

# *Subtle activation of sustainability values to enhance sustainable choice*

## **Final Report (wp088)**

This report is public and can be freely accessed and used

### **Starting date – End date**

01.05.2008 – 31.12.2010

### **People on the project**

Marijn H. C. Meijers, [m.h.c.meijers@uvt.nl](mailto:m.h.c.meijers@uvt.nl)

### **Supervised by:**

Diederik A. Stapel, [d.a.stapel@uvt.nl](mailto:d.a.stapel@uvt.nl)

Theo M. M. Verhallen, [theo.m.m.verhallen@uvt.nl](mailto:theo.m.m.verhallen@uvt.nl)



## **Aim of the Research**

Sustainable development is a hot topic at the moment. Perhaps the most iconographic metaphor for this renewed interest in sustainability in general and successful sustainable marketing techniques in particular is the worldwide success of Al Gore's Oscar-winning and Nobel-prize winning "The inconvenient truth." The planet is hurting and we, the people, need to do something --and fast!-- if we still want to profit from our planet.

This renewed interest in the marketing of sustainability has not gone unnoticed in the commercial marketing world. When one googles "sustainable marketing" or related terminology, one finds literally hundreds of experts, guru's, companies, advisors, and institutes that can help firms to make profit by repackaging their products and services as environment-friendly, ecological, biological, or sustainable. Sustainability is business. At least that is the idea. The idea is that "green sells" because it communicates "doing good" for our planet.

Notwithstanding the notion that many marketing firms have discovered the magic lure of "sustainability", the real inconvenient truth is that green marketing strategies are very seldom successful and that green product and services are still unable to obtain significant market shares. Of course, there are exceptions (Toyota's Prius, green energy), but the general conclusion is that even though most people probably have a positive attitude towards sustainability, they do not act that way (Cornelissen, Pandelaere, Warlop, & Dewitte, 2008; De Pelsmacker, Driesen, & Rayp, 2005; De Pelsmacker, Janssens, Sterckx, & Mielants, 2006; Pieters, Bijmolt, van Raaij, & de Kruijk, 1998).

Until now, the dominant existing marketing approaches to stimulating sustainable consumer demand focus on rational and explicit communication techniques (e.g. education extension approaches). The basic underlying assumption seems to rely on the knowledge deficit model, namely that "once consumers know the importance, they will take sustainability values to the point of purchases and act on them". However, in practice this appears not to be the case. Knowledge is not enough. Availability of sustainable attitudes and values is not what drives behavior. What drives behavior is the cognitive accessibility of these attitudes and values. Only when sustainability is on

people's minds at the moment of making consumer decisions, will it influence this decision. The present project takes an innovative approach in that it suggests that through more subtle priming of the central values at the moment of choice, consumers will give sustainability considerations more weight and hence act / choose in a more sustainable manner. Hence, we will explore the extent to which the subtle priming techniques may close the gap between what consumers say (attitude and intention) and do (behavior).

In addition, we will take a look at the demographic characteristics of consumers that already buy sustainable (food) items, so we can say something about who already buys 'green.' We will, also, take a closer look at what products have marketed sustainability successfully versus products that have not been so successful. In this way, we may draw some conclusions on what makes a sustainable product successful.

### **Summary of Findings**

To answer our research questions, we set up a number of subprojects. The aims and findings of each of the subprojects will be discussed in more detail below.

## **Subproject 1: Dutch Consumers (in collaboration with Ynte K. van Dam)**

Meijers, M. H. C., Stapel, D. A., & van Dam, Y. K. (in preparation). Who buys what? Sustainable food consumption in the Netherlands.

We had access to food purchasing data of about 4000 households in the Netherlands. These 4000 households scanned the food and drinks they bought with a scanning device at home. With this information we knew what products they bought (e.g., cheese, soda, fish) and whether the product was certified sustainable (e.g., organic, fair trade) or not. We had also access to the socio-demographic characteristics of these households (e.g., age, income, education), such that we could investigate what characterizes the households that buy organic food. Furthermore, we looked at what the most successful organic products of each category were. We will analyze these products across categories and look at what specific characteristics they share, such that we can say something about what makes a sustainable food item successful.

### ***Who buys what?***

Specifically, we answered two questions. First, we want to investigate what percentage of the households bought at least one sustainable product during the twelve week period of our data collection. Second, we want to investigate *who* buys these sustainable products. What is, thus, the profile of the Dutch sustainable food consumer?

Our results show that 17.5% of the Dutch consumers bought at least one sustainable product during our data collection period of twelve weeks. In other words, 82.5% of the Dutch consumers did not even buy one sustainable food item during this period. Next, we wanted to see which demographic characteristics can best predict whether people will buy a sustainable product or not. We found that higher educated people in cities or more populated areas are more likely to buy at least one sustainable product.

Next, we investigated what percentage of the total consumption was sustainable. The data shows that in our sample, only 1.63% of the total consumption was sustainable. We then decided to only look at the households that at least bought 0.01% sustainable products. We find that in 50% of these households 1% (or less) of the total consumption is sustainable. Interestingly, there are some households in which 15% (or more) of the

total food consumption is sustainable; however, this is only 3% of the households. It thus seems to be the case that very few households buy sustainable products regularly. We next tested which demographic characteristics can best predict how many sustainable products people buy. We found that especially younger people with an age between 20 and 29 buy more sustainable products. This seems consistent with the idea that buying sustainable products is trendy, as especially younger people are susceptible to trends (Roberts, Henriksen, & Foehr, 2004).

In sum, we can conclude that whether people buy a sustainable product or not, is best predicted by the education of people and the area they live in. How many sustainable products people buy (on the condition that they bought at least one sustainable product), is best predicted by their age.

### ***What makes a sustainable product successful?***

To have a look at what distinguishes a successful sustainable product from a non-successful sustainable product, we additionally analyzed what specific products consumers had been buying over a period of time. In different product categories we looked at what percentage of all the products being bought were sustainable and what specific product is the most successful within a category. Across categories, we investigated in what way the most successful products are related; are there specific characteristics that make one sustainable product more successful than the other?

The most salient finding is that in most product categories the share of sustainable products is only between 0.3%-2.6%. Notable exceptions are coffee and tea (11.8%), meat substitutes (14.6%), and fish (14,3%). One could argue that people who buy meat substitutes are –almost by default- more sustainability conscious consumers. Therefore, it could be that this is not the best category for drawing conclusions that may be generalized. Interesting to mention though, is that the top four products in this category are almost all from the same brand (Alpro) and a good quality generic brand (Albert Heijn); these are "low-profile" products that are easily found in most of the Dutch supermarkets. When we look at the most successful products in the coffee and tea, and fish category, they share one very salient characteristic: these are not "prototypical" sustainable products. The top three most successful products in the fish category consist of Captain Iglo fish sticks and two fish products from the ALDI supermarket. These are the kind of products that people generally do not buy because

they are so sustainable, but because these are products they like (for various reasons) and that happen to be sustainable. We see the same pattern in the coffee and tea category. The top three consists of three kinds of coffee from the Albert Heijn supermarket. These are all coffee's that are UTZ certified, but not coffee's that people buy because they are sustainable, but rather because they have a good quality/price ratio.

A, very preliminary, conclusion that we might conclude from this is, that the most successful sustainable products are those that are basically good products and that are in *addition* sustainable. Sustainability (e.g., organic or fair trade) does not seem to be a reason to buy a product, but rather an incidental plus. A good way to market sustainable products may thus be by stressing the other, primary, positive characteristics of the product (good taste etc.) and marketing the sustainability feature as a surplus. At the moment, sustainable products are often marketed as sustainable (and as a surplus other positive characteristics like taste), our findings seem to suggest that this might not be the best way. Advertising sustainability as a surplus -that is an added advantage over the non-sustainable product qualities that are stressed – might be a better option.

## **Subproject 2: Me tomorrow, the others later**

Meijers, M. H. C., & Stapel, D. A. (in press). Me tomorrow, the others later: How perspective fit increases sustainable behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.06.002.

In the second subproject we looked at the time perspectives people take. Sustainable development seems to be logically linked to a focus on the future. Sustainability acts, like saving energy, are especially worth doing because of their effects in the future. Thus, the general idea is that if people focus their attention on the future, they should behave more sustainable (Joireman et al., 2004). However, we think this is not always the case. A future focus will not always activate sustainability behavior. We think that not only time perspectives matter, but also person perspectives. Or better said, the combination of the two. We hypothesized that a long term future focus will only make people more sustainable when they do so in terms of the "society" or "people in general". When consumers are not focused on society as a whole but mainly on

themselves (“me”), then a short term future is likely to be more effective (in other words, they are a better *fit*). After all, to be able to make (sustainable) things happen in the long run, you need a lot of people (you cannot change society on your own), whereas making a change tomorrow is mainly possible when you focus on yourself (you cannot quickly change the behaviors of others). We posited that if people take a society perspective, in combination with a long term future perspective, they will have a “yes we can” feeling: ‘If we all work together, and we have enough time, we are able to accomplish a lot of things.’ Conversely, taking a ‘me’ perspective in combination with a short term future perspective will also lead to heightened feeling of efficacy and accordingly to more sustainable attitudes and behavior. After all, if you are taking a short term future perspective (tomorrow), thinking of what you can accomplish is more effective than thinking of what society could do, as you cannot change society within a day.

In two studies we have shown the validity of this line of argument. When people think of themselves and tomorrow, this creates a *fit*. This feeling of fit, gives people the feeling they can accomplish something and as such, they are more likely to behave sustainably. People, for example, were more likely to pick organic chocolate when they thought in terms that *fit* (i.e., me, later or others, tomorrow) than when there was not such a *fit* (i.e., me, later or others, tomorrow).

In sum, to instigate sustainable behavior, communication about sustainability might be best done in perspectives that *fit* with one another (i.e., me, tomorrow or others, later). These fitting perspectives will be more successful in instigating sustainable behavior because people will then have the feeling they can actually do something, and as such start behaving sustainably. This will be more effective than communicating in perspectives that do not fit (i.e., me, later or others, tomorrow), as these perspectives will not elicit these feelings of “I can do this”, and as such people will be more reluctant to behave sustainably.

### **Subproject 3: When nature becomes a product**

Meijers, M. H. C., & Stapel, D. A. (under review). Putting a price tag on nature: The effects of contextual cues on sustainable behavior.

Previous research has shown that although most people find sustainability issues important, they do not always behave accordingly (Knussen & Yule, 2008). In this subproject we looked at factors that may inhibit sustainable behavior; that make it difficult to make sustainable choices. Specifically, we looked at the role that our commercialized society plays in this. On an everyday basis people are exposed to economic cues that signal the importance of consumption and economy. When walking in the city center, people are exposed to many signs that advertise products that are on sale. Similarly, when one wants to buy an apple, one does not simply pick an apple from a tree, but buys apples that are packaged and priced in the supermarket. In this project we looked at the psychological effects of when nature (e.g., an apple) becomes an economic product.

There are certain values that are –almost by default- linked to economy. Previous studies have shown that exposure to “economy,” for example as one is studying economics, makes people more self-centered and egoistic, but also more competitive and materialistic (Frank, Gilovich, & Regan, 1993; Kay, Wheeler, Bargh, & Ross, 2004; Miller, 1999). We hypothesize that even something as subtle as product packaging can elicit these values. Because cues, like price tags, are associated with economy they will elicit economic values. In other words, we expect that people become more self-centered, egoistic, competitive and materialistic when they see a product packaged apple; they will have a more economic mindset. As sustainability is about making choices that are beneficial for others and for nature, making sustainable choices will be impeded when people have an economic mindset that focuses on “me” and “my social status.”

However, when an apple is depicted as a part of nature rather than an economic product, this apple will induce more nature-related values. Several scholars have argued that nature makes people less self-interested and less egocentric. In addition, they have suggested that materialism decreases when exposed to nature (De Botton, 2004; Keltner & Haidt, 2003). Previous research has also shown that after having experienced nature, for example walking through the woods, people are more likely to make sustainable choices (Stewart & Craig, 2001). Taken together, this seems to suggest that when an apple is seen as part of nature, people are more likely to have a nature mindset in which they attach more importance to others, the environment and nature --and less to

materialism and competitive. We hypothesize that this focus on others and the environment, rather than on the self, leads to making more sustainable choices.

In sum, we expected (and importantly, also found in three studies) that even very subtle, contextual cues (like a price tag on an apple) that signal the importance of economy increase the importance that people attach to the self, materialism and competitiveness and as such impede sustainable behavior. In contrast, very subtle contextual cues (like trees surrounding an apple) that signal the importance of nature, increase a focus on others and the environment, and such instigate sustainable behavior. To increase sustainable consumption, natural products should thus not be positioned as an economic product, but rather as a part of nature. By stressing that milk comes from cows that grazed in pastures and that apples once hung on trees, these products will be seen as a piece of nature, rather than a piece of the economic world. Seeing these entities as a piece of nature will, in turn, prime concern for it and as such make sustainable choices more likely.

#### **Subproject 4: Motivation, licensing effects and carry-on effects (in collaboration with Marret K. Noordewier)**

Meijers, M. H. C., Stapel, D. A., & Noordewier, M. K. (in preparation). When people take long showers after separating waste: The impact of motivation on the licensing effect.

Most people know the feeling that if they did something 'good', they allow themselves to behave a little 'bad' subsequently. Imagine a person who just switched to a green energy supplier and feels that now it is ok to take an extra long hot shower, because of having done something sustainably already. This effect is known as the licensing effect (Monin & Miller, 2001; Dhar & Khan, 2006). On the other hand one may imagine that after doing something good, people want to keep up this good behavior. Imagine a person who just switched to a green energy supplier, feels like a sustainable person, and wants to maintain his or her sustainable behavior. As a result, this person will be more likely to take a shorter shower. This effect is known as the carry-on effect (Stapel, 2010).

An important question is: when will there be licensing effects after performing a sustainable act, and when will there be carry-on effects? We argue that it depends on

whether people feel they *should* behave sustainably or they *want* to behave sustainably. In life there are, in general, things that one feels one *should* do, for example, because it is better for one's health or the environment. And there are things in life that one wants to do, for example, because this person enjoys doing it. We argue that when people see behaving sustainably as something they *should* do and they perform one sustainable act, they are more likely to feel "I have done enough" and as such stop behaving sustainably. In fact, we argue that because they feel 'good' about themselves after this sustainable deed they even allow themselves to behave a little 'badly', that is, *unsustainably*. People who really want to behave sustainably, however, are less likely to feel they have done enough after a sustainable act and as such continue behaving sustainably. They are more likely to see sustainable behavior as something they like doing and as such continue doing so.

In two studies we found support for these hypotheses. We found that people who see themselves as a person who likes to behave sustainably were more likely to show carry-on effects. People who feel they should behave sustainably, however, were more likely to show licensing-effects. We show that this is the case because after this 'good' sustainable act, "*should*" people feel 'saint-like' people who do good deeds, and as such allow themselves to behave like normal human beings again, that is, *unsustainably*. Interestingly, we show that we can also 'prime' whether people see themselves as a sustainable person (as a person who identifies with sustainable behavior and who *wants* to behave sustainably) or as a person who *should* behave sustainably (because of external demands). Practically this means that in communication towards citizens and consumers, one should frame sustainable behavior as a thing that people in general *want* to do, and enjoy doing. If people then start seeing themselves as sustainable persons, they are more likely to show 'sustainable' sustainable behavior.

### **Subproject 5: Goals and mindsets (in collaboration with Marret K. Noordewier)**

Meijers, M. H. C., Stapel, D. A., & Noordewier, M. K. (in preparation). How green goals lead to grey behavior: The effects of goals and mindsets on sustainable behavior.

In general, goals are seen as an effective way to induce sustainable behavior (Abrahamse, Steg, Vlek, & Rothengatter, 2007; McCalley & Midden, 2002). The idea is

that when one sets the goal to behave sustainably, one will behave more sustainably than when one did not set this goal. However, an important question is what happens after this goal to behave sustainably gets fulfilled. Goal theory findings show that once a goal is fulfilled, the goal deactivates (Förster, Liberman, & Friedman, 2007). The researchers found that when participants were looking for glasses, the concept “glasses” was highly accessible. However, once the participants found the glasses, the concept became inhibited. Translated sustainability, this inhibition-effect suggests that although setting a sustainability goal may have an immediate beneficial effect, this effect is unlikely to last. Once people engage in one sustainable act, and thus fulfill their goal, cognitive salience of the goal moves to the background and people stop behaving in a goal congruent manner. Therefore, we argue that to induce *repetitive* sustainable behavior, it is better to induce a sustainability *mindset*, rather than a sustainability *goal*.

Whereas a goal is a motivational construct that revolves around an endpoint (“I want to achieve sustainable behavior”), a mindset is a non-motivational construct with no desired endpoint (“behave sustainably”). A mindset is ‘simply’ a way of perceiving and processing the world, which in turn influences behavior only because a certain mindset is on top of one’s mind. A sustainability mindset will, because of this, not deactivate after performing a sustainable act – there is nothing to be achieved, thus nothing to be attained, thus nothing will be inhibited upon ‘fulfillment.’

In two studies we show that when people have a sustainability goal, this has initially beneficial effects on sustainable behavior. However, once people showed sustainable behavior, their goal to behave sustainably gets deactivated and people stop behaving sustainably. In fact, ‘*goal*’ people whose goal has been fulfilled, behave even less sustainably than people who were not primed with sustainability in the first place. Having a goal to behave sustainably might, thus, initially lead to more sustainable behavior. However, once people performed a sustainable act and fulfilled their goal, they stop behaving sustainably and even start behaving a little unsustainably. In contrast, people who have a sustainability mindset not only initially showed more sustainable behavior, but continued to behave sustainably, regardless of whether they already behaved sustainably or not. For people with a sustainability mindset it thus not seems to matter whether they behaved sustainably or not; they continue behaving sustainably, more so than people who fulfilled their sustainability goals and more so than people who have not been primed with sustainability in the first place.

In sum, our research shows that although a sustainability goal may be effective at first this beneficial effect is unlikely to last. In order to induce *repetitive* sustainable behavior, a sustainability mindset will be the better choice.

### **Subproject 6: Chaos (in collaboration with Bastiaan T. Rutjens)**

Meijers, M. H. C., & Rutjens B.T. (in preparation). Faulty science increases sustainability: How perception of chaos leads to sustainable behavior.

People like to believe in an ordered, structured, meaningful, just world (Jost, 1994; Kay et al., 2008; Noordewier & Stapel, 2009; Proulx & Heine, 2006; Stapel & Noordewier, 2009; 2010). When this idea of an ordered world gets threatened, people want to act so to make this feeling go away and see the world as ordered again (Kay et al., 2008). There are different ways that feeling of order can be restored, one of these ways is by feeling that things are under control (Kay et al, 2008; 2010). Things can feel under control in two different ways: either because you, as a person, are in control, or because a secondary actor or agent exerts control over things. This secondary source of control can be all kinds of things, for example God, the government, but also the idea that science is progressing and as such promises future order and structure (Kay et al., 2008; Rutjens, Van der Pligt, & Van Harreveld, 2009). This, however, also means that when a secondary actor has things under control, there is no need for you (as a person) to act and take control. When everything is under control feelings of order reign, and there is therefore no need to act (see also Kay, Whitson, Gaucher, & Galinsky, 2009; Rutjens, Van Harreveld, & Van der Pligt, 2009).

Science is often portrayed as the savior of our climate change problems; electric cars are getting more efficient, science has the knowledge to construct floating cities, and scientists can even put CO<sub>2</sub> in the ground so to “counter” climate change. Or, at least so it seems. Our research question was whether this idea that science might solve everything leads people to behave less sustainably. The idea that science can solve everything may lead to the illusion that everything is under control, that there is order. And since there is order, there is nothing that we (as ‘normal’ people) need to do; everything is fine. In sum, when people believe very strongly in the progress of science,

they may believe that science will take care of the climate change problems. As such, there is no need for them to act and, as a result, they will not start behaving sustainably. In contrast, when they believe that science does not progress that fast (and infer from this that science may not be able to solve the climate problems, they may feel the urge to do something; to take control. Because of this, they will start behaving sustainably so to restore the feeling that things are under control.

We tested this idea in three studies that supported our hypotheses. We found that when people have a strong belief in scientific progress, they are less likely to behave sustainably. In addition, we show that this is the case because they perceive a sense of order when science is in control. In contrast, we found that when people entertain only a mild belief in the progress of science, they are more likely to behave sustainably. We show that this is the case because they perceive a sense of disorder in the world. One way of getting rid of this feeling of disorder, is by taking control themselves through behaving sustainably.

In practice, these findings suggest that science should not be portrayed as the savior, as this will make people reluctant to do something themselves. As such, people will be less like to behave sustainably. Events like the IPCC affaire might be disadvantageous at first, however, they may thus also have a positive side. Science apparently does not have the answer to everything. This means that we cannot completely rely on science for creating a ordered, structured, meaningful world. Instead, we have to take actions ourselves, and one way of doing so is by starting to behave sustainably.

## **Deliverables**

With respect to the “data”, the deliverables will be:

- A description of the features of products that have successfully marketed the value of sustainability. *See subproject 1.*
- A description of the features (personality, demographics) customers who make sustainability-based decisions. *See subproject 1.*

- Identification and description of new marketing and communication techniques that can be used to dissolve the existing discrepancy between attitudes versus behavior towards sustainable products and services: The action perspective of this project is that one of the goals of the project is to produce a blue print of effective marketing strategies that are likely to use to effective marketing of sustainability. The goal is to give marketers of sustainability tools that will make their communication strategies more effective and thus worthwhile investments. *See subproject 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6*

With respect to the “content”, the deliverables are:

- Conceptual framework about determinants of the aforementioned attitude-action discrepancy. *See subproject 2, 3, and 6*
- At least three scientific articles (as well as presentations at academic conferences) to be submitted to peer-reviewed, high standing international journals in the fields of marketing, consumer behavior, and social psychology. *There are more than three scientific articles.*
- Communication of the results to industry and stakeholders (such as organizations involved in TransForum’s integrated projects, The Dutch European Ecolabel Organization (Milieukeur), the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality) through article(s) in industry magazines, press releases and presentations. *I presented data on subproject 4 and 5 at the TransForum Multiple Selves sustainability congress the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> of November 2010 in Amsterdam., where there were stakeholders present. There were also stakeholders presented when I presented data from subproject 3 and 6 at the ASPO the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> of December 2010 in Enschede. Furthermore, we wrote a chapter for the book that goes with the Multiple Selves congress of last November.*

### **List of publications and presentations**

### **Publications:**

Meijers, M. H. C., & Stapel, D. A. (in press). Me tomorrow, the others later: How perspective fit increases sustainable behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.06.002.

Meijers, M.H.C., Stapel, D.A., & Noordewier, M.K. (in press). I just ate organic; can I use the car now? The effects of goals and mindsets on maintaining sustainable behavior. In D.A. Stapel & H.C. van Trijp (Eds.), *Angels and demons: How to increase sustainable behavior*. Psychology Press.

Rutjens, B. T., & Meijers, M. H. C. (in press). Teveel van het goede: Hoe een sterk geloof in wetenschappelijke vooruitgang duurzaamheid tegenwerkt. *Jaarboek Sociale Psychologie 2010*.

Meijers, M. H. C., & Stapel, D. A. (in press). Een prijskaartje hangen aan natuur. *Jaarboek Sociale Psychologie 2010*.

Meijers, M. H. C., & Stapel, D. A. (2009). Ik morgen, de anderen later: Het effect van perspectievenfit op duurzaam gedrag. In J. W. van Prooijen, R. J. Renes, B. Derks, M. Stel & M. Vliek (Eds.), *Jaarboek Sociale Psychologie 2009* (pp. 269-276). Groningen: ASPO Pers.

### **Under review:**

Meijers, M. H. C., & Stapel, D. A. (under review). Putting a price tag on nature: The effects of contextual cues on sustainable behavior.

### **In progress:**

Meijers, M. H. C., Stapel, D. A., & Noordewier, M. K. (in preparation). When people take long showers after separating waste: The impact of motivation on the licensing effect.

Meijers, M. H. C., Stapel, D. A., & Noordewier, M. K. (in preparation). How green goals lead to grey behavior: The effects of goals and mindsets on sustainable behavior.

Meijers, M. H. C., Stapel, D. A., & van Dam, Y. K. (in preparation). Who buys what? Sustainable food consumption in the Netherlands.

Meijers, M. H. C., & Rutjens B.T. (in preparation). Faulty science increases greenness: How perception of chaos leads to sustainable behavior.

### **Presentations:**

Meijers, M. H. C., & Stapel, D. A. (2011, January). Putting a price tag on nature: The effects of contextual cues on sustainable behavior. *Poster to be presented at the SPSP Conference, San Antonio, TX.*

Meijers, M. H. C., & Stapel, D. A. (2010, December). Een prijskaartje hangen aan natuur. *Presented at the ASPO Jaarcongres, Enschede.*

Meijers, M. H. C., & Rutjens, B. T. (2010, December). Teveel van het goede: Hoe een sterk geloof in wetenschappelijke vooruitgang duurzaamheid tegenwerkt. *Presented at the ASPO Jaarcongres, Enschede.*

Meijers, M. H. C., Stapel, D. A., & Noordewier, M. K. (2010, November). How green goals lead to grey behavior: The effects of goals and mindsets on sustainable behavior. *Presentation at the KLI track meeting, Amsterdam.*

Meijers, M.H.C., Stapel, D.A., & Noordewier, M.K. (2010, November). I just ate organic: Can I use the car now? *Presentation at the Multiple selves: Angels, demons, and sustainable behavior symposium, Amsterdam.*

Meijers, M.H.C., Stapel, D.A., & Noordewier, M.K. (2010, September). I just ate organic: Can I use the car now? The effects of source motivation on maintaining sustainable behavior. *Presentation at the University of Cologne.*

Meijers, M. H. C., & Stapel, D. A. (2010, January). Me Now, Others Later: Perspective-Fit Effects on Sustainability. *Poster presented at the SPSP Conference, Las Vegas, NV.*

Meijers, M. H. C., & Stapel, D. A. (2009, December). Ik morgen, de ander later: Het effect van perspectievenfit op duurzaam gedrag. *Presentation at the ASPO Jaarcongres, Nijmegen.*