

Table of contents

Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	4
Introduction	5
1. Modern environmental discourse	7
1.1. Sustainable Development and Consumption	7
1.2. Criticism of the sustainability model	9
2. Overview of policies for sustainable consumption	11
2.1. Economic Instruments	12
2.2. Regulatory Instruments	13
2.3. Communication Instruments	15
2.4. Specificity of Policy Instruments for Environmental Problems	17
3. From Consumer to Citizen	19
- Government and Governance	19
- Citizenship and Environment	20
4. Methodology and Presentation of the Cases	22
4.1. Use of Plastic Bags	31
4.1.1. Plastic Bags Levy in Ireland	31
4.1.2. Modbury – England’s First Plastic Bags Free Town	32
4.2. Food Consumption	35
4.2.1. Eco-labelling	35
4.2.2. Eostre Organics: a local organic food network	36
4.3. Private Car Use	39
4.3.1. Traffic Congestion Pricing in Korea	39
4.3.2. Nortel Networks’ Green Commute in Canada	40
5. Discussion	44
Conclusion	47
References	49

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary table for comparative evaluation of policies for sustainable consumption	27
Table 2. Sources of empirical data	30
Table 3. Summary table for comparative evaluation of policies for sustainable consumption: six cases	43

Abstract

This thesis examines the potential of environmental citizenship to become a foundation to policies for sustainable consumption. It is argued that in policy making it is essential to treat individuals not only as consumers but as citizens, since it allows them foster responsible attitudes and exercise sustainable behaviour towards the environment and society. Developing this argument requires considerations of sustainable development and such important aspects as existing barriers to individual behaviour change, legitimacy of state interventions into the private sphere of consumption, and the shift from government to governance.

This work mainly contributes to theoretical knowledge about environmental policies for sustainable consumption and sheds light on the relatively new theoretical concept of environmental citizenship, which is here regarded not only as a way of protecting the environment but also as a way to societal improvement.

It also provides empirical knowledge on practical effectiveness of ecological citizenship in contrast to other policy strategies. Comparative analysis of six small empirical cases is made, and subsequent conclusions are presented on their advantages and disadvantages, particularly in terms of success of behaviour change. Thus, practical implications can be drawn on applying environmental citizenship as a strategy for sustainable present and future.

Key words: sustainable consumption, environmental policy, ecological citizenship

Acknowledgements

At the end of this intense and laborious research I have a pleasure to express my acknowledgements to all the people involved. Indeed, completing this thesis has proved to be an endeavour not possible to accomplish on your own.

First of all, I want to express sincere gratitude to my first supervisor professor Frans Coenen. Throughout the whole process he has been a very encouraging and helpful guide, was giving valuable and substantial advice together with friendly support. I would have been perplexed and demotivated had he not been helping me.

I also keenly thank my second supervisor professor Martin Rosema. Although he was busy and in the beginning warned of the little aid he could provide for my research, in the end he has given a lot of efficient and helpful assistance, along with friendly engagement.

Next I wish to express my appreciation to all the teachers of the Master program Public Administration, and in particular to professor Ringo Ossewaarde. His course with ingenious lecturing, and our communication have enormously enriched my outlook as a social scientist and simply as a person. Also, many thanks to administrators of this Master program for their genuine desire to improve things, and to make the students' study and living as comfortable as possible. Further thanks go to my friend Sadjad, who took patience to carefully review my writings and has given some valuable tips and remarks.

In conclusion I feel obliged to express my respectful gratitude to the country of Netherlands for giving me this life-changing opportunity of education and carefree living during one full year.

Let this thesis be dedicated to all these parties, and I hope its findings will contribute to the welfare of society and nature.

Introduction

“Environmental change implies social change. The intent of environmental policy is to help shape a different society. No matter along with which lines it is moulded, that society should be different and better to live in than the present one.”

P. Glasbergen

The issue of individual consumption is gaining increasing attention in the global pursuit for sustainable development. This is not mere chance, since contemporary research shows the significance of consumer behaviour as one of the key factors behind mitigating climate change and perpetrating environmental and social injustices (Micheletti, Berlin, Barkman). These global and very threatening problems make it clear that significant political, economic, social, cultural and personal changes are needed. The search for them is now mainly done through the concept and practice of sustainable development.

As Peter Leigh (2005) rightly notices, like with many of the human problems, “the underpinnings to our current ecological problems lie within our attitudes, values, ethics, perceptions, and behaviors” (p.1). This statement has been taken as a point of departure of my thesis, which is basically devoted to the search for better mechanisms to tackle environmental problems and improve public governance through changing individuals’ values and behaviour.

For the sphere of environmental policies offers a great opportunity to explore the whole range of present challenges and tendencies of how a global society’s problem is mitigated and can be solved. By exploring this, hopefully, a contribution will be made to practical realization of the concept of sustainable development, particularly of its environmental aspect, and more specific – sustainable consumption.

There are numerous practical approaches towards sustainable development invented for it, deriving from governments and NGOs, like promotion of environmental education, creating sustainable communities, encouraging public participation, and regarding consumer behavior - choice editing, awareness raising, community initiatives and others. Ultimately all these measures intend to change people’s behavior into more sustainable one. More and more of these measures are focused on an *individual*, on his/her potential to contribute to sustainable consumption through personal values and actions.

At the same time, conventional policies like economic or regulatory measures or information campaigns are rather popular. Their effect has been proved to be undeniably prompt and effective. However, it has been recognized that such an approach is superficial

in nature, aiming to change only behavior, but not underlying attitudes, and is also unstable because highly depends on political wind (Dobson, 2007). Such behaviorist policies treat citizens as consumers whose actions are based on rational choice, and can hardly succeed in changing people's attitudes, values and ethics. Therefore a more profound approach is needed in order to make people's behavior deeply motivated and lasting.

Naturally, environmental policy does not stand aside from all structural changes in today's world of public governance. Like any other policy domain, it now undergoes the change from government to governance, what means that power no longer fully belongs and is exercised by government, but rather spread over multiple and interactive actors. Also, it is facing quite a new dilemma of treating individuals either as consumers or citizens, whereby the difficulty occurs to steer their behaviour not violating the valued right of personal freedom at the same time.

The concept of environmental citizenship which is central to this thesis responds to these changes, and arguably has a potential to bring a long-lasting behavioural change, because it considers people not only as rational consumers but also as *citizens endowed with rights and responsibilities* in a variety of political, social and economic spaces (Goodenough Primer, 2005).

In order to prove this potential, it is needed to understand if the approach of environmental citizenship has something new and better in comparison to the more conventional policies. To find it out, the following questions must be answered:

- *How is environmental citizenship conceptualized and operationalized in the literature?*
- *What are the advantages and disadvantages of environmental citizenship for sustainable consumption in practice?*
- *How can environmental citizenship be used in policies for promotion of sustainable consumption?*

Apart from a theoretical inquiry, it will of course be necessary to examine this new concept in practice. For this we will consider three examples that can be regarded as the practices of environmental citizenship – ban on plastic bags, organic shopping and green commuting. These will be compared to more conventional equivalent environmental policies, and evaluated in a number of parameters, such as type of appeal to individuals, temporal and spatial duration, legitimacy, level of intrusiveness and some others. These and other deliberations will help us map the field of present environmental policies and find a place of environmental citizenship in it.

1. Modern Environmental Discourse

1.1. Sustainable Development and Consumption

It has been estimated that the present population of the Northern countries live far beyond their ecological means. Research claims that it would take about three planets to sustain current amounts of consumption and pollution of the EU population (Walter & Simms, 2006). In many other spots of the world consumption trends are also in the growing direction, and this growth naturally accompanies environmental degradation across national borders. Resource intensive economies, industrialisation on the one hand, and worsening poverty and underdevelopment on the other, have led to excessive waste, pollutions, loss of biodiversity and many other human maladies of a global scale. Sustainable development was internationally recognized as the main paradigm of ways to stop the prevailing destructive patterns of growth and improve the deteriorating environment, along with economic and social order.

The notions of sustainability and sustainable development are relatively new. They were developed and widely promoted in the second half of XX century, when inconsistency of industrial and consumption growth rates with the Earth's natural capacities was realized. Namely it became famous in 1980's. In 1983, the Secretary-General of the UN organized a commission "The World Commission on the Environment and Development". It is frequently referred to as the Brundtland Commission, owing to Gro Harlem Brundtland, the head of the commission, a former Prime Minister of Norway. The commission was intended to survey and suggest a global agenda for addressing all range of environmental problems. The conclusion was made that environmental problems are global in nature, and that it was in the common interest of humanity to establish policies for sustainable development. It also came up with the following mainstream definition of sustainable development: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (Our Common Future, p8).

The Sustainable Development Commission (SDC) offered a more extensive definition: "sustainable development provides a framework for redefining progress and redirecting our economies to enable people to meet their basic needs and improve their quality of life, while ensuring that the natural systems, resources and diversity upon which they depend are maintained and enhanced both for their benefit and for that of future generations" (SDC, 2004, p. 37).

The new term continued to gain widespread attention and was further announced at the UN conference on the environment and development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro in

1992. This meeting resulted in creation of a global action plan for sustainable development, obliging 149 governments to agree their agendas in agreement with civil society and business. It provides content, process and possible instruments for sustainable development and makes an emphasis on importance of active citizens' involvement through participation and empowerment (Huckle, 1998).

It also emphasizes the unequal distribution of consumption patterns throughout the world: excessive demands and unsustainable lifestyles in the richer segments place immense stress on the environment, whereas the poorer segments are unable to meet the needs for food, health care, shelter and education. Therefore big responsibility is placed on developed countries in achieving sustainable consumption. Their governments are urged to promote efficiency in production processes and reduce wasteful consumption, and reinforce values and patterns of sustainable production and consumption not only in their own, but also in developing countries (Agenda 21).

The next important step in the development of sustainable development discourse was creation of the Earth Charter, the result of "a decade long, worldwide cross-cultural conversation about common goals and shared values", international collaboration of experts and civil society representing millions of people. One of its major recognitions has been that protection of the environment, human rights, equal human development and peace are mutually dependent and inseparable (Huckle, 1998).

Generally, sustainable development is a result of societies realising the necessity of maintaining a dynamic equilibrium between bio-physical and social systems, defined as sustainability (Reid, 1995, Capra, 2003 in Huckle, 1998). On a metaphysical level it can be explained as the need to maintain an equilibrium of humankind between its contradictory belonging to nature and at the same time to culture. In attaining sustainability we have to balance these two attachments, preserving nature and at the same time freeing ourselves from scarcity, disease and uncertainty (Huckle, 1998).

Sustainable consumption is one of the principal ways of how sustainability strategy is implemented. The OECD provided its internationally standard definition as "the use of goods and related products which respond to basic needs and bring a better quality of life, while minimising the use of natural resources and toxic materials as well as the emissions of waste and pollutants over the life cycle, so as not to jeopardise the needs of future generations" (Norwegian Ministry of Environment, 1994, cited in OECD, 2002; 9).

It is generally recognized that overconsumption results in low-quality environments, and quite recently there has been a significant shift in understanding of responsibility for them. The liability for consumption beyond available resources has been put not so much on producers and sellers, but on consumers. Instead of governmental agencies and group

of interests, mainly individuals are now assigned to solve the task of environmental degradation (Berglund & Matti, 2006).

With such an approach, the metaphor of ecological footprint serves as a touchstone for understanding the obligations of individuals towards environment. It assumes that each individual uses a certain amount of ecological space in terms of used resources in daily life and thus helps visualise our personal impact on the Earth (Seyfang, 2006). Naturally, there is a limited amount of space available, about 1.8 global hectares per person if equally distributed across the Earth. However, the footprint of an average European is now 4.9 ha, and an American 9.2 (Global Footprint Network). It is important to realize that the ecological footprint of a modern western consumer, created for instance by fuel or food consumption, spreads all over the globe, and affects people and environments distant in space and time. Thus the ecological footprint helps to measure and feel social and environmental inequality produced by modern western consumption (Seyfang, 2006). This metaphorical term is often used in designing policies towards sustainable consumption, and is exploited in the concept of environmental citizenship which is central to this thesis.

1.2. Criticism of the sustainability model

Although the mainstream concept of sustainable development meets criticism of quite many scholars and public actors, it deserves to be mentioned talking about fulfilling the sustainability agenda. They place the official debate on sustainability in the Western world into the discourse of ecological modernisation, which they accuse of several wrongs. Mainly they disagree with politicians' and the commercial sector's intention to continue growth without interrupting current consumption behaviour but to solve present environmental problems with technology, putting forward the fact of the so-called "rebound effect": more efficient technologies only increase consumption (Binswanger, 2003 in Fournier, 2008).

The mainstream approach based on pursuit of growth can be termed as economism, which is defined as "a system of representation that translates everything into a reified and autonomous economic reality inhabited by self-interested consumers" (Fournier, 2008, p.529). It is also criticized for externalizing environmental and social costs, leaving individual consumers against powerful corporations in attempts to solve global environmental problems, and not providing motives to reduce consumption. Moreover, it is claimed that in policy making it ignores valuable psychological and social motivations people might have in their consumption behaviour, such as self-esteem, empowerment, aspiration, and need for belongingness (Seyfang, 2006). Thus the opponents bring a strong intake of weakly anthropocentric values and the belief in social development as a way to

progressive evolution of humans and nature into the environmental discourse (Huckle, 1998).

For proponents of alternative ways to sustainability the need for change is rooted not so much in quantities of consumption and not even in the need to prevent the ecological crisis, but in the need to redefine human and social values. They see the current environmental dangers as an opportunity to make the developed societies more just and to redefine the notions of quality of life and happiness (Fournier, 2008). Furthermore, they emphasize the potential of collective action so as to overcome individual powerlessness that is inherent to the official model (Seyfang, 2006).

The mainstream discourse on sustainability recognizes inherent injustice in the world's patterns of development that lies in the North-South divide – the divide between industrialized rich northern countries and poor underdeveloped southern ones. Adversaries of the official sustainability debate make this divide even sharper and more outrageous. They stress the fact that overconsumption in the north proportionally results in desertification, extreme weather conditions or other ecological problems in the south; and that the North enriches itself at the cost of the South by unbridled growth. Thus the central problem is not so much the South's backwardness but the lack of justice on the global economic and political scale. As W. Sachs accentuates:

"...if the North fails to succeed in reaching environment-policy agreements which the South accepts as fair, sustainability will be pushed to the sidelines. Without justice no ecology. If, from its own side, the South freely demands a larger share of the exploitative economy, then sustainability will be pushed to the sidelines as well. Justice is not compatible with environmental protection except when it is strived for within the framework of environmentally-friendly development. This is why the opposite applies: without ecology no justice" (2002, p.39).

Such claims, presented under various labels, such as radical sustainability model, degrowth movements, development mode of sustainability (vs. growth mode) are obviously rather extreme. Having truthful ideas, the critics help to see flaws of sustainable development set in practice. Even though feasibility of these ideas is a matter of question due to all the political and other circumstances, it is useful to bear them in mind, especially when talking about environmental citizenship, as later will be shown.

2. Overview of Policies for Sustainable Consumption

It has been recognized that sustainable development is a very complex and multifaceted concept; there is no clear agreement on the ethics, nature and course of such development. There is also lack of consensus on what is to be sustained and how. And this becomes especially evident when sustainability passes into policies that immediately encounter ethical, semantic, epistemological and other problems (Ockwell, 2006). Unfortunately, the case of policies for sustainable consumption is not an exclusion.

Policies for sustainable consumption go to the very core of ideas on boundaries between public and private, limits of state intervention and rational behaviour of individuals (Lewis, 2007 in Ockwell, 2009). During the last two decades they have come through certain evolution. Initially, Agenda 21, the main outcome of 1992 Rio 'Earth Summit' began with addressing the necessity for increased use of economic instruments: "[e]nvironmental law and regulation are important but cannot alone be expected to deal with the problems of environment and development. Prices, markets and governmental fiscal and economic policies also play a complementary role in shaping attitudes and behaviour towards the environment" (Agenda 21, chapter 8, paragraph 8.27).

In the Fifth Environmental Action Programme of the EU, adopted in 1992, and in the Maastricht Treaty there was a similar message about looking for more flexible and efficient instruments, both at national and supranational levels. OECD's policy analyses also contributed to the spread of economic instruments for environmental policy (Persson, 2007).

However, already in the mid of 90's there came another wave of policy approaches. An increasing attention was paid at 'softer' instruments, such as various types of voluntary approaches, environmental management systems, and information measures such as eco-labels. Bruijn and Hufen (1998, p. 18 in Persson, 2007) note that the significance of new instruments of information and communication relies on the idea that the 'force of conviction' will be better than rather than 'coercion'.

With this, there came and is still present a strong understanding of the consumer market as an arena for sustainable development, where individual and collective actions in daily life are to bring a change to environmental wrongdoings (Micheletti, Berlin, Barkman). Private consumption is regarded as one of the largest causes of environmental degradation (Berglund & Matti, 2006). It well explains general preoccupation with policies towards sustainable consumption of many governments nowadays. At the core of these policies is the aim to change individual behaviours and to alter choices, since they are seen

as a main obstacle on the way to sustainable future (Berglund & Matti, 2006). Such a goal seems to be very challenging for the reason that it is difficult to explain and predict an individual's behaviour with consideration of all the internal factors and external conditions. To the former relates the so-called "attitude-behaviour" gap, i.e. discrepancy between a person's values and attitudes and his/her behaviour, subjected to numerous psychological, social and other factors (Ockwell, Whitmarsh & O'Neill, 2009). To the latter can be referred the complexity of individual responses to various instruments of regulation, like those of economic incentives or regulatory instruments.

For further deliberation it is necessary to develop a working typology of all the policy instruments presently available at societies' disposal. Generally they can be divided into three main types: economic (also referred to as market-based); regulatory and communication instruments.

2.1. Economic instruments

For decades, these instruments (e.g. waste fees, taxes on energy and water use, subsidies for green energy, removal of water subsidies, etc.) have been used to change consumption patterns by providing maximum utility in favour of particular choices. They are based on treating individuals as rational actors behaving on the grounds of economic interests and are normally reported to have an immediate effect and to be highly cost-efficient (OECD, 2002). However, the following examples explain why such policies often contain "the seeds of their own demise".

An instructive example can be given by the green tax on flights in the Netherlands introduced in July 2008. Its consummation immediately led to significant change in booked flights from Schiphol and other Dutch airports: the decrease was 50 000 passengers compared with 2007. However, it had not led to their staying home, as they opted to fly cheaper from Germany or Belgium. This also led to such adverse consequences as a massive job loss in the related sectors of economy and the Dutch air companies losing their position on the international market of civil aviation (Radio Netherlands/Expatica). It has also been argued that the tax itself does not serve for environmental protection, as the money obtained through it goes to the national treasury and is spent for other aims (Nederland vliegtax vrij Initiative). In March, 2009 the Dutch authorities decided to abolish the tax, and the decision comes in force from July, 2009.

Another example could be Britain's dealing with household waste. Waste generation is reported to grow at 3% a year, and ways are sought to reduce household waste production. A seemingly effective measure could be introducing a "rubbish tax" obliging households to pay a small amount of money for each over-quota bag of waste. This would

supposedly induce people to care for the rubbish they produce and look for ways to avoid paying the tax (Dobson, 2003). In fact, there are similar existing policies in other countries. In the US the so-called “Pay-As-You-Throw” (PAYT) charge operates, by which each household pays on the basis of volume or weight of waste discarded. It is reported that it reduced waste generation for about 14-27% and increased recycling practices by about 32-59% (OECD, 2002). However, a rather significant shortcoming of such a policy is that people are very likely to find ways of cheating, for example to dump the waste on a pavement or in another backyard.

The lesson that can be learnt from the above policy examples is that the use of such instruments does change people’s behaviour, but does not influence their consciousness and attitudes. As a result they may look for unsustainable shortcuts and do not develop any commitment to the issues of environmental protection. Now is the time to see if the second group of instruments in this respect has anything better to offer.

2.2. Regulatory instruments

This type of instruments (e.g. environmental labels, waste management directives, energy-efficiency or water quality standards, product bans, extended producer responsibility regulation, etc.) is generally used more seldom because they are more costly, difficult for implementation and are quite intrusive. However, imposing standards, like minimum energy or water efficiency standards, building regulations or labelling have been rather popular tools in many countries. These are legal, enforceable, “command and control”-like instruments that aim to reach a prescribed environmental quality by regulating individual or collective behaviours. These are widely used in transport policies, for example by incentivizing people to buy more fuel efficient cars or lowering speeds. For example, in the Swiss cities of Bern and Zurich, the restrictive measures of the government succeeded in creating regulatory impediments has made driving so difficult (e.g., limited parking, road capacity reduction and diversion of through traffic) that many citizens opted for using public transport (Timilisina & Dulal, 2009).

Such measures as access bans, partial and total vehicle bans, have been widely applied in Italy, Greece, The Netherlands, Spain, and Germany. A very instructive example is given by the policy of “No Driving Day” (Hoy No Circula) in Mexico City in 1989 for controlling traffic congestion and emissions. Presumably, it would not only help reduce environmental externalities but also reduce traffic congestion. The policy mandated not driving one day during the week (except the weekends) and two days during serious pollution episodes. During the weekends, odd and even license plate numbers were used, so that one-half of the cars remained parked. The evidence suggested that removing 20%

of the vehicles from the streets in its first few months of operation contributed to improvement of air quality (Timilisina & Dulal, 2009).

However, this successful effect was only temporary. A number of reasons gradually impaired the policy outcome. First, because there was no sufficient public transport systems to meet the aroused travel demand. Second, the driving public found ways to subvert the existing regulation: many drivers bought additional autos in order to have personal transport available on any day. Many of these second vehicles were older and released more emissions (*ibid*).

Regulatory instruments, however, may bring the same adverse effects as economic ones, what can be demonstrated by the Dutch ban on breeding animals for fur. In January, 2001 the bill from Agricultural Minister was accepted to ban breeding animals for their fur. Right then it was decided to ban breeding of foxes and chinchillas, and seven years were given to the mink farmers to cease fur production. Presently the anti-fur-production legislation has not yet been enforced, but there is a high probability that it will be (Bont Voor Dieren). Regardless of the final political decision we can anyway now assume that attractive black fur markets may emerge for the very species that the ban is supposed to protect, or increased demand for fur-related products from abroad. Either, fur farming may flourish in other neighbouring countries.

Generally, a solid reason why one should be very careful introducing this or that economic or regulatory instrument for promotion of pro-environmental behaviour is a possible negative response to it. A number of experiments have proved strong relevance of the so-called “crowding out” effect, which may destroy intrinsic motivation of people to care about environment unless they get economic benefits for so doing. It can be illustrated by a case study of elderly people living in an asylum who were subject to various economic incentives, for example making beds in exchange for vouchers. After some time these people were not willing to do anything unless they were rewarded for it. Thus, they were “demoralized” by this external intervention that replaced intrinsic motivation. Observations also tell that once such motivations destroyed, they hardly return in time (Berglund & Matti, 2006).

Overall, from the instances given above we can conclude that the regulatory instruments do not differ much from economic instruments in terms of underlying values and the way of approaching individuals. Being based on the model of economic rationality they expect individuals to submit to offered regulations or to pay a penalty. They fail to reach intrinsic motivation for pro-environmental behaviour, and are also highly intrusive. Although they indeed bring immediate effects and are rather cost-efficient, the risk of emergence of unsustainable workarounds is high; they are also vulnerable to the “crowding

out” effect. Removing alternatives of consumption of particular services and products may also be problematic either because there are not always other options available, or they are also unsustainable. And generally, control of the desired behaviour forced by these instruments is often unfeasible, too costly and intrusive.

Slowly these shortcomings have been realized, and it is being admitted that behind the economic motivations, there is a lot more that guides people’s behaviour. Recently extensive research in social psychology has been carried out on determinants of pro-environmental behaviour, and among those were found values, attitudes, awareness and personal norms (Berglund & Matti, 2009). The third type of policy instruments for sustainable consumption stands closer to this finding and seeks to promote a policy that hinges upon something different than considerations of economic gains or eagerness to avoid penalties.

2.3. Communication instruments

At once it must be mentioned that communication instruments are rather diverse, and there is no precise name for them as a group. In different sources they are regarded as “social”, “information”, or “suasion” instruments. For the sake of inclusiveness, here they will be labelled as communication instruments, to which will be related those like public information campaigns, labelling, education, etc. They aim to influence awareness and willingness to act pro-environmentally, and unlike the above-mentioned instruments, intend to provoke individual, voluntary action. Quite often they appeal to individuals as to an “economic man” or “moral man”, pressing either on self-interest or personal morals. They do it by providing information on consequences of individual choices, private side benefits (economic or social), increasing individual reflection on choices, and helping construct “green identity” (OECD, 2002).

One of the serious and well-researched obstacles on the way of applying communication instruments is “value-action gap” - the discrepancy between what we think and how we act. Our behaviour is deeply embedded into numerous institutional, cultural, social and psychological structures that shape it altogether. Not always behaviour depends on rational deliberation, for example in case of habits (Ockwell et al., 2009). That is why it is very hard to directly correlate provided information with a subsequent action. To this problem adds another obstacle - public’s fatigue of misleading messages from governments and markets, resulting in scepticism, feeling powerless, other priorities and values, social norms (ibid).

A very recent research (McKinsey Quarterly, March 2008, in World Business Council for Sustainable Development) indicates that awareness and concerns about environmental

and social issues is relatively high, but it does not transform into corresponding behaviour and lifestyles. 53% of consumers in Brazil, Canada, France, China, Germany, India, UK and the US appear to be concerned, but not to take action at shops; further 13% were ready to pay more, but did not do so.

One of the reasons to it can be that communication approaches do provide enough information, but do not meaningfully engage into issues they inform about, since they underestimate the role of values, emotions and attitudes of individuals. This is because many of the communication tools rely on the psychological “information deficit model” presuming the public is like an “empty vessel” waiting to be filled with useful facts, upon which they will act. Whereas they provide good rational reasoning, for example by showing the way to lessen expenses through reducing use of energy, they still do not foster intrinsic engagement with environmental problems (Ockwell et al., 2009).

The overall conclusion made by researches is that information campaigns can be a powerful instrument for promoting sustainable consumption, but they are insufficient without other important conditions, like price structures, availability of the green goods and services, and many other infrastructural settings. The obvious advantage of these instruments is that they are least intrusive. However, it is hard to predict and measure the impact of communication campaigns (OECD, 2002).

That is why recently increasing attention has been paid to the use of more interactive and participatory approaches for promoting sustainable consumption (OECD, 2002). Most progressive researchers and policy makers have argued that behaviour change most likely occurs when initiatives are made on community level and which enhance benefits from new activities. Moser and Dilling (2007, in Ockwell, 2009) suggest that in order to motivate to act pro-environmentally, it is needed to appeal to individuals’ deep desire to have a happy and meaningful life. Likewise, Crompton (2008, *ibid*) argues that values such as personal growth, community involvement and a sense of kinship with nature must be put on a public debate.

2.4. Specificity of Policy Instruments for Environmental Problems

Before considering particular cases, an introduction into some more aspects of environmental policy instruments should be made, as well as into existing difficulties of measuring their effectiveness.

One should realise the importance of policy instrumentation as such. Due to complexity and informational intensity of the empirical reality, policy instruments appear to be the way to simplify it, thus reducing the complexity of policy making. They help to cover a certain problem, study and measure the outcomes of its treatment. However, most policies work in a longer term; they may guide future decision-making, help adapt to policies and predict their outcomes (Huppel & Simonis, 2000). In other words, the policies that are considered in this thesis practically fulfil the agenda of sustainability, and structure and solve complex environmental problems.

A working definition of policy instruments is needed. Here will be used the definition by Lundqvist (1996, p.16): “courses of action which are intended to affect society – in terms of values and beliefs, action and organization – in such a way as to improve, or to prevent the deterioration of, the quality of the natural environment” (in Mickwitz, 2003).

The choice of particular policy instruments in this area depends on a number of specific factors that are conditioned by physical and geographical features of environmental problems, which may limit the set of potential instruments (Weale, Pridham et al., 2000, in Persson, 2008). For example, in case of CO₂ emissions, it is sometimes hard to locate its source and attribute it to certain actors and activities. Because of this, the instruments chosen may lack precision and be not targeted. However, other problems like for instance, waste are more controlled and measurable. Another difficulty is that environmental problems often have very long time frames. It may take years between an action and its consequences. Therefore it is hard or often impossible to observe the outcomes of policy actions. In general, the knowledge about environmental problems is bound by immense uncertainties (Mickwitz, 2003).

The other influential factor is visibility and political salience of a problem. The more risky a problem is seen to be (for example, nuclear power or genetically modified organisms), the bigger need in precision and effectiveness of the instruments (Tews, Busch et al., 2003 in Persson, 2008).

Besides just mentioned evaluation problems, there is one more important aspect of them. There may appear a data gap because:

- Quantitative measurements sometimes do not capture social impacts;
- Evaluations were not included into a project from the start;

- It is not always possible to attribute the impact of using certain measures to subsequent actions;
- Different actors will value different outcomes (Environment Agency, 2008, p.23).

Even though there has been some progress in measurement tools, like using the method of Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) or Social Return on Investment (SROI), a tendency to combine quantitative and qualitative evaluations, there is still not enough clear data on outcomes of using certain instruments, particularly newly emerged (community involvement and other bottom-up initiatives) (ibid).

A more specific measurement problem relates to the field of individual consumption, where almost the only way to evaluate outcomes is by addressing self-reported behaviour of individuals. Majority of studies report that it is an unreliable indicator and predictor of real behaviour. The only way to slightly increase the reliability of such data is by repeating surveys in successive years so as to see certain trends (World Business Council for Sustainable Development, 2008).

Lastly, it must be mentioned that it is hard to measure sustainability of this or that policy option, since sustainable development is not an objective criterion (OECD, 2002). However, there are still ways to evaluate effectiveness of this or that policy as a strategy so as to see its possible weaknesses and strengths. This is exactly the main task of this thesis, to find out advantages and disadvantages of environmental citizenship as a possible policy for sustainable consumption. For this very purpose it will be compared to more conventional equivalent policies, and to make the comparison more systematic, a summary table with relevant policy parameters will be presented later.

3. From Consumer to Citizen

3.1. Government and governance

Emergence of new views on environmental policy, like the need for more interactive and participatory approaches on local levels, lie within a greater shift in the modern political domain of the western democracies from “government” to “governance”. This shift consists in the new meaning, method and process of governing, whereas outcomes are the same as in government – creating ordered rules and a collective action (Stoker, 1998). At the heart of governance is the focus on power that does not fully belong and is exercised by government; rather it is spread over multiple and interactive actors, where private and voluntary sectors gain more authority.

Generally it can be said that governance brings a change to the relationship between civil society and the state. A welfare system with its accent on rights is changing to the one with the same accent on responsibilities. It implies the rise of “active citizenship” and importance of social capital indispensable for economic and political well-being (Putnam, 1993 in Stoker, 1998). This change blurs the boundaries between private and public and gives rise to such agencies as NGOs, non-profits, voluntary and community-based organisations, etc. Many traditional tasks of the government have been taken up by these organizations, that makes one believe that needs can be met and problems solved without government’s interference (Stoker, 1998).

This substantial change has covered merely all domains of modern governance, and the environmental policy has not been an exception. Whereas the government approach tackled environmental problems by introducing laws, imposing regulations and offering economic incentives, the governance approach, instead, finds people crucially important agents of change. It asserts that greater citizen involvement and participation will improve the quality of decisions made and in the long run everybody will benefit from it. The government will be able to rely more confidently on its people in their responsibility and obedience, and people will feel to have more ability to change the state of affairs. The general principles of governance presuppose including widest range of interests into the political debate, working in self-managed groups, providing maximum participation and attendance and urging public commitments to action (Selman & Parker, p. 177), encouraging grass-root movement, and bottom-up initiatives.

3.2. Individual, community and the environment

It is now clear why such problems as air pollution, resource depletion or municipal waste are no longer considered to be solved by the government alone. Instead they are seen as challenges for collective action, where the outcome depends on collective efforts of various actors (Ostrom, 1990 in Matti, 2008). Given that individual and household consumption nowadays make a significant impact on the environment, individuals are involved as one of key actors to tackle the environmental problems (Matti, 2008).

However, this very shift from individualism to collectivism poses a challenge for contemporary liberal democracies that highly respect the principle of individual freedom. This challenge is rooted in the problem of relation between the state and the individual, where personal freedom to choose this or that religion, lifestyle and life project is of high value. However, the pursuit for sustainable consumption leads governments to infringe on this freedom by attempting to change private behaviour for the sake of collective good (Matti, 2004). This tension brings attention to such important policy dimensions as *intrusiveness* and *legitimacy*.

High intrusiveness is a characteristic that is undesirable in consumption policies, as it presupposes that an individual changes behaviour in a strained and immediate fashion. By this the state offhandedly intrudes into personal lifestyle and habits, what may be considered as infringement of individual freedom.

Legitimacy is one of the central concepts in the political science, and concerns acceptability of exercise of power in society. Whereas its conventional object is power institutions and their decisions, it is fair enough to also employ this concept for such an object as policy, which can be defined as a result of powerful governmental and non-governmental actors deciding upon certain (environmental) problems. Meanwhile it has already been established that people's willingness to follow a policy strongly depends on their perception of this policy as legitimate (Matti, 2004).

Following Beetham's (1991) definition of legitimacy, policy legitimacy rests on public trust and shared values, and depends on support or acceptance of political decisions. Thus, the key in pursuit for legitimacy and therefore policy acceptance is possibility to justify it in terms of shared beliefs and values. And hence, an individual's personal beliefs and values strongly determine the way a policy is perceived and responded to. In the context of policies for sustainable consumption, value-systems are thought to influence people's perception of such important premises as: acceptance of

state interference in daily life; possibility of a risk or threat; and feeling of trust to the actors that manage these threats. Practically it means that

“[i]f the individual believes that the duty of the state is to steer its citizens towards one conception of the good life, a policy which’s normative foundations expresses these values is perceived to be considered legitimate by the individual. On the other hand, if the individual’s general value system does not support such a view on the state-individual relationship, a policy which suggests this will instead suffer from a legitimacy deficit” (Matti, 2004, p.8).

This interrelation makes consideration of legitimacy one of the crucial aspects in designing and implementation of policies, and that is why will be considered below when analysing practical policy examples. However, it should be noted that there is no clear set of procedures that can guarantee legitimacy of environmental policies. On the contrary, interpretation of legitimacy is partly culturally and socially determined (Adger, Brown, Fairbrass, Jordan, Paavola, Rosendo, Seyfang, 2004).

The necessity of taking into account people’s values brings us to the need of distinguishing between people as consumers making choices upon rational considerations, and citizens, behaving primarily on the grounds of social responsibility and civil duty. The choice between the two, or their combination, will have crucial implications for environmental policies.

There is already sufficient evidence that individuals are guided not only by economic rewards, but by their personal ethical systems. Research on determinants of pro-environmental behaviour in the field of social psychology has disclosed that such factors as values, attitudes and awareness play a significant role in it (Berglund & Matti, 2006). With this, steering people’s behaviour through economic incentives may bring to detrimental consequences because of the above-mentioned “crowding-out” effect. If, for instance, people sort out waste or save water for moral reasons, pricing policies may destroy their ethical motivation and lead to negative changes in their behaviour (ibid).

Therefore, replacing or combining the economic role of a consumer with a political role of a citizen represents an important move. It looks promising, since political nature of citizenship can offer a way out of economism: appealing to citizens helps to depart from self-interested consumerism, gives a way to link individual behaviour with collective action and to invite private choices and consumption practices into political domain (Fournier, 2008).

3.3. Citizenship and Environment

The issue of citizenship is nowadays topical among environmentalists because of its potential to foster new ethics for consumers to change their behaviour into more sustainable and responsible one (Seyfang, 2006). Such a potential derives from the aggregate of rights, obligations and actions citizenship presupposes between individuals and institutions in a variety of social, economic and political spaces (MacGregor, Pardoe, Dobson, and Bell., p.1). Before discussing environmental citizenship, it is reasonable and necessary to begin with the definition of citizenship as such.

The notion of citizenship has multiple interpretations, but its conventional liberal definition concerns status and actions of individuals in the public sphere and in relations with the state (Seyfang, 2006). According to Marshall's concept of citizenship, for example, these statuses and actions can be divided into three main types: civic, political and social. The first implies rights for free speech, religion, thought; the second means "the right to participate in the exercise of political power as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body"; the third draws on numerous social rights, like for economic well-being, education or health (Marshall, 1950). Apparently, in his theory Marshall stresses only the rights aspect, not paying much attention at the aspect of duties an individual is supposed to fulfil to be a citizen.

However, modern interpretation of citizenship has begun to incorporate the fourth set of rights – environmental ones – for a natural and safe milieu, protecting individuals from polluted and degrading environment (Paehlke, 2008). Very remarkable is the growing emphasis on environmental duties more than on rights. To these duties belong protecting soil, avoiding pollution of water and air, preserving and enriching biodiversity, and of course limiting consumption to a reasonable minimum, to name a few. From this idea of rights for the environment and obligations towards it, the concept of environmental citizenship¹ seems to begin.

Dobson, the founder of the concept of environmental citizenship, wants to make clear the source of these obligations, arguing that it must be a matter of justice, not charity. The "Samaritan" goodwill to help is not applicable to the modern environmental problems, because, as Linklater states, 'the main impetus for global moral responsibility arises in the context of increasing transnational harm' (Linklater, 1998, in Dobson,

¹ Dobson distinguishes between *environmental* citizenship that concerns enjoyment of rights in the public sphere, and *ecological* citizenship that concerns rights and responsibilities enjoyed both in private and public (Dobson, 2003, pp. 88-90). However, since this difference has low relevance for the contents of this thesis, these two terms will be used interchangeably.

2005). The biggest environmental impact is now produced by the developed northern countries, but its consequences often arise in poor developing regions. Thus, the moral obligation of the northern countries to help the victims must not originate from charity, but from justice. The crucial difference is that whereas charity is voluntary, justice is not, and it leaves the harmer responsible for the victim (Dobson, 2003). This is how “humanity” transforms into “citizenship”:

“Justice, as I have pointed out, is a more binding and less paternalistic source and form of obligation than charity, and its political nature takes us out of the realm of ‘common humanity’ and into the realm of citizenship. This obligation to do justice is a political obligation rather than a more general moral obligation, and is therefore more appropriately predicated of ‘being a citizen’ than ‘being human’” (Dobson, 2005, p.270).

Another strand of conventional theory of citizenship is civic republicanism, and here the emphasis on duties and responsibilities for citizens for the interest of the common good becomes bigger. The proponent of this approach Sagoff (1988) stresses the importance of serving to “common good” as a foundation of citizenship. Moreover, he makes a distinction for an individual to be a “citizen” and a “consumer”:

“I shall be concerned with two rather abstract social roles we all play, namely, the role of citizen and the role of consumer. As a *citizen*, I am concerned with the public interest, rather than my own interest; with the good of the community rather than simply the well-being of my family... In my role as a *consumer*, in other words, I concern myself with personal or self-regarding wants and interests; I pursue the goals I have as an individual” (p. 8, emphasis added).

Such an interpretation of citizenship may serve as a good background for introducing the new – environmental type of citizenship, since it underscores environmental duties over rights. The distinction between a citizen and a consumer now deserves better discussion, since it has very important theoretical and practical implications. In the first case people are regarded as self-interested actors, and thus their behaviour is deemed to be best influenced by “carrots and sticks” mechanism. In the other case they are treated as responsible actors motivating behaviour not only by personal win, but by other priorities. Ludwig Beckman explains:

“However, the question of sustainable behaviour cannot be reduced to a discussion about balancing carrots and sticks. The citizen that sorts her garbage or that prefers ecological goods will often do this because she feels committed to ecological values and ends. The citizen may not, that is, act in sustainable ways solely out of economic or practical incentives: people sometimes choose to do good for other reasons than fear (of

punishment or loss) or desire (for economic rewards or social status). People sometimes do good because they want to be virtuous” (Beckman 2001, in Dobson, 2003, p.3).

Research on environmental values and attitudes done by the Swedish programme ‘Sustainable Households; Attitudes, Resources and Policy’ (SHARP) serves as evidence. It has been found out that such “external motivations” as taxes or rewards play a role in promoting sustainability, but “people tend to ascribe far greater importance to the motivational values contained in the self-transcendence cluster (altruism) ... than to the opposing values of self-enhancement (egoism)” (Berglund & Matti, 2003, p.563).

One more important dimension of environmental citizenship is private vs. public/political. The traditional citizenship thought draws a clear-cut line between private and public, and citizenship is to be exercised in the latter, in relation to the state (Seyfang, 2006). However, when speaking about environmental rights and duties, there is a tendency to claim that “personal is political”, thus removing this distinction. Consumer behaviour, such as domestic water or energy use, choice of particular goods and services and other consumption activities are, in most cases, the matter of personal choice realized in the private sphere. But because these actions and choices have environmental consequences, private consumer behaviour becomes a public action and enters the political domain (McGregor et al., 2005).

Another feature of environmental citizenship is its global inclusiveness. The environment itself and consequently environmental problems are borderless by nature and have no territorial division. In addition, over the last decades the world has become increasingly globalised, integrated by global economy. Therefore, environmental citizenship intends to provide “a sense of membership in a global political community with a common ecological fate”. One can say, it is a “citizenship without a state” (Paehlke, 2008). Therefore, it seeks for obligations and responsibilities going as far as beyond the nation state and as close as the personal lifestyle (MacGregor et al., 2005, p.2). In this sense we are all citizens of the Earth, as “there are no outsiders on this planet” (Paehlke, 2008). Moreover, it is expanded not only in space, but in time, because we are obliged to secure the future generations with liveable environmental conditions (Dobson, 2003).

Overall, this sort of citizenship can be summarized as “a total practice of responsibility between individuals and their political, social, economic and natural environment”. It is not only a formal status or relationship of duties and rights between an individual and the state, but “a multi-faceted relationship that stretches the spatial,

temporal and material bounds of citizenship from its traditional national-state setting to that of the global economy” (Micheletti et al., p.2).

However, the Dobson’s concept has one gap for which it is now being criticized. Namely the opponents pose the question: what is the basic reason for people to change from self-interested individuals into civic-minded collectivists? Dobson himself argues justice should be a sufficient ground for it; however, the question remains why we should get so motivated (Fournier, 2008). For instance, Mason (2009) claims that obligations of justice towards fellow citizens and future generations are “insufficient to give the idea of citizenship a secure foothold” (p. 280). He asserts that “[a]ny adequate account of citizenship has to explain how the duties, obligations and responsibilities to which it is wedded are owed to fellow citizens” (p. 285).

Indeed it may be difficult to find the exact mechanism by which this obligation of justice can be set in action; as well as a legitimate ground for intervention into individuals’ private sphere of consumption, considering the above-mentioned paramount principle of state neutrality and freedom of individuals in the Western liberal societies.

It seems that the most convincing answer to this criticism can be given by the proponents of communitarian ideals (Sandel, MacIntyre, Taylor), who believe that the state has a right to interfere in individuals’ lives when a certain order and ideals are to be upheld (Matti, 2004). Moreover, all initial documents on sustainability take it as a collective goal for governments, corporations and individuals to protect the environment. Considering that the environmental hazards resulting from present patterns of consumption (and production) may have extensive and pervasive effects in the future for every individual, it seems logical to insist on everyone’s responsibility and the need to act for their prevention. Another argument may be that, having a strong ethical component inside, ecological citizenship has the same kind of mandate as other ethical obligations, like to be well-mannered, for instance. It is hard to show the exact cause to be such; however the benefits of being well-mannered are rather obvious. Apparently, the ethical foundation of ecological citizenship has much in common with the previously mentioned criticism on mainstream policies for sustainability. It implicitly argues that it is what we have to work on if we are to realize our potential as human beings and expand it beyond “consuming” (Fournier, 2008, Huckle, 1998, Seyfang, 2006).

Thus, we have encompassed the theoretical field and now can give a comprehensive definition to environmental citizenship: it is a particular form of

citizenship encouraged by a desire for greater social and environmental justice inducing responsibilities across nations and generations and thus promoting sustainability. Environmental citizenship has a number of characteristics. It emphasizes duties over rights and is more an activity rather than status, for the sake of common good. It prompts to justice, but not charity, towards far away people and future generations. It treats people both as consumers and citizens, both in private and public domains. It is global in nature, since the environmental problems respect no political borders. The whole debate on environmental citizenship is placed within the shift from “government” to “governance”.

What concerns criticism of Dobson’s concept – even if the arguments above leave one convinced in justifiability of the need to foster ecological citizenship in individuals, it still remains a challenge how to do it, if one does not engage voluntarily. We will turn back to this issue in the concluding part of this thesis.

Now as we have spoken on various instruments and ecological citizenship at sufficient length, it is time to summarize all important aspects of three types of policies for sustainable consumption discussed above, and ecological citizenship as a potential policy.

A number of relevant policy parameters have crystallized out of the previous theoretical deliberations: appeal to an individual, temporal duration, spatial effect, source of initiative, behaviour change, level of intrusiveness and legitimacy. They seem to largely determine the shape and practical outcomes of policies for sustainable consumption. The dimension of legitimacy in this context has appeared to be an unexplored area; therefore the empirical investigation in the following section has to give some new theoretical and practical insights. The following table will help to keep in mind all necessary aspects for further empirical investigation and answering the main research question:

Table 1. Summary table for comparative evaluation of policies for sustainable consumption

Policy Dimensions	Economic and Regulatory instruments	Conventional Communication Approach	Environmental Citizenship (as a policy strategy)
Appeal to an individual	self-interested actor, "homo economicus", egoist	"homo moralis", individual moral actor	Civil-minded, responsible actor, "homo civicus", altruist
Temporal duration	Temporally changeable, may expire once political circumstances changed or new policies introduced	unknown	Rather long-standing, less exposed to external political and policy influences
Spatial effect	Bound to a certain political terrain	Non-territorial	Non-territorial, associated with a global society
Source of initiative	Top-down	Top-down/Bottom-up	Bottom-up
Behaviour change	Compulsory	Voluntary	Voluntary
Level of intrusiveness	High	Low	Low
Legitimacy	no research undertaken	no research undertaken	no research undertaken

4. Methodology and Presentation of the Cases

A comparative approach was chosen in the study for the reason that “it forces greater specificity on the researcher” (Peters 1998, p. 4), in terms of examining all the variables of the instruments studied. This specificity will help us see the main differences in the previously elaborated policy dimensions of this or that approach, and therefore will bring to the main empirical objective to find out advantages and disadvantages of the policy approaches.

Peters (1998, p. 10) separates five types of comparative studies: single country descriptions of politics; analyses of similar processes and institutions in a limited number of countries selected for analytic reasons; studies developing typologies or other forms of classification schemes for countries or subnational units; and statistical or descriptive analyses of data from a subset of the world’s countries; statistical analyses of all countries of the world.

This study is of the second type, focussing on similar processes, namely the processes of choosing environmental policy instruments in a limited number of countries. It should be respected that the choice of policy instruments is not a simple task, but a challenge, since it involves consideration of a wide range of social, institutional, cultural, economic and political factors (Persson, 2008). However, due to the time limitations of this research, it is not possible to make a thorough investigation of all these factors. Rather, a more superficial inquiry will be made, focussing on the effectiveness of behaviour change made by these or those instruments.

A reasonable question would be how the choice of the cases presented below can be explained. The decision can be justified in a number of ways. First, there are now very few examples of ecological citizenship put in practice (Seyfang, 2006). After an intensive and scrupulous search it was still possible to find some that were not labelled as such, however can be defined as ecological citizenship in action. The countries involved will be Ireland, England, Germany, USA, Canada and Korea. Most of these countries may be considered presently as pioneers in the quest for environmental and social improvement. One of the displays of this is freedom of information they provide for the concerned issues; absence of language barriers was also a beneficial factor.

Moreover, the issue of plastic bags as an environmentally harmful and excess commodity has now been topical in many countries of the world. Besides the advantage of a wide range of accessible information about this issue, this case is also particularly demonstrative in terms of behaviour change. As for the other two cases - food

consumption and transportation are one of the five areas (along with energy use, water use and waste generation) of household consumption that have biggest impacts on environment (OECD, 2002). And again, the chosen cases turned to be the most demonstrative in terms of results of behaviour change.

Peters (1998, p.37) indicates that “[e]ither focus of comparison – explaining similarities or differences – can tell the researcher a great deal about the way in which governments function.” It should be noted, however, that in our case the comparison is not aimed at finding out specific features of policy implementation of a country’s government; rather, it seeks *to contrast applicability and effectiveness of conventional policy approaches vs. the approach of ecological citizenship, so as to tell if the latter has a new potential to change individual behaviour, and as a policy for sustainable consumption as such.*

One more important determination is level of analysis. The focus is made both on national and local policy-making. These two are important in the scope of this research. The national level represents a more strategic approach and has a larger legal mandate for actions. However, the use of some instruments is sometimes initiated locally (Persson, 2008). This is exactly the case of ecological citizenship that is not regarded here as an official policy but more as a potential policy strategy.

The study is also to be delimited in time. The cases studied extend from 1998 to now, as some of the policies and initiatives are ongoing. This temporal period can show how older instruments (under the government paradigm) are implemented along with modern instruments (under the governance paradigm) and how their effect changes over time.

For this study there was no common sufficient source of information. Therefore a wide range of sources was taken, both primary and secondary, such as web-sites, interviews in mass-media, reports of governmental and other institutions, academic articles. One of the richest sources of data has been “Tools of Change” web site (www.toolsofchange.com) - a free-of-charge Canadian source for planning and running programs that promote healthy and environmentally sustainable actions. It offers information on specific tools, case studies, and a planning guide for helping people take actions and adopt healthy and environment-friendly habits. Another similar source was the website of Asia-Pacific Environmental Innovation Project and its “good practices inventory” (<http://hydmozoo1.iges.or.jp/APEIS/RISPO/>) - a collaborative research project developing policy options to lead the Asia-Pacific region towards sustainability.

Also, very informative for the research were a number of academic articles, working papers and reports.

The overall list of resources is presented in the following table:

Table 2. Sources of empirical data

Plastic Bags (Republic of Ireland and England)	Food consumption (Germany, USA and UK)	Private car use (Korea and Canada)
<p>Bag to Basics: report by London Environment Committee. December 2007</p> <p>A Woman, a Village and a War on Plastic Bags. (K. Sullivan) Article in Washington Post Foreign Service Tuesday, May 6, 2008 http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2007/may/16/business.waste http://www.abolishplasticbags.org.uk/ http://www.plasticbagfree.com http://banchoryagainstplastic.wordpress.com/about/</p>	<p>Seyfang, G. (2006). Ecological citizenship and sustainable consumption: examining local organic food networks.</p> <p>Erskine, C.C., Collins, L. (1997). Eco-labelling: success or failure?</p> <p>Reisch, L.A. (2001). Eco-labeling and sustainable consumption in Europe – lessons to be learned from the introduction of a national label for organic food.</p> <p>Salzman, J. (1998). Product and raw material eco-labelling: the limits for a transatlantic approach. www.eostreorganics.org.uk www.soilassociation.org</p>	<p>Introduction of traffic congestion pricing in Seoul, Korea http://hydms001.iges.or.jp/APEIS/RISPO/inventory/db/pdf/0056.pdf www.commuterchallenge.com Nortel Networks Green Commute www.toolsofchange.com</p>

4.1. Use of Plastic Bags

During recent decades consumption of plastic has become a matter of big concern, as the world produces 200 million tons of it a year, and 96% of it is not recycled. A big deal of this volume goes for packaging that is used only once and then goes in landfills, and plastic bags are a big amount of this waste. Plastic waste is not biodegradable and represents a serious danger of contaminating soil, the ocean and animals. It is especially threatening to the marine fauna, as most of marine litter comes from land and is lethal to many marine species when they try to eat it or encounter it in other ways (www.plasticbagfree.com).

This problem is increasingly recognized by many countries in the world. In several of them plastic bags have already been phased out, in others various measures are sought to stop or decrease use of plastic bags. Below are two examples of campaigns aimed at ceasing their consumption.

4.1.1. Plastic Bags Levy in the Republic of Ireland

Environment Minister of the Republic of Ireland initiated the debate on plastic bags, leading the discussion to introduction of a levy. After it, negotiations with the retail sector were made for a number of compromises (i.e. smaller plastic bags to be issued for meat and fish). Finally, a levy on plastic bags was introduced in 2002, as a measure of litter reduction, and not as a measure of reducing amounts of waste sent to landfill. It was set as 10-15 cents per bag and was enforced overnight. Immediately it brought to 94% reduction in the issuing of plastic bags, from 1.3 billion the number was reduced to 100 million.

It is argued that the key success of this policy was that the levy was included into the VAT return process, and has not brought to new administrative burdens for retailers. They were simply to include the amount of plastic bags they had distributed. Importantly - as a preliminary measure the population was informed on the levy's goals through a publicity campaign, what made it both effective and popular, so that approval ratings for the levy reached 91%.

This policy measure overall has now been considered as one of the most successful (Environment Committee). However, in the next years there was observed a slight reversal: between 2004 and 2007, the number of plastic bags has increased over 100 million, as well as litter arising from them. Nevertheless, overall the policy remains to be successful: between these years five billion of plastic bags have not been used.

But it has also brought negative outcomes that cannot be overlooked. The number of bin liners (plastic bags used for inside of rubbish bins) increased for 77%. The use of paper bags has also grown. Both these type of bags are more damaging to the environment than the plastic bags. Having seen this, the Scottish Parliament as well as present Irish Environment Minister expressed their fear of adverse effects of plastic bag levy, leading to people using more plastic in other forms (Environment Committee).

4.1.2. Modbury – England’s First Plastic Bag Free Town

From May, 2007 the town of Modbury officially became the first town in UK that stopped issuing plastic bags at retail shops. This venture was supported first of all by retailers, but initially started not by a campaigner or green activist but by a Modbury’s inhabitant, wildlife filmmaker Rebecca Hosking. During making a film about marine wildlife, she saw the plastic (bags, bottles, pens, toys) that had killed huge amounts of marine animals. On coming back to Modbury, she felt committed to take action, and began preparing her plan of plastic bags ban, looking for their possible alternatives. In April, 2007 she called a meeting for local merchants, showed them a film, provided other evidence of plastic pollution of the ocean and presented her plan to ban the plastic bags, which was then supported by majority and implemented overnight. As alternatives, cornstarch bags for 10 cents each began to be sold, however most locals started carrying reusable canvas shopping bags.

Campaigns manager for Greenpeace D. Kennedy commented on this campaign as follows:

"I see the case of reusable bags as fairly superficial, but also very useful.. The best thing about the plastic bag campaign is that people recognized the ecological world view; that everything is linked. It's also very empowering that so many people have engaged, and so quickly" (www.plasticbagfree.com).

The initiator of the campaign R. Hosking added: *"My personal view is that the disposable plastic bag is the icon of our unsustainable lifestyles. I know that removing plastic bags from our lives won't make us a sustainable culture anymore than saving the polar bear will stop global warming. However, plastic bags and polar bears will make us all stop and think about the bigger picture"* (www.plasticbagfree.com).

The main aim of the Modbury campaign was to encourage people using a reusable bag, since it is the most environmentally friendly owing to its durability and total compostability at the end of its life (it is estimated that an average cloth bag in its

lifetime will save the owner from using at least a 1000 plastic bags). The prices for all the disposable alternatives to plastic bags are passed to customers, what brought to a 90% reduction in use of disposable bags across the town.

The overnight change has not harmed the trade but only increased public interest about the campaign. As is in the Irish case, the measure was also widely accepted by customers. The complaints about charging for bags were rather few and soon after disappeared.

On the Modbury campaign website there is a detailed description of the steps taken. The campaign included such submeasures as negotiating with retailers, informing for customers, one-time handout of cloth bags. The authors warn that the information provided serves only as a free reference, and advise to think of other ways of how it can be applied and altered to fit with the needs of a community that wants to follow this successful example (www.plasticbagfree.com). It should also be noted that the whole initiative was completely voluntary, unpaid and carried out by ordinary citizens of Modbury.

Comparison 1

From the Irish levy example a number of policy parameters have become rather evident. First is that a levy is indeed a type of instrument that addresses individuals as self-interested economic actors. They are to decrease the use of plastic bags because it is their own interest to avoid the imposed expense. Second, it is rather an intrusive measure, however, not as intrusive as a ban, since customers do still have an option to buy a bag. Therefore, the behaviour change is apparently compulsory. The spatial effect is bound to the Irish territory, as, most probably, shopping abroad the Irish consumers would again use free plastic bags, as they would not be economically incentivized to do otherwise.

The second example from Modbury is contrary. The individuals acted as responsible, environmentally conscious people not caring so much about economic aspects of the anti-plastic bag campaign. Moreover, they felt like a community of action with a strong sense of civil belonging both to their own town and the wider environment. Thereby the measure was voluntary and non-intrusive. The spatial effect of it must be non-territorial, as people acting upon their belief in the harm of plastic bags would, most probably, not use plastic bags regardless of a country they shop in. Either, it is not likely that they would excessively buy and use alternative bags, like made of paper or bin liners.

The success expressed in monetary terms has been equally impressive in both cases. However, it should be noted that the Irish consumers started to buy more plastic bags after some years of the levy, what led the Irish authorities to consider increasing the price for plastic bags from 15 to 22 cents. This indicates temporal vulnerability of a levy; on the contrary, to ecological citizens the price of plastic bags would stay irrelevant.

It can be argued that legitimacy has been achieved in both cases. 91% of the Irish were in favour of the levy owing to the prior publicity campaign. In Modbury the ban also met a firm support from major stakeholders. In other words, the decisions were accepted because they rest on values shared both by common citizens and policy implementers – the need to reduce needless waste and consumption.

4.2. Food Consumption

Food consumption represents one of those areas of household consumption that have biggest environmental impacts. Although most of these impacts arise in production and processing sectors, individuals have their share of influence through: choosing particular diets; demands for food and food-related areas; ways of purchasing and preparing food; and generation of organic and packaging waste (OECD, 2002). Food consumption is projected to grow in the following decades; therefore it becomes necessary to look for environmentally friendly ways of producing and consuming various products.

Quantification of environmental impacts from food consumption is an underdeveloped area: data are hard to find and/or difficult to link to an individual behaviour (ibid.). However, the following two examples of attempts to make food consumption more sustainable should allow us to see their potential for change of behaviour.

4.2.1. Eco-labelling

Eco-labelling is one of the ways of making food consumption a more sustainable practice. Since it was not possible to obtain a full example from one country, we will refer to various sources and experiences of eco-labelling programs so as to draw a fuller picture for using this instrument. Even though it is argued that there is no empirical answer if eco-labelling benefits the environment (Erskine & Collins, 1997), it is still worth to consider their potential and lessons learnt from their use.

Eco-labelling was encouraged by Agenda 21 as one of the tools to promote sustainable patterns of consumption. In the beginning of 1990's it was seen as a powerful and low-cost instrument for environmental protection of a voluntary "soft" profile, so as to complement more traditional instruments. It can be related to conventional communication instruments, as its functioning basically rests on the power of information. Namely, labelling was expected to: increase transparency and credibility of supply; provide credible information to consumers; increase awareness of personal and social risks; let consumers express their ecological concerns through their purchasing behaviour; produce indirect macro effects on sustainability of supply. All these potential benefits are deemed to be means of protecting the environment (Reisch, 2001). The practical experience of UK, Sweden, Germany and USA, however, seems surprisingly similar in identifying the difficulties of eco-labelling programs.

The UK practice of labelling for different product groups has indicated that: the scheme is elitist because it reaches 15-30% of products and so creates market barriers; it threatens exporters from developing countries because may be viewed as a protectionist measure; producers are reluctant to enter the scheme voluntarily; it lacks credibility among interest groups; the unlabelled products remain meaningless in their environmental value (Erskine & Collins, 1997).

Launching a national label for organic food in Germany in 2000 was organized as a cooperation of nine major organic farming associations. It brought rather unsuccessful results - in 2001 only 74 producers used the label for approximately 1000 products for the reasons very similar to the UK. In both countries consumers lacked trust to the label since the market has been replete with multiple eco-labels, what led to general confusion and scepticism about them (Reisch, 2001).

In the USA introduction of eco-seal for household cleaning products by a private national program, Green Seal, was witnessed to improve the environmental profile of products in the household cleaning sector. However, the American “Coalition for Truth in Environmental Marketing Information” charges against eco-labels in general, claiming that: they prevent consumers from making informed choices by training to look only for symbols; create barriers by focusing on regional environmental priorities that may be irrelevant internationally; it is impossible to develop objective scientific criteria for identifying “environmentally superior products” (Salzman, 1998).

Another important criticism relates to whose environment should be protected. Since eco-labels are developed as domestic policy instruments, they are tailored for local concerns and matters. This calls for objections from foreign exporters since they may be denied a label because of a country’s specific requirements. For example, paper from Brazil could not satisfy EU eco-labelling criteria mandating a certain minimum of recycled content, despite the fact that the Brazilian raw material was from sustainably harvested plantations and processed with hydroelectric power (ibid., p.13).

4.2.2. Eostre Organics: a local organic food network

Another means to increase sustainability of consumption, of food in particular, is producing and promoting organic food. Investment into sustainability is done by not using chemical fertilisers and pesticides, keeping animals in more natural conditions and using production methods that are friendlier to the environment. The most popular reasons for consuming organic food nowadays are: safe nutrition, protection of the environment, better taste and animal welfare (www.soilassociation.org).

Quite a rich example of how the concept of organic food realized is the organic food producer cooperative Eostre Organics in England, selling vegetables and fruit to individuals, businesses and hospitals in the East Anglia region. Its charter explicitly states:

“Eostre believes that a fair, ecological and co-operative food system is vital for the future of farming, the environment and a healthy society. Direct, open relationships between producers and consumers build bridges between communities in towns, rural areas and other countries, creating a global network of communities, not a globalised food system of isolated individuals” (www.eostreorganics.co.uk).

Commercially, Eostre has been a successful enterprise: during the first year the sales were increased for 70%. It is important to know the motivation of the consumers. A survey indicated that 75% of them chose local organic food because considered it safer, more nutritious, tastier and of better quality; 70,5 % were motivated by environmental protection – desire to avoid intensive agriculture, long food miles and packaging waste; 65,2% - because they want to strengthen the local economy and community and gain independence from global corporations and supermarkets. As respondents explain:

“...It feels like a healthier way to lead one’s life. And that also means not being so dependent on the supermarkets. Plus it means not exploiting the environment by bringing food from overseas etc. There’s an holistic quality to buying food from a local supplier”. Or:

“I believe passionately that humanity must reduce its impact on the world. Using local organic food is just one way, but for many it is the most visible and accessible way”.

Comparison 2

It is apparent that labelling programs are not intrusive since they are voluntary. Their temporal effect can be very short-term or absent at all at least presently, when there have been no clear regulations and procedures developed, thus the majority of producers and consumers in various countries remain confused.

Labelling programs clearly reveal a defect in such a dimension as legitimacy. The discussed national examples demonstrate that labelling attempts are often seen as unlawful because they may serve as protectionists or market barriers; therefore many producers oppose against their use. Moreover, consumers are distrustful about them, so they do not fully accept them, and thus the basic prerequisite of legitimacy – trust - is missing.

Even though the appeal to an individual in eco-labelling is like to an environmentally concerned, there is also an emphasis on buying eco-labelled products for the sake of own good, like being a good consumer caring for one's health and quality of life. Eco-labels are also spatially attached because they are strictly bound by and are valid only within national laws and regulations, what creates multiple difficulties.

The case of organic food approaches people and the food problem from a different standpoint. This is a vivid example of ecological citizenship, since customers of Eostre Organics are almost equally concerned for personal and environmental well-being. Either they care for improving their communities; something that is eco-labels are not intended to do. This makes clear that they are guided more by socially responsible, civil motives and make their choice based on considerations of social justice, global welfare and caring for future. Thereby, even though the organic food network is by definition local, its spatial effect is not so limited, because like in the previous case, the ecological citizens carry their values across time and space.

The claims against eco-labels cast by "Coalition for Truth in Environmental Marketing Information" are especially interesting to correlate with Eostre Organics case. The Coalition is right saying that eco-labels only coach people to react on them not considering what's behind them. In this sense Eostre Organics network has a clear superiority, as its consumers are deeply aware of the concept of organic food and are intrinsically dedicated to it. The other superiority it gains is in the question "whose environment should be protected", because it is less contingent upon international trade regulations and large corporations than the eco-labelling counterpart.

4.3. Private Car Use

Household travel, and private car use in particular, is another area where individuals gravely contribute to greenhouse effect, air and water pollution, and noise exposure. Although cars have significantly improved environmental performance, there emerges previously mentioned “rebound effect”: overall use of private cars is steadily increasing (OECD, 2002).

In many countries and cities private car use is not only a matter of environmental concern, but of traffic congestion. So-called single occupant vehicles create large traffic jams and thus produce contamination of local air and increase time of trips. We have already referred to the unsuccessful attempt to change drivers’ behaviour in Mexico City; now we will examine two more programs aimed at decreasing private car use.

4.3.1. Traffic Congestion Pricing in Korea

Since 1980’s the capital of Korea, Seoul had been suffering from heavy traffic congestion. Building more transportation facilities had not improved the situation, and Seoul Metropolitan Government took a set of measures to mitigate the congestion, namely to facilitate the use of public transport through vehicle-related taxation, congestion pricing, parking fees and car-use restraints. The policy mix consisted mainly of economic instruments complemented by awareness-raising.

From November 1996 a toll of 2000 won (about U.S. \$1.50) was introduced for private cars carrying only one or two people in two main tunnels, collected from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. at work days and from 7 a.m. to 3 p.m. on Saturdays. The penalty for violation amounted to 10,000 won (five times the congestion fee), and certain types of vehicles were exempted from charge.

Also, resident priority parking system was enforced: local streets over 5.5 meters wide were converted into one-way roads with car parking provided on one side. A citizen could rent a designated space by paying about 30,000 won (about U.S. \$23) per month. And additionally, traffic induction charge came in force for efficient management of traffic volume, on more than 1,000 square meters in floor space facilities.

In order to raise awareness and ensure acceptance of the new policy by citizens the Seoul government launched public information campaign. This led to increasing of number of carpooling vehicles, and traffic conditions significantly improved. But by 2000 the traffic volume had increased again, a bigger proportion of which consisted of toll-free vehicles (taxies, trucks, private cars with three or more people). Despite this, however, the whole policy was estimated to be relatively successful, since the average

travel speed of the two tunnel corridors steadily improved and has maintained at about 30 km/h. The use of public transportation has also increased, and overall policy has contributed to the urban economy.

4.3.2. Nortel Networks' Green Commute in Canada

In 1998, Nortel Networks, a global internet and communications corporation, began Green Commute, a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program for its campus expansion in Ottawa, Canada. The overall goal of the Green Commute was “to enhance and promote alternative commuting practices in an effort to proactively confront environmental issues facing our communities” with such specific measurable objectives as: to increase the percentage of non-auto trips from 12 % to 15 %, and to increase average auto occupancy from 1.12 to 1.3 people per car by the year 2000. It involved a wide range of municipal organizations that together initiated a wide-ranging campaign providing stimuli for and decreasing barriers to “green” commuting for 11500 people working at the Nortel Networks campus.

Prior to the campaign, the City of Ottawa and the corporation conducted a traffic count and a comprehensive online survey for gathering information on all the commuting-related issues. Subsequently, basic infrastructure elements for the program were arranged, like making the site accessible, safer and easier for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users. Additionally, a centrally located transit hub was made where people could wait for buses and obtain information on routes and scheduling. An online survey introduced Green Commute to all the employees, providing information on the program, plus a formal media event was held to formally introduce the GreenCommute.

A *carpooling initiative* was also a part of the program. After preliminary research about barriers to car-pooling, Nortel Networks developed its own custom intranet-based ride-matching system (launched in December 1998) allowing members to search for compatible carpool partners. Soon after, *Cycling Promotion Week* was organized by the Green Commute in association with the Nortel Networks Bicycle Users Group (NORBUG) and Citizens for Safe Cycling. The event was to promote cycling as an efficient form of commuting and included demonstrations on safe cycling and different bicycle designs, what resulted in a 50 percent increase in NORBUG's membership.

One of the program's biggest initiatives was *Commuter Challenge* – a national grassroots event for promoting “green” commuting practices. A part of it was “What Moves You” *transportation fair* (May 2000) with the participation of various Nortel's commercial, public partners and a non-profit environmental group. The fair intended to

provide information on a variety of commuting alternatives and included demonstrations and/or information on buses, routes, schedules and future plans, light rail in Ottawa, bicycle maps and safety, active living, environment, health. The fair also contained a component of financial incentives. Free day bus passes were distributed, and coupons redeemable for a free April transit pass. The pass was aimed at attracting those who had never tried or seldom used transit, to ride the bus for one month. Impressively, 29 percent (1,300 people) of the employees took advantage of this pass. As a result of the promotion, there was a 25 % increase in transit ridership for the succeeding month.

A special emphasis in the fair was made on the issue of climate change: Green Commute offered the opportunity to learn more about global climate change through a presentation by a leading scientist in the field. The Commuter Challenge repeated in 2004 involved over 17,000 commuters in Ottawa Region indicating significant growth from the previous years. There were 432 workplaces involved, with some companies reaching one hundred percent participation rate (www.commuterchallenge.com).

The program has been ongoing; however, except for the success of Commuter Challenge-2004, no fresher data available but for 2000. By then it had achieved sound positive outcomes: traffic count data indicated that 15 % of the approximately 5,200 employees were taking non-auto transportation (transit, telecommuting and cycling) to work in 2000, a 3 % increase from 12 percent in 1998. High turnout of employees on all the related events can serve as evidence of increased awareness and engagement. According to a posterior survey, 90 % of respondents thought the GreenCommute provided a meaningful benefit; 79 % said that it made it easier to get to work without a car; and 70 % thought that the program caused them to think more about the impacts of commuting on the environment, health and the community. Overall, everybody benefited from the program by improved transit facilities, better routes, and faster travel times.

Comparison 3

The policy of traffic congestion pricing exhibits features similar to the conventional policies described in the previous cases. The level of intrusiveness is rather high, since individuals have to change private desires and needs in such an important part of lifestyle as driving. Appeal to individuals as economic actors is also explicit.

There is no data available if Seoul citizens gave their consent for the new policy after the information campaign. However, the Seoul authorities came to conclusion that

communication instruments such as public hearings and information campaigns can be of help in mobilizing public support for a new policy. They also found out that when the pricing system is transparent and its positive results are apparent to road users the support will likely be higher. Nevertheless, indicative of legitimacy deficit in such a practice can be the fact that having found the policy quite effective, the Seoul government planned to extend the scheme to other routes leading to the city center. However, the plan was suspended because the authorities encountered public opposition and claims of double taxation. This suggests that legitimacy in such measures can be still a vulnerable matter. Apparently, the effect of this policy is very limited in time and space, as the number of cars gradually increased, and hardly are the drivers doing car pooling and use public transport once they go out of Seoul.

The Green Commute program comprised of many subprograms, some of which also used economic incentives, like giving free transit passes. However, this case can be rightfully classified as ecological citizenship for several reasons. The designers of the program took a very thorough approach in reaching people's attitudes with the help of such tools as building motivation over time, norm appeals, word-of-mouth. Altogether they were to bring a behavioural change by changing personal norms not so much through providing financial lures but through socio-psychological influence. Moreover, the grassroots event Commuter Challenge had a particular goal to promote "green commuting" and related it to the issues of active living, health and global warming. This gives a strong echo to global citizenship as a voluntary activity for the common good, and it certainly addressed people as civil-minded altruists.

Although spatially the program has been limited only to one area covering about 12000 people, it is reasonable to suggest that most people involved have built enough motivation to move sustainably not only to their work, and not only until the program is over. People's voluntary involvement, high rate of their participation, and cooperation of many governmental and non-governmental organizations at all the events suggests that the legitimacy of the program is strong.

The program's quantitative outcomes seem impressive; unfortunately they cannot be compared to the ones of traffic congestion pricing policy, since the two programs differ in scale. However, they yield some valuable considerations that will be discussed in the next section.

Now as we came through six small empirical cases and weighed them in various dimensions, it will be convenient to place their differences in a comparative table, so as to summarize them and further proceed to discussion.

Table 3. Summary table for comparative evaluation of policies for sustainable consumption: six cases

Policy Parameters Empirical Cases	Levy on Plastic Bags (Ireland)	Ban on Plastic Bags (England)	Eco-labelling programs (Germany, USA, UK)	Food Network “Eostre Organics” (England)	Traffic Congestion Pricing (Korea)	Nortel Green Commute (Canada)
	Plastic Bags (Waste Generation)			Food Consumption		Household Travel (Daily Car Use)
Appeal to an individual	Self-interested economic actor	Responsible, altruistic citizen	Individual moral actor: emphasis on own good – private side benefits and reflection on personal choices	Responsible, altruistic citizen	Self-interested economic actor	Self- and Community-interested citizen
Temporal duration	Limited: until the levy is in force	Unlimited, for a long period	Limited: until eco-labels on products are present	Unlimited, for a long period	Limited: until the pricing is in force	Unlimited, for a long period
Spatial effect	Limited: only in Ireland	Unlimited: although the ban is valid only in Modbury, its inhabitants are likely to maintain their behaviour elsewhere	Limited: only where there are labels that a buyer is familiar with and trustful to	Unlimited: it is likely that the clients would seek to buy organic products elsewhere	Limited: only in Seoul	Limited/Unlimited: the program is designed only for the campus; however, it is likely that the commuters would look for sustainable transportation elsewhere
Source of initiative	Top-down	Bottom-up	Top-down	Bottom-up	Top-down	Multilevel network cooperation - mixed
Behaviour change	Compulsory	Compulsory	Voluntary	Voluntary	Compulsory	Voluntary
Level of intrusiveness	High	High	Low	Low	High	Low
Legitimacy	Medium/Low	High	Very low	High	Medium/Low	High

5. Discussion

Investigation of six compact cases and summarizing its results in the table now allow us to answer the main research question - What are the advantages and disadvantages of environmental citizenship for sustainable consumption in practice?

All three cases of ecological citizenship show that it can be a powerful tool for behaviour change.

Ecological citizenship has a particular advantage over other approaches in terms of raising awareness, developing attitudes and intrinsic motivation for sustainable behaviours, what is especially well proved by the comparison to eco-labelling: while eco-labels do not teach much about sustainability, but incline people to react on labels without much consideration what is behind them. On the opposite, ecological citizens make a more motivated choice based on their ethical attitudes and personal devotion.

Another vast advantage of ecological citizenship is its non-territoriality – it is indeed above national boundaries, and does promote behaviour change which is not fixed on a particular terrain. Modbury inhabitants would most probably not use plastic bags anywhere they go, as well as Eostre’s customers would everywhere look for organic food, and Nortel Networks’ staff would tend to choose sustainable means of transport, because what drives them are their values and attitudes. On the contrary, in case of the three conventional policies, people would either feel freedom elsewhere (like in taking plastic bags), not know what to buy (like in choosing sustainable food) or get back to unsustainable behaviour because there would be no means of control (like no toll bars for Seoul drivers).

The same advantage applies to the temporal aspect – ecological citizenship seems to produce a more continued effect, most probably because values and attitudes are harder to destroy than economic interests. The case of plastic bags levy and traffic congestion pricing vividly show how economic “carrots and sticks” expire over time – people get used to the price and tend to increase their consumption regardless of it. On the contrary, ecological citizens disregard change of price over time (in the organic food case they are even willing to pay the higher, but more fair price). It also indicates that they are more independent from economic variations and political changes (suppose a new government repeals a policy).

One more gross advantage is that the programs initiated by ecological citizens (Modbury ban, Eostre organics), or with the use of the theoretical premises and elements of ecological citizenship (Nortel Networks) meet full consent and high support of people in place. This suggests that these initiatives fully corresponded to their values

and beliefs, and consequently are highly legitimate. However, it is not so with attempted introduction of ban on plastic ban in London or traffic congestion pricing in other Korean cities than Seoul, where there have emerged public protests.

Except these direct benefits that ecological citizenship gives, it also brings a very positive sort of “side effect” that can be termed as social sustainability. At least in the case of Modbury plastic bags ban and Eostre Organics food network it is vivid that the citizenly activities provide social cohesion, awaken collective feelings and encourage for better health and welfare of a person and a community. There is already more evidence that local initiatives like these help coping with social exclusion, improve democracy and better the quality of decisions, as they are made with local knowledge (Environment Agency, 2005).

What also apparent now is that this phenomenon has a strongly expressed bottom-up nature. That is probably why it brings so many benefits - grassroots movements, from the very society, are based on local knowledge and genuine initiative, and are thus potentially more viable than any commands descending from official bodies.

It would be interesting to extrapolate the working and effects of these ecological citizenship campaigns in the three areas of consumption to other ones, for instance energy, water consumption or tourism travel. It seems like the whole picture would stay the same: citizens would deliberately behave pro-environmentally when it comes to any area of their consumption.

With all this it may seem that environmental citizenship is an excellent way to sustainable future. But unfortunately it also reveals a number of weaknesses that represent a serious obstacle en route to making it an extensive policy.

A significant disadvantage of ecological citizenship can be that it may be too much time- and resource-consuming. The case of plastic bags ban in Modbury has been very successful in this way: the campaign was organized only during a number of months and was not too costly. The time and costs related to creation and support of Eostre Organics food network could also be reasonable, considering the fact that it is economically profitable. However, the Nortel Networks’ Green commute has been, beyond all doubt, very costly, if to count all the subprograms and accompanying infrastructure arrangements. This suggests that as a grassroots initiative, ecological citizenship may still be justifiable in terms of time and money spent; however there are doubts about it if the initiative is organized on a bigger scale, i.e. takes more or less a form of policy. Probably public domains in many countries would not be able to find so many resources; if only they attract powerful corporations, like Nortel Networks in Canada.

However, the entire attempt may seem too costly and hard, especially when a problem is of an urgent character and involves a large population (for example, reduction of severe traffic congestion in a populous city). Even though three cases of environmental citizenship have been called economically successful, it may only be due to their local, small-scale character.

Another serious obstacle and disadvantage of environmental citizenship is that it remains a challenge how to mobilize individuals for action in the conditions of benevolence. There has not been such a problem in UK and Canada; however, what can guarantee that elsewhere people would be the same enthusiastic and active in joining a public campaign? It is fair to suggest that in particular places and circumstances people would lack motivation and/or personal resources to join for an environmental action. This again reduces the potential of environmental citizenship as a policy strategy.

Overall it can be said that the practices of environmental citizenship have qualitative strengths versus quantitative ones of the conventional policies. Whereas the former secures better results in terms of temporal and spatial duration of pro-environmental behaviour, provides high legitimacy and independence from economic and political wind, the latter is more effective in operative solving of large-scale problems.

Conclusion

Theoretical deliberations together with consideration of the case-studies have brought to the point where we can place ecological citizenship into the greater domain of environmental politics and finally conclude on how it can be used in policies for promotion of sustainable consumption.

Environmental citizenship, as we have seen, is a practice between individuals, society, state and nature that expands beyond formal relationship of duties and rights and makes individuals contribute to the global welfare through conscious pro-environmental behaviour. It also became apparent that this practice is a part of the change from government to governance. Activation of citizens brings transformation into the governing process, by which no longer only governments are to command and control, but citizens and other social institutions are to mobilize and perform. This is also a part of move towards “generative policies” that allow “individuals and groups to make things happen, rather than have things happen to them, in the context of overall social concerns and goals” (Giddens, 1994, p. 15 in Huppel & Simonis, 2000). Inclusion of more public and private actors and allowing persuasion and negotiation into the policy process seek to make policies more inclusive, but less intrusive (Hogl, Pregernig, 2009).

Three empirical examples have shown that ecological citizens aspire not only to improve the state of environment, but cure other social maladies, like environmental injustice, social disintegration and personal ill-being. This group of people understands better than others that sustainability entails eliminating many human problems that are all strongly interrelated. As has been shown, they have good achievements in these aspirations. That is why environmental citizenship should be considered by various governments and institutions as a good way to sustainability. We are now also better equipped to answer to the previously posed dilemma of treating individuals as consumers or citizens when designing policies for sustainable consumption.

As has been demonstrated, environmental citizenship is hard to make a full-fledged policy. Since it requires many structural arrangements and infrastructural preparations, it becomes time- and resource-consuming. Considering that many of contemporary environmental problems are rather large-scale and urgent to mitigate, the idea of gradual and resource-intensive fostering of ecological citizenship may be unaffordable.

However, it does not exclude the possibility of integration of elements of environmental citizenship into more extensive top-down policies – for example, to

combine financial incentives and disincentives with using mechanisms for building motivation over time and norm appeals. This will let people activate or develop their citizenly nature apart from economic nature. Apparently, economic policy instruments will not lose their immediate and effective force in changing behaviour and bringing a desired change. However, it is wrong to ignore other values and motivations people may have, like their commitments and desire to protect the environment. Therefore, it is reasonable to combine the role of a citizen and consumer in policy-making, i.e. to interweave traditional policy instruments with those environmental citizenship-like. Such a combination is most likely to be possible in a democratic society, where an individual is endowed trust to freely act as a citizen and influence the state of affairs from the bottom to the top – from a local to the governmental level.

It should be recognized, however, that the challenge remains to transform the consciousness of many people and activate their sense of obligations towards community and environment, so as to make the practice of environmental citizenship and policies combining citizen and consumer a more effective undertaking. How do to it is now being investigated in many research projects. They suggest to encourage citizenship through education; social learning - changing individual's behaviour by following surrounding people so as to gradually change social norms; action research; participative decision-making; supporting and facilitating volunteers and already existing initiatives – these are only some possible interventions (Environment Agency, 2005).

Last but not least, it should be recognized that in order to achieve a sustainable today and tomorrow, changing individual consumption patterns by whatever means will not be enough. This is only a small share in the whole production and consumption infrastructure.

References

- Adger, W.N., Brown, K., Fairbrass, J., Jordan, A., Paavola, J., Rosendo, S., Seyfang, G. (2004). Governance for sustainability: towards a “thick” understanding of environmental decision making. Working Paper, Centre for Social and Economic Research.
- Agenda 21*. (1991). Retrieved May 2009, from <http://www.gdrc.org/u-gov/a21-decision-making.html>
- Beetham, D. (1999). *The Legitimation of Power: Issues in Political Theory*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Berglund, C., Matti, S. (2006). Citizen and Consumer: the Dual Role of Individuals in Environmental Policy. *Environmental Politics*. Vol. 15, N^o4, pp. 550-571.
- Bont Voor Dieren. Dutch Animal Protection Organization. Retrieved June, 2009 from <http://www.bontvoordieren.nl/english/dutch.php>
- Biopesticide Industry Alliance. Organic Food Labelling in Canada. Retrieved June, 2009 from <http://www.biopesticideindustryalliance.org/images/organiccanada.pdf>
- Dobson, A. (2007). Environmental citizenship: empirical reflections. Retrieved May 8, 2009 from <http://sdrnadmin.rechord.com/wp-content/uploads/andrew-dobson-presentation.pdf>
- Dobson, A. (2003). *Citizenship and the Environment*. Oxford University Press
- Dobson, A. (2005). Globalisation, Cosmopolitanism and the Environment. *International Relations*. Vol. 19, N^o3, pp. 259-273.
- Dobson, A. (2008). There is an alternative: environmental citizenship. *Green World*. Vol. GW61, p. 15.
- Erskine, C.C., Collins, L. (1997). Eco-labelling: success or failure? *The Environmentalist*. Vol. 17, pp. 125-133.
- Environment Agency. *Environmental Citizenship: Literature Review*. Retrieved December, 2008 from www.environment-agency.gov.uk
- Fournier, V. (2008). Escaping from the economy: the politics of degrowth. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*. Vol.28, N^o 11/12, pp. 528-545.
- Glasbergen, P. (1998). *Co-operative Environmental Governance. Public-Private Agreements as a Policy Strategy*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Global Footprint Network (2005). Retrieved June, 2009 from <http://www.ecofoot.net>
- Guardian: M&S to charge for plastic bags. Retrieved June, 2009 at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2007/nov/06/waste.recycling>

- Hogl, K., Pregernig, M. (2009) New Modes of governance in environmental and natural resource policy: Conceptual innovations and empirical insights". Coordinated paper at 15th International Symposium on Society and Resource Management. Vienna.
- Huppes, G., Simonis U.E. (2000). *Environmental policy instruments in a new era*. Working Paper. Centre of Environmental Science, Leiden University.
- Huckle, J. Citizenship Education for sustainable development in initial teacher training. (1998). Retrieved December, 2008, from http://www.citized.info/pdf/induction/John_Huckle.pdf
- MacGregor, S., Pardoe, S., Dobson, A., Bell, D. (2005). Environmental Citizenship. The Goodenough primer. Retrieved January, 2009 from www.environmentalcitizenship.net
- Marshall, T.H. (1950). "Citizenship and Social Class" in: *Citizenship and Social Class*; T.H. Marshall/Tom Bottomore; London et altera: Pluto Press1992, pp. 101-102
- Matti, S. (2004). *The individual or the community: towards a common understanding understanding of values*. Working paper, Uppsala University.
- Matti, S. (2008). *From sustainable consumers to ecological citizens: elucidating attitudes towards individual environmental action in Sweden*. SHARP Working Paper.
- Micheletti M., Berlin D., Barkman H.. Sustainable citizenship: opportunities and barriers for citizen involvement in sustainable development. Retrieved June, 2009 from http://www.statsvet.su.se/homepages/archive/michele_micheletti/micheletti_sustainable_citizenship_project_feb_09.pdf
- Mickwitz, P. (2003). A framework for evaluating environmental policy instruments. Finnish Environment Institute, Finland.
- Nederland Vliegtax Vrij Initiatief. Holland finally got rid of the Flight Tax. Retrieved June, 2009 from <http://www.nederlandvliegtaxvrij.nl>
- OECD, 2002. *Policies to Promote Sustainable Consumption: An Overview*. ENV/EPOC/WPNEP(2001)18/FINAL. OECD, Paris.
- Ockwell, D., Whitmarsh, L., O'Neill, S. (2009). Reorienting climate change communication for effective mitigation. Forcing people to be green or fostering grass-roots engagement? *Science Communication*. Vol. 30, N^o 3, pp. 305-327.
- Paehlke, R. Ethics, Green Citizenship and Globalization. Retrieved December, 2008, from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/7/2/5/3/p72537_index.html
- Persson, A. (2007). *Choosing environmental policy instruments: case studies of municipal waste policy in Sweden and England*. PhD Thesis. London School of Economics and Political Science. Retrieved March 2009 from Stockholm Environment Institute digital library.
- Peters, B. G. (1998). *Comparative politics: theory and methods*. Basingstoke, Palgrave

Radio Netherlands/Expatica. Dutch Environmental flight tax to stay. Retrieved in June, 2009 at http://www.expatica.com/nl/news/local_news/Dutch-environmental-flight-tax-to-stay.html

Reisch, L.A. (2001). Eco-labeling and sustainable consumption in Europe – lessons to be learned from the introduction of a national label for organic food. *Consumer Interests Annual*. Vol. 47, pp. 1-6.

Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. Retrieved June, 2009 from <http://www.un-documents.net/wced-ocf.htm>

Sachs, W. (2002). *Nach uns die Zukunft. Der globale Konflikt um Gerechtigkeit und Ökologie*. Frankfurt/Main.

Salzman, J. (1998). *Product and raw material eco-labelling: the limits for a transatlantic approach*. Working paper 117, Washington College of Law.

SDC (Sustainable Development Commission). (2004). *Shows promise. But must try harder*, London.

Selman P., Parker J. (1997). Citizenship, civicness and social capital in Local Agenda 21. *Local Environment*, Vol. 2, Nº2, pp. 171-183.

Seyfang, G. (2006). Ecological citizenship and sustainable consumption: examining local organic food networks. *Journal of Rural Studies*. Vol. 22, pp. 383-395.

Stoker, G. (1998). *Governance as theory: five propositions*. UNESCO, Blackwell Publishers.

Sustainable Consumption: Facts and Trends. World Business Council for Sustainable Development. Retrieved January, 2009 from http://www.wbcsd.org/DocRoot/I9Xwhv7X5V8cDIHbHC3G/WBCSD_Sustainable_Consumption_web.pdf

Timilisina G., Dulal H. (2009). *A review of regulatory instruments to control environmental externalities from the transport sector*. Policy research working paper. The World Bank. Retrieved June, 2009 from <http://econ.worldbank.org>

Vedung, E. (1999). Constructing effective government information campaigns for energy conservation and sustainability: lessons from Sweden. *International Planning Studies*. Vol. 4, Nº 2, pp. 237-252.

Walter, J., Simms, A. (2006), *The End of Development? Global Warming Disasters and the Great Reversal of Human Progress*, New Economic Foundation, London.