formal analysis, original draft, and writing – review and editing. RH and SM: participant recruitment and ethical standards. KK, SM, SG, and MS: review and editing. AN: funding acquisition. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Funding

This work was supported in part by the research project “202CM” funded by the JPI Climate Solstice and French National Research Agency (ANR-20-SOLS-0001-01).

References

- Abramowitz, A. I. (1989). Viability, electability, and candidate choice in a presidential primary election: a test of competing models. *J. Politics* 51, 977–992.
- Acocck, A. C., and DeFleur, M. L. (1972). A configurational approach to contingent consistency in the attitude-behavior relationship. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 37, 714–726. doi: 10.2307/2093582
- Adger, N. (2003). Social capital, Collective action, and adaptation to climate change. *Econ. Geography* 79, 387–404.
- Ajzen, I. (1988). *Attitudes, Personality, and Behavior*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decision Proc.* 50, 179–211. doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
- Ajzen, I., and Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: a theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychol. Bull.* 84, 888–918. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.84.5.888
- Ajzen, I., Fishbein, M., Lohmann, S., and Albarracín, D. (2018). The influence of attitudes on behavior. *Basic Principles Handb. Attitudes* 1, 197–255.
- Ajzen, I., and Schmidt, P. (2020). “Changing behavior using the theory of planned behavior,” in *The Handbook of Behavior Change*, eds M. S. Hagger, L. D. Cameron, K. Hamilton, N. Hankonen, and T. Lintunen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 17–31. doi: 10.1017/9781108677318.002
- Aldy, J. E., Orszag, P. R., and Stiglitz, J. E. (2001). “Climate change: an agenda for global collective action,” in *Paper Prepared for the Conference on the Timing of Climate Change policies*, Pew Center on Global Climate Change, (Washington, DC).
- Armitage, C. J., and Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: a meta-analytic review. *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.* 40, 471–499. doi: 10.1348/014466601164939
- Asch, S. A. (1951). “Effect of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments,” in *Groups, Leadership, and Men*, ed. H. Guetzkow (Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Press), 177–190.
- Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: I. a minority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychol. Monographs: General Appl.* 70, 1–70. doi: 10.1037/h0093718
- Aschemann-Witzel, J., and Niebuhr Aagaard, E. M. (2014). Elaborating on the attitude-behaviour gap regarding organic products: young Danish consumers and in-store food choice. *Int. J. Consumer Stud.* 38, 550–558. doi: 10.1111/ijcs.12115
- Aubin, J. (2014). Empreinte environnementale de la viande et des produits carnés. *Viandes Produits Carnés* 30, 1–7.
- Bagozzi, R. P., and Schnedlitz, P. (1985). Social contingencies in the attitude model: a test of certain interaction hypotheses. *Soc. Psychol. Quarterly* 48, 366–373. doi: 10.2307/2786698
- Barma, M. C., Saidur, R., Rahman, S. M. A., Allouhi, A., Akash, B. A., and Sait, S. M. (2017). A review on boilers energy use, energy savings, and emissions reductions. *Renewable Sustainable Energy Rev.* 79, 970–983. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.187
- Bellard, C., Bertelsmeier, C., Leadley, P., Thuiller, W., and Courchamp, F. (2012). Impacts of climate change on the future of biodiversity. *Ecol. Lett.* 15, 365–377. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01736.x
- Bergquist, M., and Nilsson, A. (2016). I saw the sign: promoting energy conservation via normative prompts. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 46, 23–31. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2016.03.005
- Bohner, G., and Dickel, N. (2011). Attitudes and attitude change. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 62, 391–417. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131609
- Bolderdijk, J. W., and Jans, L. (2021). Minority influence in climate change mitigation. *Curr. Opinion Psychol.* 42, 25–30. doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.02.005
- Bresnahan, M., Zhuang, J., and Zhu, X. (2016). Why is the vegan line in the dining hall always the shortest? understanding vegan stigma. *Stigma Health* 1, 3–15. doi: 10.1037/sah0000011
- Chai, B. C., van der Voort, J. R., Grofelnik, K., Eliasdottir, H. G., Klöss, I., and Perez-Cueto, F. J. A. (2019). Which diet has the least environmental impact on our planet? a systematic review of vegan, vegetarian and omnivorous diets. *Sustainability* 11, 4110–4128. doi: 10.3390/su11154110

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher’s note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Supplementary material

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.935209/full#supplementary-material>

- Cholez, L.-A. (2021). *Menu Sans Viande Dans les Cantines Scolaires?: la Polémique en Cinq Actes*. Available online at: <https://reporterre.net/Menus-sans-viande-a-Lyon-les-contre-verites-des-politiques> (accessed May 1, 2021)
- Christensen, N. S., Wood, A. W., Voisin, N., Lettenmaier, D. P., and Palmer, R. N. (2004). The effects of climate change on the hydrology and water resources of the Colorado River basin. *Climatic change* 62, 337–363.
- Chung, A., and Rimal, R. N. (2016). Social norms: a review. *Rev. Commun. Res.* 4, 1–28.
- Cialdini, R. B., Reno, R. R., and Kallgren, C. A. (1990). A focus theory of normative conduct: recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 58, 1015–1026. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.58.6.1015
- Conner, M., Sparks, P., Povey, R., James, R., Shepherd, R., and Armitage, C. J. (2002). Moderator effects of attitudinal ambivalence on attitude-behaviour relationships. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 32, 705–718. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.117
- de Groeve, B., Hudders, L., and Bleys, B. (2021). Moral rebels and dietary deviants: how moral minority stereotypes predict the social attractiveness of veg*ns. *Appetite* 164:105284. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2021.105284
- Deffuant, G., Roozmand, O., Huet, S., Khamzina, K., Nugier, A., and Guimond, S. (2022). “Can biases in perceived attitudes explain anti-conformism?” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, (Piscataway, NJ).
- Falomir-Pichastor, J. M., Mugny, G., Quiamzade, A., and Gabarrot, F. (2008). Motivations underlying attitudes: regulatory focus and majority versus minority support. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 38, 587–600. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.494
- Farjam, M., Nikolaychuk, O., and Bravo, G. (2019). Experimental evidence of an environmental attitude-behavior gap in high-cost situations. *Ecol. Econ.* 166:106434. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106434
- Fife-Schaw, C., Sheeran, P., and Norman, P. (2007). Simulating behaviour change interventions based on the theory of planned behaviour: impacts on intention and action. *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.* 46, 43–68. doi: 10.1348/014466605X85906
- Fritzsche, I., Jonas, E., and Kessler, T. (2011). Collective reactions to threat: implications for intergroup conflict and for solving societal crises. *Soc. Issues Policy Rev.* 5, 101–136. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-2409.2011.01027.x
- Fuglestad, J., Berntsen, T., Myhre, G., Rypdal, K., and Skeie, R. B. (2008). Climate forcing from the transport sectors. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S A.* 105, 454–458. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0702958104
- Galperin, B. L. (2012). Exploring the nomological network of workplace deviance: developing and validating a measure of constructive deviance. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 42, 2988–3025. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00971.x
- Geiger, N., and Swim, J. K. (2016). Climate of silence: pluralistic ignorance as a barrier to climate change discussion. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 47, 79–90. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2016.05.002
- Grube, J. W., and Morgan, M. (1990). Attitude-Social support interactions: contingent consistency effects in the prediction of adolescent smoking, drinking, and drug use. *Soc. Psychol. Quarterly* 53, 329–339. doi: 10.2307/2786738
- Guagnano, G., Stern, P., and Dietz, T. (1995). Influences on attitude behavior relationships: a natural experiment with curbside recycling. *Environ. Behav.* 27, 699–718. doi: 10.1177/0013916595275005
- Guimond, S., de Oliveira, P., Lalonde, K. N., Lalonde, R. N., Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., et al. (2013). Diversity policy, social dominance, and intergroup relations: predicting prejudice in changing social and political contexts. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 104, 941–958. doi: 10.1037/a0032069
- Guimond, S., Streith, M., and Roebroek, E. (2015). Les représentations du multiculturalisme en France: décalage singulier entre l'individuel et le collectif. *Soc. Sci. Inform.* 54, 52–77. doi: 10.1177/0539018414554826
- Gutmann-Kahn, L., and Lindstrom, L. (2015). “I just want to be myself”: adolescents with disabilities who identify as a sexual or gender minority. *Educ. Forum* 79, 362–376. doi: 10.1080/00131725.2015.1068416
- Hassounah, D., Lutz, K. F., Beckett, A. K., Junkins, E. P. Jr., and Horton, L. L. (2014). The experiences of underrepresented minority faculty in schools of medicine. *Med. Educ. Online* 19:24768. doi: 10.3402/meo.v19.24768
- Hayes, A. F. (2014). *SPSS, SAS, and Mplus Macros and Code*. Available online at: <http://afhayes.com/spss-sas-and-r-macros-and-code.html> (accessed January 3, 2021).
- IPCC (2021). “Summary for policymakers,” in *Proceedings of the Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the 6th Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Katz, E., and Fialkoff, Y. (2017). Six concepts in search of retirement. *Ann. Int. Commun. Assoc.* 41, 86–91. doi: 10.1080/23808985.2017.1291280
- Khamzina, K., Huet, S., Deffuant, G., Streith, M., and Guimond, S. (2021). Making the planet green again: the interplay of attitudes and group norms in the conversion to organic farming. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 51, 1073–1088. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12825
- Krispenz, A., and Bertrams, A. (2020). Correlates of the intention to reduce meat consumption. *Sustainability* 12:4774. doi: 10.3390/su12114774
- La Barbera, F., and Ajzen, I. (2020). Control interactions in the theory of planned behavior: rethinking the role of subjective norm. *Eur. J. Psychol.* 16:401. doi: 10.5964/ejop.v16i3.2056
- Lalot, F., Falomir-Pichastor, J. M., and Quiamzade, A. (2018). Compensation and consistency effects in pro-environmental behaviour: the moderating role of majority and minority support for pro-environmental values. *Group Proc. Intergroup Relations* 21, 403–421.
- Markowski, K. L., and Roxburgh, S. (2019). If I became a vegan, my family and friends would hate me:” anticipating vegan stigma as a barrier to plant-based diets. *Appetite* 135, 1–9. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2018.12.040
- Mildenberger, M., and Tingley, D. (2017). Beliefs about climate beliefs: the importance of second-order opinions for climate politics. *Br. J. Political Sci.* 49, 1279–1307. doi: 10.1017/S0007123417000321
- Moscovici, S., and Lage, E. (1976). Studies in social influence III: majority versus minority influence in a group. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 6, 149–174. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420060202
- Moscovici, S., Lage, E., and Naffrechoux, M. (1969). Influence of a consistent minority on the responses of a majority in a color perception task. *Sociometry* 32, 365–380. doi: 10.2307/2786541
- Moscovici, S. (1991). *Psychologie des Minorités Actives*. Available online at: <http://classiques.uqac.ca/> (accessed March 30, 2021).
- Mugny, G., Kaiser, C., and Papastamou, S. (1983). Influence minoritaire, identification et relations entre groupes: étude expérimentale autour d'une votation. *Cahiers Psychol. Soc.* 19, 1–30.
- Nardini, G., Rank-Christman, T., Bublitz, M. G., Cross, S. N., and Peracchio, L. A. (2021). Together we rise: how social movements succeed. *J. Consumer Psychol.* 31, 112–145. doi: 10.1002/jcpy.1201
- Niemiec, R. M., Champine, V., Vaske, J. J., and Mertens, A. (2020). Does the impact of norms vary by type of norm and type of conservation behavior? a meta-analysis. *Soc. Nat. Resources* 33, 1024–1040. doi: 10.1080/08941920.2020.1729912
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1993). *The Spiral of Silence: Public Opinion—Our Social Skin*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1974). The spiral of silence a theory of public opinion. *J. Commun.* 24, 43–51. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1974.tb00367.x
- Packer, D. J. (2008). On being both with us and against us: a normative conflict model of dissent in social groups. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* 12, 50–72. doi: 10.1177/1088868307309606
- Packer, D. J. (2009). Avoiding groupthink: whereas weakly identified members remain silent, strongly identified members dissent about collective problems. *Psychol. Sci.* 20, 546–548. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02333.x
- Packer, D. J., and Chasteen, A. L. (2010). Loyal deviance: testing the normative conflict model of dissent in social groups. *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 36, 5–18. doi: 10.1177/0146167209350628
- Prentice, D. A., and Miller, D. T. (1993). Pluralistic ignorance and alcohol use on campus: some consequences of misperceiving the social norm. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 64, 243–256. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.64.2.243
- Riebl, S. K., Estabrooks, P. A., Dunsmore, J. C., Savla, J., Frisard, M. I., Dietrich, A. M., et al. (2015). A systematic literature review and meta-analysis: the theory of planned behavior's application to understand and predict nutrition-related behaviors in youth. *Eating Behav.* 18, 160–178. doi: 10.1016/j.eatbeh.2015.05.016
- Salazar, G., Neves, J., Alves, V., Silva, B., Giger, J. C., and Veríssimo, D. (2021). The effectiveness and efficiency of using normative messages to reduce waste: a real world experiment. *PLoS One* 16:e0261734. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0261734
- Salonen, A. O., and Helne, T. T. (2012). Vegetarian diets: a way towards a sustainable society. *J. Sustainable Dev.* 5, 10–24.
- Sanchez-Sabate, R., and Sabaté, J. (2019). Consumer attitudes towards environmental concerns of meat consumption: a systematic review. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 16:1220. doi: 10.3390/ijerph16071220
- Sandri, G., and Seddone, A. (2015). Sense or sensibility? political attitudes and voting behaviour of party members, voters, and supporters of the Italian centre-left. *Italian Political Sci. Rev. Rivista Italiana Sci. Politica* 45, 25–51.
- Scheufele, D. A., and Moy, P. (2000). Twenty-five years of the spiral of silence: a conceptual review and empirical outlook. *Int. J. Public Opinion Res.* 12, 3–28. doi: 10.1093/ijpor/12.1.3

- Schittly, R. (2021). *Le Menu Sans Viande des Écologistes Dans Les Cantines de Lyon n'est Pas au Goût du Gouvernement*. Paris: Le monde.
- Schulte, M., Bamberg, S., and Rees, J. (2021). We, the change: outlining research lines of how psychology can contribute to the understanding of societal transition processes. *Eur. Psychol.* 26:172. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040/a000445
- Sharma, G. (2017). Pros and cons of different sampling techniques. *Int. J. Appl. Res.* 3, 749–752.
- Sherif, M. (1936). *The Psychology of Social Norms*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Steg, L. (2018). Limiting climate change requires research on climate action. *Nat. Climate Change* 8, 759–761. doi: 10.1038/s41558-018-0269-8
- Steg, L., and Vlek, C. (2009). Encouraging pro-environmental behaviour: an integrative review and research agenda. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 29, 309–317.
- Steinmetz, H., Knappstein, M., Ajzen, I., Schmidt, P., and Kabst, R. (2016). How effective are behavior change interventions based on the theory of planned behavior? a three-level meta-analysis. *Zeitschrift Psychol.* 224:216. doi: 10.1027/2151-2604/a000255
- Symmank, C., Mai, R., Hoffmann, S., Stok, F. M., Renner, B., Lien, N., et al. (2017). Predictors of food decision making: a systematic interdisciplinary mapping (SIM) review. *Appetite* 110, 25–35. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2016.11.023
- Thøgersen, J. (2006). Norms for environmentally responsible behaviour: an extended taxonomy. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 26, 247–261. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2006.09.004
- Tukker, A., and Jansen, B. (2006). Environmental impacts of products: a detailed review of studies. *J. Industrial Ecol.* 10, 159–182. doi: 10.1162/jiec.2006.10.3.159
- Vadera, A. K., Pratt, M. G., and Mishra, P. (2013). Constructive deviance in organizations: integrating and moving forward. *J. Manag.* 39, 1221–1276. doi: 10.1177/0149206313475816
- Van Valkengoed, A. M., Steg, L., and Perlaviciute, G. (2021). Development and validation of a climate change perceptions scale. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 76:101652. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2021.101652
- Wan, C., Shen, G. Q., and Choi, S. (2017). Experiential and instrumental attitudes: interaction effect of attitude and subjective norm on recycling intention. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 50, 69–79. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.02.006
- Watson, R. T., Zinyowera, M. C., Moss, R. H., and Dokken, D. J. (eds) (1998). *The Regional Impacts of Climate Change: an Assessment of Vulnerability*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitmarsh, L., and Capstick, S. (2018). “Perceptions of climate change,” in *Psychology and Climate Change: Human Perceptions, Impacts, and Responses*, eds S. Clayton and C. Manning (Cambridge, MA: Academic Press), 13–33. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-813130-5.00002-3
- Willis, K. J., and Bhagwat, S. A. (2009). Biodiversity and climate change. *Science* 326, 806–807. doi: 10.1126/science.1178838
- Wilson, M. S., Weatherall, A., and Butler, C. (2004). A rhetorical approach to discussions about health and vegetarianism. *J. Health Psychol.* 9, 567–581. doi: 10.1177/1359105304044040
- Wullenkord, M. C., and Hamann, K. R. (2021). We need to change: integrating psychological perspectives into the multilevel perspective on socio-ecological transformations. *Front. Psychol.* 12:655352. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.655352
- Wynes, S., and Nicholas, K. A. (2017). The climate mitigation gap: education and government recommendations miss the most effective individual actions. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 12:074024. doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/aa7541