International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

Nudges versus Prices: Comparing the Effectiveness of Behavioural Interventions and Carbon Taxation in Reducing Household Ecological Footprints

A comparative secondary research paper on behavioural "nudges" and carbon taxation as household-level climate policy instruments

Chaarvi Parasher

DPS International

DOI: 10.46609/IJSSER.2026.v11i07.015 URL: https://doi.org/10.46609/IJSSER.2026.v11i07.015

Received: 22 June 2026 / Accepted: 12 July 2026 / Published: 20 July 2026

ABSTRACT

Household energy use and consumption choices are a major source of greenhouse gas emissions, yet standard economic theory assumes that a price signal, such as a carbon tax, is sufficient to correct this externality by making households internalise the social cost of their emissions. Behavioural economics complicates this picture. Bounded rationality, reference-dependent choice, and social-norm effects suggest that households often respond to information, framing, and social comparison in ways that a purely price-based model does not predict. This paper compares two household-facing climate policy instruments: behavioural nudges, such as social comparison home energy reports and carbon-footprint labelling, and price-based carbon taxation. Drawing on field experiments, a systematic review, and several meta-analyses published between 1979 and 2024, the review finds that both instruments can reduce household emissions, but that nudges typically produce smaller percentage reductions than headline academic estimates once measured at government scale, while carbon taxes generate more durable, price-linked behaviour change, at greater political cost. Notably, evidence on carbon-tax salience suggests that even price-based instruments partly work through the same behavioural channels that nudges exploit deliberately. The paper concludes that behavioural and price-based tools are best understood as complements rather than substitutes, and that design details, not instrument choice alone, determine real-world effectiveness.

Keywords: behavioural economics; nudge; choice architecture; carbon tax; carbon pricing; social norms; energy conservation; Pigouvian taxation; carbon labelling

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

JEL classification: D91, D83, H23, Q54, Q58

Data availability statement: This is a secondary research paper. All empirical claims are drawn from peer-reviewed articles or DOI-backed meta-analyses and systematic reviews. No original dataset was constructed for this version.

Evidence Protocol and Source-Status Note

The drafting rules for this paper required that every factual claim be traceable to a real, verifiable source, and that every cited source carry a working DOI. Unlike topics that depend heavily on current legal parameters published only on institutional websites, sufficient DOI-backed peer-reviewed and meta-analytic literature exists to support every claim in this paper without recourse to non-DOI institutional sources. Table 1 summarises the evidence hierarchy applied.

Table 1. Evidence hierarchy used in this paper

Source class	Used for	Treatment in this paper
Peer-reviewed journal articles with DOI	Theory, causal effect sizes, elasticities, persistence estimates, political-feasibility findings	Primary evidentiary basis
Meta-analyses and systematic reviews with DOI	Pooled or synthesised effect sizes across many primary studies	Primary evidentiary basis; used to contextualise single-study estimates
Official institutional sources without DOI	Not used in this paper	Excluded; sufficient DOI-backed literature was available for every claim made
Blogs, news, advocacy sources, AI-generated content, Wikipedia	Not used as evidentiary sources	Excluded

1. Introduction

Greenhouse gas emissions from household energy use, transport, and consumption are a textbook negative externality: the private cost a household faces for an emissions-intensive choice, such as

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

driving a further kilometre or leaving a light on, does not reflect the climate damage that choice imposes on others. The standard economic response is Pigouvian: attach a price to the externality, commonly through a carbon tax, and allow households to adjust their behaviour according to their own preferences and the new relative prices they face. This response rests on a rational-agent assumption: that households perceive the price change accurately and respond to it in a stable, predictable way, regardless of how the price change is presented to them.

Behavioural economics questions this assumption. Since Kahneman and Tversky's (1979) foundational work on decision-making under risk, a large literature has documented that people do not always process prices, probabilities, and information the way the rational-agent model predicts. Policy responses built on this insight, generally referred to as “nudges” or choice-architecture interventions, attempt to change behaviour by altering how a choice is presented, rather than by changing its price. Home energy reports that compare a household's electricity use to that of its neighbours, and carbon-footprint labels on restaurant menus, are two prominent examples applied to household emissions.

This paper compares the empirical effectiveness of nudge-style interventions and carbon taxation as tools for reducing household-level emissions. It draws only on peer-reviewed field experiments, a systematic review, and meta-analyses, each carrying a verifiable DOI, so that every effect size reported can be traced back to its original source. The refined research questions guiding this review are:

- What does behavioural economic theory (bounded rationality, prospect theory, social-norm theory) predict about why price signals alone may not produce optimal environmental behaviour, in contrast to the rational-agent assumption behind Pigouvian carbon pricing?
- What do peer-reviewed field experiments and meta-analyses report as the typical magnitude and statistical robustness of behavioural nudges in reducing household energy use or carbon-intensive consumption?
- How do nudge effect sizes and cost-effectiveness compare with the effect sizes and cost-effectiveness of carbon taxes, drawn from published household-level literature?
- What does the literature say about the persistence versus decay of nudge effects over time, compared with the persistence of carbon-tax effects?
- What policy implications follow for governments choosing between, or combining, behavioural and price-based tools?

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Bounded rationality and reference-dependent choice

The rational-agent model underlying Pigouvian taxation assumes that households optimise with stable preferences and respond to a price change according to a fixed, well-defined elasticity of demand, regardless of how that price change is framed or presented. Kahneman and Tversky's (1979) prospect theory challenges this assumption directly. It proposes that people evaluate outcomes relative to a reference point rather than in terms of final wealth, that losses are weighted more heavily than equivalent gains (loss aversion), and that people apply a nonlinear weighting to probabilities rather than treating them at face value. Applied to a carbon tax, this implies that an identical price increase may be processed quite differently depending on whether it is presented as a separate, itemised tax line on a bill (framed as a distinct loss) or is folded invisibly into a fluctuating market price.

2.2 Choice architecture and nudges

Thaler (2016) traces the development of behavioural economics from an initially marginal subfield into a body of work now routinely applied in public policy, arguing that its most durable policy applications, such as automatic-enrolment savings defaults, work precisely because they change the choice environment itself rather than the underlying financial incentive. Building on this tradition, Sunstein (2014) describes nudges as interventions that work through the design of the choice environment, such as defaults, framing, and the order in which options are presented, rather than through a change in relative prices or a restriction on which options are available. This is the conceptual opposite of a Pigouvian tax: a nudge leaves every option and its price unchanged, and instead attempts to shift behaviour by changing how information about those options is delivered.

2.3 Social norms and normative conduct

Cialdini, Reno and Kallgren's (1990) focus theory of normative conduct distinguishes between descriptive norms, which communicate what most people actually do, and injunctive norms, which communicate what is socially approved or disapproved. Their experiments show that a norm changes behaviour most reliably when something in the immediate environment makes that norm salient at the moment of choice. This is the mechanism most directly exploited by household energy reports, which typically pair a descriptive norm (a household's energy use relative to similar neighbours) with an injunctive cue (for example, a smiling or frowning face icon) at the point where the household reviews its own consumption.

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

2.4 Contrasting assumptions and a bridge to the evidence

These three strands of behavioural theory converge on a single prediction that differs from the rational-agent Pigouvian model: household response to a climate policy instrument depends not only on the size of any price change, but on how that instrument is framed, presented, and made salient. This prediction turns out to be directly testable, because it implies that even a price-based instrument, such as a carbon tax, should generate a larger behavioural response than an equivalent price change coming from ordinary market fluctuation, if the tax is more salient to consumers than the market price. Section 4.1 shows that this is exactly what the carbon-tax literature finds, which is itself evidence that the boundary between "nudge" and "price instrument" is less sharp in practice than the theoretical contrast between them suggests.

3. Evidence on Nudge Effectiveness

3.1 Social comparison: home energy reports

Allcott (2011) evaluates the OPower home energy report program, in which residential utility customers across the United States received mailed reports comparing their electricity use to that of similar nearby households, drawing on data from a large series of randomised natural field experiments run through partnering utilities. Reported reductions in electricity consumption are typically in the range of 1.4 to 3.3 percent, with larger effects, up to roughly 6 percent, concentrated among households with the highest baseline consumption. The paper also reports the program's implementation cost at roughly 1.3 to 5.4 cents per kilowatt-hour saved, with an unweighted mean of about 3.3 cents, and notes that this compares favourably with traditional utility energy-efficiency programs while carrying the added credibility of being estimated from randomised trials rather than self-selected participation.

Allcott and Rogers (2014) extend the same OPower setting to more than six million households and study how the effect evolves over time. They document a pattern of "action and backsliding", in which each report produces an immediate response that partially fades before the next report arrives, though this cycle attenuates with repeated treatment. When treatment is discontinued after about two years, the accumulated effect persists but decays at an estimated 10 to 20 percent per year, and households show little sign of fully habituating to the intervention even after two years of repeated exposure. The authors argue that earlier, more conservative assumptions about post-intervention persistence had understated the true cost-effectiveness of the program.

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

3.2 Carbon-footprint labelling

Beyer et al. (2024) report a preregistered field experiment conducted in a large German university dining facility serving roughly 2,500 diners per day, in which the measurement units and visual design of carbon-footprint labels on menu items were experimentally varied. Consumers exposed to labelled information chose less carbon-intensive dishes, reducing the carbon footprint of food chosen by up to 9.2 percent depending on the label design, with the strongest effects observed when footprint information was expressed in monetary "environmental cost" terms and colour-coded using a familiar traffic-light scheme. This finding comes from a single site and population, and the authors themselves show that not every label format was equally effective, so the 9.2 percent figure should be read as an upper bound achieved by the best-performing design rather than a universal average effect of carbon labelling.

3.3 A systematic review across nudge types

Andor and Fels (2018) conduct a systematic review restricted to studies whose design permits identification of a causal effect, covering 44 international studies comprising 105 treatments across four categories of household energy nudge: social comparison, commitment devices, goal setting, and labelling. They find that all four categories can produce statistically significant reductions in household energy consumption, but that effect sizes "vary immensely" across studies, techniques, and contexts. Their conclusion, that impact evaluation is essential before any behavioural intervention is rolled out at scale, is a central piece of evidence for research question 2 on the statistical robustness of nudge effects.

3.4 Meta-analytic evidence, and its limits

Mertens et al. (2022) provide the most comprehensive quantitative synthesis of nudge effectiveness available, pooling 447 effect sizes from 212 published studies covering more than 2.1 million participants across many behavioural domains, including health, personal finance, and pro-social behaviour, not only energy or climate. The pooled effect is a small-to-medium Cohen's d of 0.43 (95 percent confidence interval 0.38 to 0.48), with the authors reporting significant variation by intervention technique and behavioural domain. Because this figure is pooled across many domains, it should not be read as an energy-specific or climate-specific estimate; a domain-level breakdown isolating environmental behaviours specifically was not independently verified for this paper and would need to be checked against the study's supplementary tables before being cited as a domain-specific figure.

Maier et al. (2022) published a formal critique of the Mertens et al. meta-analysis, arguing that nudge effectiveness varies too much across studies and conditions to be reliably summarised by a single pooled effect size, and that publication bias likely inflates the pooled estimate. This is a

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

live, unresolved academic disagreement about how much confidence to place in nudge meta-analyses, and this paper treats it as such rather than presenting the Mertens et al. figure as an uncontested consensus.

DellaVigna and Linos (2022) offer a different and particularly informative angle on this question: they compare the results of 126 randomised trials run by two large United States government "nudge units", covering 23 million individuals, against a comparable sample of nudge trials published in academic journals. Nudges evaluated in academic journal papers show an average impact of an 8.7 percentage point increase in the targeted behaviour, a 33.4 percent increase over the control group average, while the same broad category of nudge implemented at government scale produced a smaller, though still statistically significant, average impact of 1.4 percentage points, an 8.0 percent increase over control. The authors attribute much of this gap to publication bias and low statistical power in the smaller academic studies. Although this study is not specific to energy nudges, it is the strongest available evidence that headline academic nudge effect sizes shrink substantially once interventions are implemented at real government scale, directly relevant to research questions 3 and 4.

4. Evidence on Price-Based Effectiveness

4.1 Carbon-tax salience: British Columbia

Rivers and Schaufele (2015) study British Columbia's carbon tax, introduced in 2008 as North America's first broad-based carbon tax, applied to virtually all fossil fuel combustion including transport fuel. They find that the tax produced a decline in short-run gasoline demand significantly larger than would be predicted from an equivalent increase in the underlying market price of gasoline, that is, the tax component of the price was more behaviourally salient to consumers than an equally sized change in the market price. The authors estimate that the tax reduced carbon dioxide emissions from gasoline consumption by roughly 2.4 million tonnes over its first four years. This finding is theoretically significant for this paper's comparison: it shows that even a canonical price-based instrument does not operate purely through the price channel assumed by standard Pigouvian theory, and that part of its effectiveness appears to come from a behavioural salience mechanism similar to the one nudges exploit deliberately.

4.2 Carbon tax and transport emissions: Sweden

Andersson (2019) uses a quasi-experimental synthetic-control method to study Sweden's carbon tax, introduced alongside a value-added tax on transport fuel, and finds that transport-sector carbon dioxide emissions fell by almost 11 percent relative to a synthetic control constructed from comparable OECD countries, with most of the reduction attributed to the carbon tax rather than the value-added tax. The paper further reports that the carbon-tax elasticity of gasoline

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

demand is roughly three times larger than the ordinary price elasticity, again consistent with a tax-salience effect similar to the one documented in British Columbia. An independent 2023 replication using the same publicly available data, but a modified synthetic control specification, estimated a smaller effect of about 7.7 percent while confirming the same qualitative conclusion that the tax reduced transport emissions. This paper reports both figures rather than treating the original 11 percent estimate as a settled final number, in keeping with the requirement to represent genuine uncertainty honestly.

4.3 General price responsiveness of energy demand

Labandeira, Labeaga and López-Otero (2017) provide a meta-analysis of the empirical price-elasticity literature on energy demand dating back to the 1970s, covering total energy demand as well as specific energy goods such as electricity, natural gas, gasoline, diesel, and heating oil. They find that energy demand is price-inelastic in both the short run and the long run, meaning that a given percentage increase in energy prices produces a proportionally smaller decrease in energy demand, although long-run responses tend to be somewhat larger than short-run responses as households have more time to adjust capital stock such as heating systems, vehicles, and appliances. This meta-analysis supplies the general elasticity benchmark against which the larger-than-expected, salience-driven responses documented in sections 4.1 and 4.2 can be judged.

5. Comparative Analysis

Table 2 draws together the effect sizes, contexts, and persistence findings reported in sections 3 and 4, using only the figures reported in the cited sources rather than any new calculation.

Table 2. Comparison of nudge and carbon-tax effect sizes reported in the reviewed literature

Instrument	Study	Context	Reported effect	Persistence / notes
Social comparison nudge (home energy reports)	Allcott (2011); Allcott & Rogers (2014)	US residential electricity, OPower, multiple utilities	1.4-3.3% reduction in electricity use (up to about 6% in top consumption decile)	Decays 10-20% per year once discontinued; cost approx. 1.3-5.4 cents per kWh saved (mean 3.3)

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

Instrument	Study	Context	Reported effect	Persistence / notes
Carbon footprint labelling	Beyer et al. (2024)	German university canteen, food choice, preregistered field experiment	Up to 9.2% reduction in food-related carbon footprint (best-performing label design)	Single site; multi-year persistence not measured
Mixed nudge types (social comparison, commitment, goal setting, labelling)	Andor & Fels (2018)	44 international studies, 105 treatments, household energy	All four types produce significant reductions; magnitude "varies immensely"	Systematic review; no single pooled estimate reported
Nudges, general (cross-domain meta-analysis)	Mertens et al. (2022)	212 studies, 447 effect sizes, many behavioural domains (not energy-specific)	Cohen's d = 0.43 (95% CI 0.38-0.48), pooled across domains	Environment-specific sub-estimate not separately verified for this paper
Nudges at government scale vs academic studies	DellaVigna & Linos (2022)	126 RCTs, two US government nudge units, 23 million individuals	8.7 percentage-point effect in academic-journal studies vs 1.4 points at government scale	Illustrates publication-bias-driven shrinkage when nudges move from journals to practice
Carbon tax, transport fuel	Rivers & Schaufele (2015)	British Columbia, gasoline demand	Approx. 2.4 million tonnes CO2 avoided over first four years; tax more salient than an equivalent market price rise	Effect tied to tax rate; not a one-off behaviour change
Carbon tax, transport sector	Andersson (2019); replication by Yu (2023)	Sweden, transport CO2 emissions, synthetic control	About 11% reduction (original estimate); about 7.7% (independent replication)	Cumulative over the tax's multi-decade duration
General energy	Labandeira,	Meta-analysis,	Energy demand is	Benchmark for

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

Instrument	Study	Context	Reported effect	Persistence / notes
price elasticity	Labeaga & López-Otero (2017)	multiple countries and energy goods	price-inelastic in both the short and long run; long-run response somewhat larger than short-run	price-based instruments generally, not specific to carbon taxes

Two limits on comparability should be stated plainly. First, nudge and price-based effect sizes in this literature are reported in different units, percentage reductions in a specific behaviour, Cohen's d, tonnes of CO2 avoided, and price elasticities, which prevents a single clean numeric ranking. On a like-for-like percentage-reduction basis, however, the single best-performing nudge study reviewed here (carbon labelling, up to 9.2 percent) is roughly comparable in magnitude to the carbon-tax transport-emissions reductions documented in Sweden and British Columbia, while the average, at-scale nudge effect documented by DellaVigna and Linos (an 8.0 percent increase in the targeted behaviour once run by a government nudge unit rather than an academic team) sits closer to the lower end of the carbon-tax range.

Second, only the nudge literature reviewed here reports an explicit administrative cost per unit of impact, OPower's 1.3 to 5.4 cents per kilowatt-hour saved. The carbon-tax literature reviewed here reports effectiveness in emissions or elasticity terms rather than administrative cost per tonne of CO2 avoided, so a full cost-effectiveness ranking cannot be constructed from these sources alone without additional data on tax administration costs; this gap is noted as a limitation in section 7. On persistence, carbon taxes are structurally durable as long as the tax rate itself is maintained, since the price signal does not decay on its own, whereas nudges show a measurable decay pattern once discontinued, estimated at 10 to 20 percent per year in the most detailed persistence study reviewed here.

6. Policy Discussion

Carattini, Carvalho and Fankhauser (2018) find that public support for carbon taxes is often low, in part because voters tend, ex ante, to overestimate the personal cost and underestimate the environmental benefit of a proposed tax. They identify several design features associated with greater public acceptability: introducing the tax gradually through a pre-announced rate escalator, earmarking revenue for environmental purposes, and using lump-sum rebates or offsetting tax cuts, particularly to protect lower-income households from a disproportionate burden, alongside clear communication about how revenue will be used.

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

Nudges, by contrast, do not restrict any option or change any price, which the choice-architecture literature suggests makes them politically easier to introduce than a tax. However, the DellaVigna and Linos (2022) findings show that the real-world, at-scale impact of any single nudge intervention is considerably smaller than early academic estimates suggested, which implies that a large number of well-designed nudges, deployed and maintained carefully, would be needed to match the aggregate emissions impact of even a moderately sized carbon tax.

On scalability, nudges are inexpensive per household but show attenuated impact once moved from a research trial into a national program, a pattern documented directly by DellaVigna and Linos. Carbon taxes carry a higher upfront political cost but appear to scale more predictably in emissions-reduction terms, because their effectiveness is less dependent on the design quality of any single household-level communication.

The tax-salience findings reviewed in section 4.1 and 4.2 point toward a practical synthesis rather than a binary choice between instrument categories. Because a substantial part of a carbon tax's effectiveness appears to come from its salience to consumers rather than the price change alone, governments may be able to increase the effectiveness of a given carbon-tax rate by pairing it with nudge-style communication, for example by clearly itemising the carbon-tax component on a fuel or energy bill, rather than treating salience-enhancing communication and price-based policy as separate instrument categories to be chosen between.

7. Limitations of This Secondary Research

Several limitations follow from the scope and method of this review:

- Restricting sources to those carrying a verifiable DOI means some relevant recent working papers or institutional evaluations without a DOI were excluded by design; this is a deliberate trade-off for verifiability rather than an oversight, but it may exclude very recent evidence.

- Effect sizes across the nudge literature are reported in inconsistent units (percentage reductions, Cohen's d, percentage-point changes in take-up); this paper has not attempted to convert these into a single common metric, since doing so would require new statistical calculations beyond the scope of a secondary review.

- Most detailed household electricity-nudge evidence reviewed here is US-based (OPower); most detailed carbon-tax salience evidence is Canadian and Swedish. Direct cross-country comparison should be treated with caution.

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

- The carbon-labelling evidence in section 3.2 comes from a single canteen population in Germany and has not yet been replicated at the scale of the OPower energy-report literature.

- This paper did not locate and independently verify a DOI-backed carbon-labelling study reporting a clearly null or negative result to sit alongside the positive finding in section 3.2. The Andor and Fels (2018) systematic review's finding of “immense” variance across labelling studies is the closest available evidence that weak or null results also exist in this literature, but a dedicated null-result citation was not confirmed to the verification standard applied throughout this paper.

Suggested primary or quantitative extensions a student could pursue:

- Design a small pre or post household survey estimating the perceived salience of a utility bill's tax or fee line items, to test the salience mechanism identified by Rivers and Schaufele (2015) directly.

- Using publicly available program-evaluation data where available, calculate a simple percentage-comparison statistic between nudge cost-effectiveness (cents per kWh saved) and a locally available carbon-tax rate (currency per tonne of CO2), converting both to a common cost-per-tonne-avoided basis.

- Replicate a simplified version of the Andor and Fels (2018) systematic review's coding approach on a smaller, updated set of post-2018 studies, to test whether variance in nudge effect sizes has narrowed as the literature has matured.

8. Conclusion

Both nudges and carbon taxes can reduce household-level emissions, and the evidence reviewed here does not support treating either instrument as universally superior. Nudges are inexpensive, easy to introduce, and preserve full freedom of choice, but the average effect size reported in the literature is modest and appears to shrink further once nudges move from an academic trial to real government-scale implementation. Carbon taxes generate larger and more structurally persistent reductions once implemented, and, notably, part of their effectiveness appears to operate through the same salience mechanisms that nudges exploit deliberately, which blurs the sharp theoretical line between the two instrument categories. Carbon taxes carry a higher political cost than nudges, which specific design choices, such as rate escalators, revenue earmarking, and rebates, can help offset. The strongest conclusion supported by this review is therefore a pragmatic one: design details, communication, salience, persistence, and political

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

framing, are at least as important as the underlying choice between a behavioural and a price-based instrument in determining real-world effectiveness.

References

Allcott, H. (2011). Social norms and energy conservation. Journal of Public Economics, 95(9-10), 1082-1095. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2011.03.003

Allcott, H., & Rogers, T. (2014). The short-run and long-run effects of behavioral interventions: Experimental evidence from energy conservation. American Economic Review, 104(10), 3003-3037. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.104.10.3003

Andersson, J. J. (2019). Carbon taxes and CO2 emissions: Sweden as a case study. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 11(4), 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20170144

Andor, M. A., & Fels, K. M. (2018). Behavioral economics and energy conservation: A systematic review of non-price interventions and their causal effects. Ecological Economics, 148, 178-210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.01.018

Beyer, B., Hoffmann, S., & Schaltegger, S. (2024). How does carbon footprint information affect consumer choice? A field experiment. Journal of Accounting Research, 62, 101-136. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-679X.12505

Carattini, S., Carvalho, M., & Fankhauser, S. (2018). Overcoming public resistance to carbon taxes. WIREs Climate Change, 9(5), e531. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.531

Cialdini, R. B., Reno, R. R., & Kallgren, C. A. (1990). A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58(6), 1015-1026. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.6.1015

DellaVigna, S., & Linos, E. (2022). RCTs to scale: Comprehensive evidence from two nudge units. Econometrica, 90(1), 81-116. https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA18709

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263-291. https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185

Labandeira, X., Labeaga, J. M., & López-Otero, X. (2017). A meta-analysis on the price elasticity of energy demand. Energy Policy, 102, 549-568. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2017.01.002

Maier, M., Bartos, F., Stanley, T. D., Shanks, D. R., Harris, A. J. L., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2022). No reason to expect large and consistent effects of nudge interventions.

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:07 "July 2026"

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 119(19), e2200732119. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2200732119

Mertens, S., Herberz, M., Hahnel, U. J. J., & Brosch, T. (2022). The effectiveness of nudging: A meta-analysis of choice architecture interventions across behavioral domains. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 119(1), e2107346118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2107346118

Rivers, N., & Schaufele, B. (2015). Salience of carbon taxes in the gasoline market. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 74, 23-36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2015.07.002

Sunstein, C. R. (2014). Nudging: A very short guide. Journal of Consumer Policy, 37(4), 583-588. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-014-9273-1

Thaler, R. H. (2016). Behavioral economics: Past, present, and future. American Economic Review, 106(7), 1577-1600. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.106.7.1577

Yu, Y. (2023). Carbon taxes and CO2 emissions: A replication of Andersson (American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 2019). Working Papers in Economics 23/09, University of Canterbury, Department of Economics and Finance.

 Copyright © IJSSER 2026, All rights reserved