A call for psychological and behavioural science on degrowth

Dario Krpan[1,2]*, Frédéric Basso[1], Dallas O'Dell[3], Jason E. Hickel[3,4,5], and Giorgos Kallis[3,4]

[1] Department of Psychological and Behavioural Science, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK

[2] Centre for the Understanding of Sustainable Prosperity (CUSP), University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

[3] Institute of Environmental Science and Technology (ICTA-UAB), Autonomous University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

[4] Catalan Institution for Research and Advanced Studies (ICREA), Barcelona, Spain

[5] International Inequalities Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK

* Corresponding author: Dario Krpan (d.krpan@lse.ac.uk)

Standfirst (330 characters): Degrowth is a socio-economic paradigm that prioritises planetary health and human well-being through a democratically planned reduction of unnecessary production and consumption. We urge psychological and behavioural scientists to study this important topic and suggest ways to develop an integrated research agenda for degrowth.

Estimates indicate that the point of no return for limiting global warming to 1.5° C—a threshold critical to averting severe environmental and societal impacts—may occur between 2021-2040[1]. We are therefore at a pivotal moment requiring urgent, transformative global action to combat the climate crisis. Psychological and behavioural scientists are doing their part by researching how to encourage sustainable behaviours and develop practical interventions for policymakers. However, much of this work focuses on behaviours with limited impact on climate change mitigation, while resolving the crisis requires systemic economic transformations and individual behavioural changes aligned with—and driving—these systemic shifts.

Degrowth is a planned reduction of damaging and unnecessary production and consumption, to reduce resource and energy use, and enable faster decarbonization, while production is reorganized around ensuring universal access to goods and services that are most important for human well-being[2]. This approach ensures good living standards with substantially less aggregate production and throughput in high-income economies, achieving social and ecological goals together. Degrowth primarily targets wealthy nations, while supporting increased production in the Global South as needed to meet human needs and development goals[3].

Since degrowth represents a radical departure from the growth-based economic paradigm embraced by many nations, adopting its principles requires profound changes in lifestyles and mindsets. Understanding the psychological and behavioural aspects of this transition is therefore essential for the successful implementation of degrowth. Insights from such research could help identify strategies to support the behavioural changes required by degrowth practices and policies while shedding light on their implications for human functioning and wellbeing. Yet, degrowth is scarcely addressed in the vast literature on the psychology of sustainability, with few papers exploring it directly[4].

Despite this, research from other relevant fields indicates that psychological aspects (e.g., attitudes, values, behaviour change, and wellbeing) are essential for understanding degrowth-related initiatives and practices, including housing cooperatives[5], participatory budgeting[6], citizens' assemblies[7], and addressing wealth disparity[8]. Collectively, psychological and behavioural aspects are already influencing diverse efforts that align with degrowth principles.

This is important for two reasons. First, it highlights the relevance of psychological insights to degrowth, making a compelling case for psychological and behavioural science to more formally study degrowth and shed light on its drivers, implementation, and consequences. Second, it underscores the need to connect existing and future findings into an integrated body of knowledge, as psychological insights on degrowth can be found in various research disciplines.

Therefore, this comment aims to guide psychological and behavioural scientists in conducting research to advance the understanding and implementation of degrowth; and propose how the psychological and behavioural science of degrowth can evolve into an integrated field.

Degrowth policies, topics, and future research

One challenge in approaching degrowth is its broad character, ranging from institutional change to degrowth-akin communities and experiences (intentional or not), different modes of living (self-sufficient, communal/cooperative), or different forms of political organizing (movements, unions and parties). Here we focus on degrowth-oriented policies, developing a research agenda around the study of the psychological drivers of support and the psychological impacts of these policies. This allows concrete and tangible proposals, pilots, or implementations.

We start from an overview of important degrowth-focused policies. Table 1 (Column 1) summarizes the most important policy goals identified across two literature reviews of degrowth policies[3,9]. These goals are intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive, and readers can consult the two reviews[3,9] for a comprehensive list of policies. We first grouped these policy goals into overarching themes (Table 1; Column 2) to emphasise the broader objectives of degrowth: economic justice and

social equity (policies 1, 2, 3, and 7), economic democracy and decentralized decision-making (policies 4, 5, and 9), sustainable living and working practices (policies 1 and 8), and inclusive housing and community management (policies 6 and 10).

For each policy goal, we then provided an example illustrating the relevance and importance of psychological and behavioural science (Table 1; Column 3). These examples are based on our interpretation of previous work, mostly recent systematic literature reviews[5,6,8,10,11,7,12–15]. Although these reviews are generally from fields outside psychology, such as ecological economics and public health, they underscore the critical role of psychological and behavioural factors in implementing and understanding degrowth objectives.

Finally, for each policy goal, we proposed potential research avenues, framed as research questions, that could advance it (Table 1, Column 4). These questions draw on the examples of psychological and behavioural relevance (Table 1; Column 3) and broader understanding and knowledge of the degrowth and psychology literatures. Some research avenues are relevant across most policies, particularly those exploring their impact on health and wellbeing. However, we also offer a rich palette of research questions that are specific to each policy and can help understand which psychological and behavioural factors and barriers can facilitate the support for, implementation of, and adjustment to the policies, and how the policies shape various psychological processes (e.g., decision-making, risk taking).

Our proposed research avenues are indicative rather than prescriptive. We expect to inspire researchers to advance degrowth policies in a way they find suitable. This may entail studying how to help implement key policy solutions not listed in the table, such as public finance mechanisms to achieve socially and ecologically necessary objectives or critical education initiatives that promote emancipatory learning and ecological consciousness.

Table 1

Building an integrated field of research

To build an integrated field of research on the psychology of degrowth means to produce findings that can be linked to each other, eventually developing a body of knowledge that can explain the psychology behind degrowth policy adoption and the impact of these policies on psychological functioning. Below we propose how this could be achieved via conceptual and theoretical integration as more psychological and behavioural scientists focus on degrowth.

Conceptual integration

Currently, two key issues in understanding human psychology behind degrowth are (1) the lack of formal research on this topic in the discipline, and (2) themes and even policies that are relevant to degrowth can be studied separately without referring to degrowth and its broader framework. For example, a researcher may focus on degrowth-related food consumption (e.g., local and plant-based diet[9]) without linking this research pursuit to the relevant degrowth policies. In this context, conceptual integration refers to clearly connecting published research relevant to degrowth to its policies and their associated research questions (Table 1) so that it becomes possible to map out psychological work on degrowth and to start building explanations and theories. For this purpose, researchers studying relevant themes should clearly state in their publications that their work contributes to degrowth and link it to the corresponding policies, such as those in Table 1 or others found in the literature[2,3,9].

Linking publications with degrowth fosters conceptual clarity and facilitates the integration of research findings into a cohesive body of knowledge. By explicitly associating work with degrowth, researchers contribute to advancing the field and ensure their insights are recognized as part of a

larger effort to address systemic sustainability challenges. However, this process may reveal heterogeneity in how researchers approach degrowth. For example, scholars in the Global North might focus on reducing overconsumption and promoting sufficiency, while those in the Global South could prioritize equitable resource distribution on a global scale and addressing basic human needs. Acknowledging and bridging these diverse perspectives enriches the dialogue and enhances the global applicability of degrowth principles.

Motivating researchers to link their publications with degrowth involves clarifying its relevance and making it more relatable. Degrowth might be viewed as abstract and system level, disconnected from individual psychology and behaviours. To address this, we have demystified degrowth by illustrating how it encompasses tangible policies—such as sufficiency, participatory budgeting, and community-led housing—that align closely with psychological research questions (Table 1). Additionally, emphasising the urgency of climate change and advocating for a non-Western-centric, transformation-oriented perspective can help researchers see degrowth not as an abstract ideal, but as a critical, actionable agenda to which they can contribute meaningfully.

Theoretical integration

Theoretical integration involves building theories that explain how human psychology influences and is influenced by various behaviours required, promoted, or affected by degrowth policies.

Box 1 outlines our proposed model for theoretical integration. The first and acritical step in applying this model is to identify a broad range of degrowth policy-related behaviours studied in the literature (Box 1; Element 1). The behaviours in Box 1 are adopted from Table 1 and serve as examples. To illustrate, behaviours associated with Policy Goal 8 (Sufficiency-oriented production and consumption and low-carbon provisioning systems, Table 1) include adopting consumption-related sufficiency and practicing self-limitation in daily life. Next, it is important to identify a comprehensive range of psychological influences that have been investigated in relation to these behaviours. In Box 1 (Element 2), we provide several examples of such influences that are based on Table 1. Boundary conditions (Box 1; Element 3) refer to factors that may determine whether psychological influences impact a behaviour. For example, motivation may shape how likely people are to adopt self-sufficiency and limitation in their lifestyles, provided that potential barriers to these behaviours are not too difficult to overcome and the required reduction in the consumption of goods and services is not too extreme. However, as these challenges increase, the relevance of motivation may diminish. The final aspect of Box 1 (Element 4) highlights the psychological consequences of adopting degrowth-related behaviours, such as effects on wellbeing or decision making.

Box 1

After the links between each behaviour and its psychological influences, consequences, and boundary conditions have been mapped out, it helps understand whether certain behaviours have shared influences and consequences, as well as the role of various boundary conditions. This allows for developing theories that can predict whether and under what circumstances people are likely to engage in behaviours advocated by degrowth policies, and how these behaviours may in turn impact psychological functioning of the individuals. It will also enable developing strategies that motivate people to adopt various degrowth-related behaviours. Overall, theoretical integration helps explain how to promote degrowth policy aims from the human side and anticipate their consequences for people's wellbeing, thinking, and behaviour.

Concluding remarks

In recent years, degrowth has emerged as a compelling paradigm for addressing the climate crisis, with research on the topic gaining momentum in ecological economics and related fields. While psychological and behavioural research on sustainability recognises the importance and interconnectedness of pressing social, economic, and environmental issues, degrowth is a crucial strategy that deserves greater recognition. The purpose of this call is to demystify degrowth by demonstrating that its policies are related to psychological and behavioural dimensions where experts in these fields can make meaningful contributions. By providing clear avenues for this research, we hope to help psychological and behavioural scientists investigate and inform evidence-based climate policy from the perspective of degrowth, leading to cumulative knowledge about transformative social change and climate justice.

Table 1: Overview of the main degrowth policy goals (adapted from reviews by Fitzpatrick et al.[9] and Kallis et al.[3]), their themes, preliminary research that indicates psychological and behavioural relevance to these goals, and future research avenues that psychological and behavioural scientists could pursue to contribute to the degrowth framework.

	Degrowth policy goal [a]	Policy goal themes [b]	Example of psychological and behavioural relevance to the policy goal	Future research avenues
1.	Reducing working time, and sharing necessary work more evenly[3,9].	Sustainable living and working practices. Economic justice and social equity.	Studies of working time reductions (WTR) show positive effects on wellbeing (e.g., lower emotional exhaustion) and health (e.g., minimized risk of burnout, improved sleep quality), and on work-family conflict (e.g., more adequate time for social activities, friends and family)[10]. WTR can be used to prevent involuntary unemployment in a degrowth scenario, or in any scenario where total labour requirements decline.	- What are the effects (short and long term) of reduced working hours on physical and mental health? - Are these effects dependent on individual differences such as personality traits and values? - What is the most optimal distribution of working time across working days (e.g., 30 hours in 5 days vs. fewer days) for work-related meaning and overall life satisfaction? - What are psychological and behavioural changes that people may experience due to working less? - How can people be assisted in adjusting their lifestyles to working less? - How does working less influence interpersonal relationships? - What psychological factors contribute to a more equitable distribution of paid and unpaid work (e.g., childcare) between men and women?
2.	Redistributing wealth and resources (e.g., income, land, housing, healthcare, education) to reduce inequalities,	Economic justice and social equity.	Equitable distribution of resources is necessary to ensure good social outcomes with less total resource use. The objective is to address environmental, social and economic (including income) inequalities in	- What are the psychological and behavioural underpinnings that are shared across the several forms of climate justice actions that can exist, ranging from activism involving non-violent direct action (e.g., protests, marches, sit-ins, lock-ins, street theatre), to community-based outreach

	within and between countries[3,9].		terms of systemic intersectional, intergenerational, and international dimensions. The literature on climate justice emphasises the psychological and behavioural changes needed to address the unequal impacts of climate change on people in a fair and equitable way. Climate justice actions are characterised by a shift from an individual ("What can I and other people do to address climate change?") to a more collective ("How can I support and work towards climate justice?") perspective on climate change decision-making and action[8].	programmes and interventions (e.g., deliberative planning processes), to active climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts (e.g., mangrove restoration projects)? - Are these underpinnings common to the different kinds of actors, at different stages of their lives (whether children, young people, adults or elders), and in various contexts (e.g., corporations or universities)? - Which psychological and behavioural mechanisms (e.g., emotions, efficacy, moral beliefs and values, activist identity or worldviews and ideologies) can reinforce a shift from individual to collective climate justice actions? - What value frames can help reinforce intersectional and intergenerational solidarities with underrepresented groups and communities exposed to climate disruption? - How do micro (i.e. cognitive, affective and behavioural) to macro (i.e. political) effects interact and influence climate justice actions?
3.	Guaranteeing universal access to basic needs[3,9].	Economic justice and social equity.	Universal basic income (UBI; i.e., regular, unconditional cash payments to all citizens) is an example of universal provision of fundamental human needs along with universal basic services (UBS; i.e., free access to essential services like healthcare, education, and housing) and public job guarantee (JG; i.e., government-provided employment for anyone willing to	- Does receiving UBI, UBS, or a JG influence people to develop long-term planning rather than focusing on short-term goals? - What are the effects of UBI, UBS, or a JG on recipients' sense of financial security and stability, and how does it impact their spending and saving habits? - Do UBI, UBS, or a JG allow individuals to focus more on activities and pursuits that are in line with their values and beliefs?

			work). Findings suggest that basic income programs can have a positive influence on physical health (e.g., physical activity, improved diet), mental health (e.g., reductions in mental strain), and social relations (e.g., more time with family, friends, and community members) as well as psychological wellbeing[11].	- How do UBI, UBS, or a JG affect recipients' decision-making processes regarding career choices, educational pursuits, risk-taking, and various other relevant topics? - What are the effects (short and long-term) of UBI, UBS, or a JG on recipients' general well-being and mental health? - How does UBI affect various relevant recipients' attitudes and perceptions (e.g., toward social fairness, justice, work, and leisure activities)? - What are the psychological factors that influence recipients' decisions to invest in skills training and educational opportunities?
4.	Democratising decision-making[3,9].	Economic democracy and decentralized decision-making.	Analyses of "Citizens' Assemblies" (CAs; i.e., a new form of deliberative democracy involving collective decision-making) recommendations in several (European) countries show that CAs tend to propose and endorse sufficiency and regulatory climate policies in areas such as mobility, agriculture and nutrition, or production and consumption, which are approved by large majorities and focus on structural changes at the system level rather than targeting individuals only (e.g. through information campaigns)[7].	- What psychological factors (e.g. values, world views, beliefs) could complement socio-demographic dimensions (e.g. age, income, education, social class) to ensure representativeness in CAs? - Which psychological factors (e.g., values, moral worldviews, social identity, perceived fairness) shape public engagement and trust in CAs? - Which psychological interventions could minimize the influence of expert advisers, facilitators, or other steering bodies on collective discussions and decisions while preserving citizens' agency, creativity, and freedom of choice, thus ensuring democratic, inclusive, and unbiased decision-making? - Which psychological and behavioural techniques are most effective in improving public perceptions and the perceived legitimacy of CAs while reducing potential distrust in their representativeness, and

				which communication channels (e.g., public broadcasting for transparency) are most effective for delivering these interventions? - Which decision-making tools (e.g., cognitive tools, decision aids) could enhance the capacity of CAs to make effective decisions and recommendations? - Which existing psychological interventions could be applied or new interventions developed to encourage systemic change rather than focusing solely on individual behavioural change?
5.	Decentralising decision-making[9].	Economic democracy and decentralized decision-making.	One of the most common examples of decentralising decision-making which could lead to bottom-up social change is participatory budgeting (i.e., community members directly and collectively deciding how to allocate part of a public budget). Studies around the world tend to show that participatory budgeting promotes community development by contributing to a stronger civil society, greater accountability and improved well-being in many areas such as health, education, sanitation, transport and poverty reduction[6].	- What decision-making processes are common to inclusive and successful participatory budgeting? - What is the influence of cross-cultural differences on these decision-making processes? - Do decision-making processes need to be adapted in individualistic societies to encourage participation and avoid disengagement or free-riding? - What solutions might prevent participatory budgeting techniques from reproducing inequalities in terms of class, race/ethnicity and gender? - What collective decision-making processes could promote consensus in participatory budgeting?
6.	Promoting social and community-led housing[9].	Inclusive housing and community management.	Empirical evidence indicates that community-led housing, which encompasses various non-profit models of housing delivery, such as housing cooperatives, co-housing, and self-help housing, has a positive	- What are the short- and long-term effects of different forms of community-led housing, such as cohousing, on primary health outcomes such as healthy eating, physical activity and well-being? - To what extent are these effects subject to physical, social, economic, and environmental

			impact on health outcomes (e.g., physical activity, healthy eating) and wellbeing, as well as on neighbourhood-level factors that affect health (social contact, employment, safety, environmental sustainability, and affordability). Community-led housing may also assist in addressing a number of health issues among vulnerable populations, including refugees, homeless individuals, the elderly, and those with disabilities[5].	factors (e.g., accessibility, affordability, safety, environmental sustainability)? - What solutions could help overcome tensions and feelings of lack of privacy among housemates? - What rules and decision-making processes can facilitate the sharing of tasks and responsibilities? - What are the effects of different cultures (e.g., individualistic vs. holistic), contexts (e.g., COVID closure) or age differences between members on cohousing? - How does cohousing between younger and older generations contribute to health benefits? - Can cohousing promote individual autonomy and a sense of community?
7.	Supporting pro-social investment and exchange systems like public finance, local currencies and credit networks[9].	Economic justice and social equity.	Public finance can ensure sufficient investment in necessary objectives such as universal public services and renewable energy, regardless of profitability. At the community level, time banks may have a positive influence on mental health and well-being. Such initiatives are associated with a number of benefits, including reduced loneliness, strengthened friendships and wider relationships, as well as impacts on individuals' sense of purpose and awareness of their own abilities[12].	- What are the psychological underpinnings and sources of motivation that can lead people to become active and contributing members of time banks and more broadly community exchange systems, and thus ensure the critical mass necessary for the adoption of such systems? - Could the adoption of such exchange systems foster social inclusivity by benefitting demographic groups that may be vulnerable, marginalised or underprivileged, such as low-income earners or young adults? - What are the most common social and psychological barriers to the adoption of community exchange systems? - What positive psychological effects (e.g., reduced loneliness, strengthened friendships and other relationships, etc.) would participation in

				community exchange systems have on its members? - Which psychological changes are associated with long-term participation in community exchange systems?
8.	Sufficiency-oriented production and consumption, and low-carbon provisioning systems[3,9].	Sustainable living and working practices.	Sufficiency in production and consumption is essential to the creation of sustainable economies. The psychological and behavioural aspects of sufficiency have mainly been documented in terms of changes of (non-materialistic) values and norms towards less and more moderate individual consumption and lifestyle that foster well-being and satisfy needs[13].	- Which psychological factors, including attitudes, values, norms, and others, shape the support for sufficiency and self-limitation on both sides of the economic system, including the consumers and producers? - Are there common psychological barriers to sufficiency-oriented practices that are shared at the institutional and individual levels? - Which psychological interventions could encourage people to practice sufficiency, both in terms of consumption (e.g., energy, clothing, meat) and beyond (e.g., personal relationships, spiritual practices). - Should psychological interventions that encourage organisations to practice sufficiency in their economic activity be different in for-profit and non-profit sectors? - Which values should be shared to improve communication between individuals and institutions to facilitate societal adoption of sufficiency practices? - How does practicing sufficiency in individual decisions and lifestyles affect wellbeing, personal relationships, and overall psychological functioning?

9.	Relocalising production where feasible[9].	Economic democracy and decentralized decision-making.	Democratic local food systems are alternative food networks that contribute to reducing the distance between food consumers and producers by connecting local producers with local markets (e.g., restaurants, schools, and supermarkets) and by engaging citizens, communities, and food system actors at large through active participation in the governance and design of the food network. Evidence shows that these sustainable food systems help achieve health and well-being goals (e.g., reducing food poverty, promoting food justice and education, improving diets, nutrition and healthy eating, reducing food waste)[14].	- What is the role of psychological and behavioural underpinnings in participation in local food systems (e.g. trust, collective agency, shared economic, social and environmental values) beyond the influence of demographics (e.g. income, gender, education)? - How can collaboration, knowledge sharing and active participation of individuals as food citizens be sustained in democratic local food networks? - How to best convey information that should be considered to keep food citizens knowledgeable about food production and distribution processes in terms of food origins and health and nutritional considerations? - What decision-making processes can sustain meaningful forms of participation and deliberation and facilitate advocacy for changes in food preferences in the local food system? - How should decision-making processes be tailored to the specific characteristics of democratic local food networks?
10.	Protecting and equitably sharing natural resources for collective wellbeing[3,9].	Inclusive housing and community management.	Environmental stewardship is linked to the policy goal of defending and reclaiming the commons by promoting the responsible management and protection of shared natural resources, to ensure their conservation and sustainable use for the well-being and health of all community members and future generations. Empirical evidence shows the importance of	- How do psychological factors, including identity, values, norms, beliefs, emotional attachment to place, and sense of belonging shape participation in environmental stewardship across urban and rural contexts? - What are in turn the effects of participation in environmental stewardship on psychological wellbeing and personal relationships? - What behaviour change tools and interventions, aside from agri-environmental incentive schemes, can effectively mobilize stewardship actions?

		environmental stewardship actions to protect, conserve, restore or sustainably use the natural environment, in privately-owned and public lands as well as in urban areas[15].	- How can cultural psychology help to effectively integrate cross-cultural collaboration with local and indigenous populations into public natural resource management, thereby shifting away from Western-centred perspectives? - Are the main barriers that prevent people from engaging in actions to defend and reclaim the commons psychological or beyond the realm of psychology (e.g., economic incentives, private property rights)?

[a] For each policy goal, it is indicated in which of the two review articles[3,9] it can be found. The policy goals in our table are the ones for which we could identify relevant examples of psychological and behavioural relevance and translate them into avenues suitable for psychological and behavioural research. Therefore, although our comment covers the majority of key policy goals identified across the two review articles, some policy goals that do not easily lend themselves to psychological and behavioural research are not included in our table (e.g., state creating money to support social and environmental initiatives[3] or prioritising small, highly self-sufficient communities[9]).

[b] Some policy goals are thematically broad and are therefore linked to more than one theme (for example, Degrowth policy goal 1).

Box 1: Model for theoretical integration of psychological and behavioural literature on degrowth

Element 1—Behaviour

Adopting sufficiency and (collective) self-limitation; Becoming an active and contributing member of time banks and community exchange systems; Collaboration; Engaging in climate justice actions (e.g., protests, marches, sit-ins); Engaging in community-led housing; Engaging in community practices; Engaging in environmental stewardship actions; Engaging in participatory budgeting and other forms of decentralized decision making; Equal distribution of work; Knowledge sharing; Organising and encouraging participation in Citizens' Assemblies (CAs) to inform policymaking with their recommendations; Participating in local food systems; Universal Basic Income (UBI) expenditure; Working less.

Element 2—Psychological Influences on Behaviour

Attitudes; Beliefs; Collective efficacy; Decision making; Emotion and feelings; Identity; Motivation; Norms; Perceptions; Self-efficacy; Social identity; Traits; Trust; Values; Worldviews and ideologies.

Element 3—Boundary Conditions That Determine the Psychological Influences

Micro (e.g., individual level factors): Barriers to the adoption of behaviour; Behavioural demands and characteristics (e.g., how much a person needs to limit the consumption of goods and services); Demographic characteristics.

Meso (e.g., factors pertaining to groups and organisations): Collective actions and community-led initiatives; Organisational and institutional decision-making processes; Social and economic networks.

Macro (e.g., broader societal or systemic factors): Culture (e.g., individualist vs. collectivist); Political factors; Wider economic factors.

Element 4—Psychological Consequences of Behaviour

Decision making; Experienced lack of privacy; Perceived financial security and stability; Interpersonal relationship quality; Leisure time use; Physical and mental health and wellbeing; Planning (e.g., long vs. short term); Psychological adjustment strategies; Reduced loneliness; Risk taking; Sense of agency and freedom of choice; Sense of autonomy; Sense of belonging; Sense of community.

Model Clarification

The model proposes first mapping out degrowth policy-related behaviours studied in the literature, followed by their psychological influences and boundary conditions, which refer to different contextual factors that may determine whether the psychological influences would shape a behaviour or not. For example, people's attitudes toward (that is, support for) participating in local food systems may shape how likely they are to engage in this behaviour if potential barriers to participation are not too difficult to overcome, and if wider economic factors allow it. However, as these challenges increase, more positive attitudes may not boost participation. The model also involves mapping out potential psychological consequences of different behaviours (please note that we do not categorize the consequences as positive or negative, as these distinctions can be subjective and open to interpretation in some cases). Identifying these elements, and investigating and documenting their links, can provide valuable insights into how psychological influences shape behaviours, under what circumstances they do so, and what psychological consequences may result from these behaviours, ultimately contributing to a deep theoretical and practical understanding of degrowth implementation. Please note that, in this box, we do not provide an exhaustive list of behaviours, psychological influences, boundary conditions, and consequences—they are examples taken from Table 1.

Author contributions

D.K. and F.B. were responsible for conceptualization and visualization. D.K., F.B., D.O., J.H., and G.K. were all involved in the original draft, provided comments, and addressed revisions.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Display Image

https://www.alamy.com/stock-photo-banksy-british-graffiti-artist-waterloo-london-uk-europe-17627297.html?imageid=6B9E1BF6-4A3E-48DD-AB80-CCBA8A1CF203&p=47085&pn=1&searchId=02a3c53c504ae49cc795d7078d9cad24&searchtype=0

References

1. Lee, H. *et al. Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report* (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2023).
2. Hickel, J. *et al. Nature* **612**, 400–403 (2022).
3. Kallis, G. *et al. Lancet Planet. Health* **9**, e62–e78 (2025).
4. Krpan, D. & Basso, F. *J. Environ. Psychol.* **74**, 101586 (2021).
5. McClatchey, R., McClymont, K., Griffin, E. & Carmichael, L. *Int. J. Hous. Policy* **25**, 18-55 (2025).
6. Touchton, M., McNulty, S. & Wampler, B. *Am. Behav. Sci.* **67**, 520–536 (2023).
7. Lage, J. *et al. Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* **104**, 103254 (2023).
8. Trott, C.D. *et al. Local Environ.* **28**, 1131–1152 (2023).
9. Fitzpatrick, N., Parrique, T. & Cosme, I. *J. Clean. Prod.* **365**, 132764 (2022).
10. Hanbury, H. *et al. Sustain. Sci. Pract. Policy* **19**, 2222595 (2023).
11. McKay, F.H., Bennett, R. & Dunn, M. *Health Promot. Int.* **38**, daad119 (2023).
12. Lee, C., Burgess, G., Kuhn, I., Cowan, A. & Lafortune, L. *Public Health* **180**, 117–128 (2020).
13. Jungell-Michelsson, J. & Heikkurinen, P. *Ecol. Econ.* **195**, 107380 (2022).
14. Borsellino, V., Ascani, M., Martino, G. & Schimmenti, E. *Local Dev. Soc.* **5**, 268-297 (2024).
15. McLeod, L.J. *et al. PLOS ONE* **19**, e0284255 (2024).