




Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Journal of Cleaner Production

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/jclepro](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jclepro)

## Transforming sustainable food and waste behaviors by realigning domains of knowledge in our education system

Erin Redman\*, Aaron Redman

Departamento de la Sostenibilidad, Escuela Nacional de Estudios Superiores-UNAM, Unidad León, Boulevard UNAM, Col. Predio el Saucillo y el Potrero 2011, CP. 36969 Guanajuato, Mexico

## ARTICLE INFO

*Article history:*

Received 15 December 2012

Received in revised form

24 June 2013

Accepted 11 September 2013

Available online xxx

*Keywords:*

Sustainability education

Sustainable behaviors

Pro-environmental behaviors

Knowledge domains

K-12 teachers

## ABSTRACT

Changing from current unsustainable production, consumption, and disposal patterns will clearly require technological, political and other structural changes, but also individual behavior change. Consumer demand and individuals' purchasing power exerts pressure on many parts of the production system, including how crops are produced (e.g., organic), products are packaged and labeled (e.g., rBGH-free labels on milk), and even where products are distributed and how they are disposed of. Individual consumer behaviors have even led to political and structural changes over time, such as the consumer boycott of tuna which led to 1990 US legislation creating the "Dolphin Safe" tuna label.

One of the central ways to foster responsible citizenry and promote sustainable production is to harness the capacity of teachers and schools to create change. Educating for conscious consumerism is a critical part of creating changes in production, consumption and disposal systems, but our current education system and approaches often reinforce unsustainable practices that neglect subjective ways of knowing as well as action and change. Research and experience suggests that traditional, information intensive teaching about sustainability alone does not motivate the behavior change a transition to sustainability will require. Utilizing a previously developed framework that identifies four distinct types of knowledge—declarative, procedural, effectiveness and social—we hypothesize that procedural, effectiveness and social knowledge are important predictors of an individual's participation in sustainable behaviors, while declarative (information) knowledge is not. While the knowledge domain framework has been theoretically detailed by other researchers (Kaiser and Fuhrer, 2003; Frisk and Larson, 2011) and qualitatively assessed through an intensive case study education program (Redman, 2013), to date, this is the first quantitative assessment of the relationship between the four domains of knowledge and sustainability-related behaviors.

We tested our hypothesis through an extensive survey of 346 current and future K-12 teachers about sustainable food and waste knowledge and behaviors. The survey results supported our hypothesis that high levels of declarative knowledge alone did not predict increased participation in sustainable behaviors while procedural and social knowledge were statistically significant predictors of sustainable food behaviors and procedural, effectiveness, and social knowledge were all statistically significant predictors of sustainable waste behaviors. Through active incorporation of appropriate forms of procedural, effectiveness, and social knowledge into the K-12 classroom, educators can empower the next generation to make individual changes based on their vision of the future and insist on structural and institutional changes that are essential for a successful transition to sustainability.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

### 1. Introduction

Sustainability advocates widely recognize that many consumer behaviors will need to change in order for society to achieve a sustainability transition that will meet human needs, reduce social

inequities and maintain the natural resources necessary to support human life on Earth (Heller and Keoleian, 2003; Leiserowitz et al., 2005). Prominent behavior researcher, Paul Stern, suggests that "changing environmentally significant consumer behavior" is critical for an array of policy decisions and interventions, including the introduction of new and beneficial technology, modifications of institutional structures, and for changing material or financial incentives (Stern, 1999, p. 461). Through this research we focus on consumer behaviors as they relate to sustainable food and waste

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +52 477 109 8848.

E-mail addresses: [erin.n.redman@enes.unam.mx](mailto:erin.n.redman@enes.unam.mx), [erin.n.redman@gmail.com](mailto:erin.n.redman@gmail.com) (E. Redman), [aaron.redman@enes.unam.mx](mailto:aaron.redman@enes.unam.mx) (A. Redman).

strategies. Food and waste systems are embedded within a complex array of political, technological, and institutional structures, yet, it has been seen that individual consumer demand and purchasing power can, over time, impact these structures and promote change throughout the production, consumption, and disposal phases (Heller and Keoleian, 2003). One such example of consumer behaviors impacting political change and production processes is the consumer boycott of tuna that led to the 1990 US legislation creating the “Dolphin Safe” tuna label (Wright, 2000). A number of other researchers have also concluded that one of the most effective strategies for enhancing the sustainability of the U.S. food system (including waste and disposal processes) exists in changing consumer behavior (Heller and Keoleian, 2003; Stagl, 2002).

While other researchers have clearly established the importance of targeting individuals' behaviors in order to create sustainable change, diffusion of many sustainable practices and behaviors has yet to take-off; in part due to erroneous assumptions about how change occurs (McKenzie-Mohr, 2000; Rogers, 2003). First, some researchers are influenced by an innovation bias and implicitly assume that a great new idea, practice, or technology will inevitably diffuse throughout most of society on its own because it is cleaner, healthier, safer, more efficient, and/or more sustainable (Rogers, 2003). Separately, there are others that recognize individual behaviors as a central part of creating collective change but proceed on the faulty assumption that simply providing information (e.g., through marketing, labeling, or education) will foster the targeted behavior change (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002; Monroe, 2003; Pooley and O'Connor, 2000; Simmons and Volk, 2002). This research, on the other hand, proceeds on the notion that creating a more sustainable product, idea, or practice and providing information regarding said product will not, on its own, lead to the desired collective change. Rather we should understand what motivates or constrains individual behaviors and create programs that move beyond information in order to target the predictors of behavior.

In targeting the adoption of specific behaviors, many scholars and practitioners have turned to education as a pivotal tool in creating long-term change (Kelder et al., 1994; Luepker et al., 1983). There are a number of fields with which to draw from regarding the relationship between education and behavior modification (health, drug, smoking, and anti-violence programs to name a few). We focus on environmental education literature, in part, due to the parallels often drawn between sustainability and environmental education—although sustainability is a distinct departure from environmental education and the associated nature-centric points of view. For decades the primary goal of environmental education has been to foster pro-environmental behaviors (Hungerford and Volk, 1990; Monroe, 2003; Pooley and O'Connor, 2000; Ramsey, 1993). However, as education psychologists, Pooley and O'Connor note, “The main focus of environmental education programs has been to change environmental behavior through increasing environmental knowledge” (2000, p. 711). This focus on environmental (declarative) information as the means for targeting behaviors has been termed the Information-Deficit Model (e.g., students just need to understand the environment and then they will behave in a pro-environmental manner). This simplistic, linear approach to behavior change has been found to be inadequate in addressing the motivators and impediments to changing behaviors (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002; Monroe, 2003; Pooley and O'Connor, 2000). Therefore, this research looks beyond information as a predictor of behavior in order to explore diverse, dynamic and often subjective ways of knowing that influence participation in sustainable food and waste practices amongst K-12 educators (see Section 1.2 for details on the selection of our target population).

While this article focuses on a select number of sustainable behaviors, the incorporation of multiple forms of knowledge has

broader implications for all sustainability education. First, we emphasize that sustainability knowledge is not confined to scientific information or codified facts; rather it incorporates subjective ways of knowing that allow for diverse values and perspectives. In order to educate for sustainability in a way that integrates different ways of knowing, pedagogical approaches must also become more reflexive, integrative, and collaborative (DuPuis and Ball, 2013). Hence, the approach taken here also suggests a need to depart from didactic pedagogies in which an expert disseminates facts to passive recipients. Previous research has linked the knowledge domains to an array of innovative pedagogy, including real-world, experiential, problem-based, and collaborative methods, in order to emphasize social learning processes (Redman, 2013). To effectively integrate this approach into classrooms and schools, a shift away from traditional, positivistic views of science needs to occur. If universities can embrace a change to post-normal science, teachers whom receive their training at universities will become acquainted with science through this more participatory, normative and inclusive approach that acknowledges multiple ways of knowing (Funtowicz and Ravetz, 2003).

### 1.1. Knowledge domains

In order to move away from the Information-Deficit Model of behavior change, this research drew on behavioral theories and related studies in order to inform the relationship between education and action. While behavior scientists have proposed a variety of useful frameworks for explaining individual action, we chose to use a framework proposed by Kaiser and Fuhrer (2003) that centers on four different domains of knowledge as an organizational tool: declarative (factual/technical socio-ecological information), procedural (how-to information and skills), effectiveness (subjective understanding of impacts/efficacy), and social (subjective understanding of normative trends and social expectations) (Redman, 2013; Kaiser and Fuhrer, 2003). While the knowledge domains are insufficient individually to entirely explain the motivations behind people's actions, they collectively provide an overarching framework for integrating an array of behavioral theories (Frisk and Larson, 2011). The approach to the knowledge domains taken here expands beyond the traditional views of knowledge in order to include the subjective and dynamic processing of our environment as a form of knowledge. In this manner, we have integrated concepts about values, norms, attitudes and beliefs developed by other behavioral scholars into the domain constructs (Ajzen, 1985; Cialdini et al., 1990; Stern, 2000). Below we briefly define each domain as they relate to various schools of thought regarding environmentally responsible behaviors.

Declarative knowledge typically addresses how environmental systems operate in factual, technical, mechanical or biophysical terms, such as information about the ecological structure, functioning of ecosystems, and social-ecological interactions (Kaiser and Fuhrer, 2003). Although research has suggested that this is the least effective type of knowledge in promoting pro-environmental behaviors, most educators focus on disseminating declarative knowledge (Pooley and O'Connor, 2000; Simmons and Volk, 2002). Declarative knowledge is emphasized in the Information-Deficit Model (IDM), whereby in a straightforward, linear fashion, environmental knowledge is expected to lead to awareness and concern, and ultimately, to pro-environmental behaviors (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002). Psychologists and others have since refuted this simplistic model, noting that changing behavior is very difficult and information is simply not enough to spur the change itself (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002).

Procedural knowledge refers to process knowledge and how-to skills—such as how to sort garbage into recyclables and non-

recyclables for proper disposal (Kaiser and Fuhrer, 2003; Monroe, 2003). Certain forms of procedural knowledge have been effective in promoting behavior change; for instance, information about how to participate in decision-making processes is a strong predictor of political engagement (Kaiser and Fuhrer, 2003). Procedural information provides answers to questions such as, 'where do I vote?' or 'how do I register?' but not value-laden questions such as 'what is the significance of my vote?' Procedural knowledge correlates closely with situational and structural factors that facilitate or constrain action (i.e. the presence or absence of a curbside recycling program impacts the how-to's of recycling) and appears to be most effective in fostering behavior change when that knowledge is gained through experience and action (Redman, 2013).

Effectiveness, or impact, knowledge addresses the awareness of consequences associated with different behaviors, essentially answering the question, 'is the behavioral sacrifice worthwhile?' (Kaiser and Fuhrer, 2003; Monroe, 2003). Stern's (2000) Value-Belief-Norm (VBN) model of pro-ecological behavior highlights two key behavioral determinants pertinent to effectiveness knowledge; the first is the perceived consequences of behaviors, and the second is beliefs about who is responsible for environmental outcomes. The latter correlates to a person's "locus of control," which represents the confidence individuals have in their ability to bring about impactful change through their personal actions (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002; Monroe, 2003). Effectiveness knowledge influences behaviors through people's perceptions about how or even if their behaviors really impact the environment or others. As such, they are closely correlated to subjective beliefs and attitudes which are subject to change over time and are likely to vary due to local influences (Kaiser and Fuhrer, 2003; Monroe, 2003). For example, if an individual believes that recycling is not an energy efficient means of waste management, their negative perception about the effectiveness of that action may deter them from recycling (Tucker and Speirs, 2003).

Social knowledge encompasses knowledge regarding the motives, intentions, and actions of other people (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002). Social knowledge embodies what is typically described as social norms by behavioral scientists (Stern, 2000; Trumbo and O'Keefe, 2001). Kaiser and Fuhrer (2003) use social knowledge to explain two types of norms; conventional norms refer to customs, traditions, and expectations associated with the need for social approval, while moral norms refer to the value or importance a person places on equity, human welfare, environmental impacts or other behavioral outcomes. Schultz et al. (2007) further distinguish between different types of norms; descriptive norms refer to perceptions of what is commonly done, whereas injunctive norms refer to what is approved or disapproved by others. Changing the perception of what society approves or views as desirable has been the subject of much research and hundreds of marketing campaigns, ranging from smoking ads to recycling campaigns (McKenzie-Mohr, 2011). The importance of social knowledge as a predictor of behavior is especially critical in a normative field such as sustainability, where societal values are central in guiding what we ought to sustain and how. Classrooms provide an ideal environment for fostering sustainable social norms because of the many opportunities teachers have for modeling and positively reinforcing sustainable behaviors.

Academic studies rarely address more than two of these knowledge domains, typically declarative and procedural, while education programs generally focus solely on declarative, ecological knowledge. Although Kaiser and Fuhrer hypothesize that the convergence of all four domains of knowledge will lead to sustained pro-environmental behaviors, the collective effect of the knowledge domains on sustainable behaviors has yet to be empirically assessed (Kaiser and Fuhrer, 2003). Our hypothesis builds off the insights or Kaiser and Fuhrer regarding the ineffectiveness of technical,

ecological information while empirically exploring all four domains of knowledge. We hypothesize that an individual with more procedural, effectiveness and social knowledge about a sustainability area (e.g. waste) will participate in more sustainable behaviors in that area more frequently. On the other hand, having more declarative knowledge about that area will *not* make the individual more likely to engage in sustainable behaviors. Our survey is the first empirical study to quantitatively assess the four domains of knowledge as predictors of sustainable food and waste behaviors.

## 1.2. Selection of teachers as target population

K-12 education is being increasingly seen as a critical environment for building capacity for transformative change toward sustainability (Nolet, 2009; Simmons and Volk, 2002; Sterling, 2001). One of the reasons to focus on K-12 education is due to the vast number of people—60 million Americans—that spend their time at K-12 schools (Freeman, 2013). Additionally, education has often been cited as central to equipping future generations with the knowledge, skills, and behaviors necessary to cope with our sustainability challenges (Cortese, 2003; Orr, 1991; Pooley and O'Connor, 2000; Rowe, 2007). Within schools, teachers are ideally positioned as role models for future generations and have the capacity to reach a younger population that has yet to become too entrenched and cemented in their habits and behaviors to change (Kelder et al., 1994).

Currently, few educators incorporate action and change as a component of their teaching or classroom practices (Moore, 2005; Stir, 2006). One barrier to integrating sustainability practices into the classroom is a lack of deep knowledge among teachers regarding sustainable behaviors (Nolet, 2009). While research indicates that educators have adequate surface knowledge (i.e., declarative knowledge), they tend to neglect practical skills (i.e., procedural knowledge) and action as part of sustainability education (Nolet, 2009; Stir, 2006). Through our survey of future and current K-12 teachers across the United States described here, we sought to understand where knowledge (and of what types) is most lacking and how the presence or absence of different types of knowledge impacts participation in sustainable behaviors. The results of this research can inform approaches to teacher education so that they better target gaps in knowledge and behaviors with the ultimate goal of promoting pro-sustainability behaviors and supporting teachers as social agents of change.

The basis for empirically assessing the relationship between knowledge in the four domains and associated behaviors amongst teachers, in part, stems from the success (measured in terms of behavior change) of an education program that targeted the four knowledge domains through novel pedagogical approaches. A recent publication by Redman (2013) details the education practices implemented and the associated changes in knowledge and behaviors amongst the student participants. In addition to the impacts this approach had upon the students (outlined in Redman, 2013), there were also three K-12 teachers involved in the program as part of their Masters degrees in science education. Prior to participating in the education program, the teachers reported low-levels of knowledge regarding food and waste sustainability and paid little credence to the importance of modeling and positively reinforcing sustainable behaviors or setting sustainable norms in the classroom. In the follow-up interviews and surveys the teachers detailed how the action-oriented, hands-on approach to knowledge acquisition changed their personal food and waste behaviors as well as prompted them to implement more sustainable practices in their classrooms. The findings gathered through the previously conducted qualitative work provided a basis for proposing our hypothesis regarding the relationship between the four knowledge domains and food and waste behaviors.

### 1.3. Selection of food and waste behaviors

There is mounting evidence suggesting that the actions promoted and propagated by our industrialized society could destroy the health and well-being of our planet and many of the efforts to counteract this are focusing on changing people's patterns of consumption and disposal in order to transition toward a more sustainable society (Cortese, 2003; Kates and Parris, 2003; McKenzie-Mohr, 2000; Monroe, 2003; Zelezny, 1999). This research focuses on a select number of food and waste behaviors in order to understand the relationship between different ways of knowing and participation in sustainability-related activities. However, it is critical to note that sustainable solutions are neither fixed nor prescribed. In the face of complexity and uncertainty, we acknowledge that the behaviors selected for study are not without their trade-offs and we do not propose them as perfect solutions to the many wicked sustainability challenges. Rather, we must muddle through and attempt to make progress in understanding how individuals can contribute to collective change for sustainability.

A number of researchers have established that consumer behavior and dietary habits have a significant impact on agricultural production, distribution and the nature of our food options (Heller and Keoleian, 2003). The benefits of changing food consumption and purchasing behavior ripples out through the food life cycle, resulting in a multiplying effect that impacts energy, materials, and the environment as well as human health and well-being (Heller and Keoleian, 2003). We narrowed our focus to a few specific behaviors that were selected because of their action-ability at an individual scale and prevalence in the food sustainability literature. Our survey focused on the following sustainable food behaviors: 1.) reduced meat consumption, 2.) purchasing of organic foods, 3.) purchasing of local products from farmer's markets, 4.) consumption of whole foods rather than processed ones.

Changing people's purchasing and disposal behaviors in order to reduce the amount of waste created and sent to landfills has been the focus of a number of studies (Barr et al., 2005; Joseph, 2006; McKenzie-Mohr, 2011). Our current, mostly linear (meaning not closed loop), waste system squanders valuable resources (both energy and materials) and creates health, environmental and economic problems. In this study, we focused on widely accepted and researched sustainable waste strategies: 1.) reduce waste produced by the individual, 2.) choose reusable products over disposables (i.e., single-use products), and 3.) engage in waste recovery practices (i.e., recycling and composting). Each of these behaviors diverts waste from landfills which is one of the principal goals of a sustainable waste system. Additionally, reducing the consumption of single-use products through reuse and reduce strategies impacts energy input in production and distribution phases, hence linking waste strategies with broader discussions on promoting environmentally conscious consumerism (Eriksson et al., 2005).

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Survey design

As discussed in Section 1.3 we chose to focus this study on just two sustainability-related areas, food and waste. To do so, two separate surveys were created one focusing on each area (further details on survey design can be found in Appendix A). Table 1 illustrates the question formats and response scales utilized (a complete list of questions sorted by knowledge domain can be found in Appendix A).

The survey was pilot-tested with different audiences and was checked for content validity by experts in sustainability and survey design. A web-based survey was created after incorporating feedback from this review process with a mechanism for participants to

**Table 1**  
Question format and associated response scales.

Question format	5-Point response scales
How familiar are you with the following terms and concepts	'Never heard of' to 'Heard of & know a lot about'
How would you rate your knowledge about	'Poor' to 'Excellent'
How would you rate your ability to	'Poor' to 'Excellent'
How would you rate your awareness of	'Poor' to 'Excellent'
How would you rate your agreement with the following statements	'Strongly agree' to 'Strongly disagree'
Over the last year, how often have you made the following choices	'Never (not at all)' to 'Always (>90% of the time)'

be randomly distributed between the food and waste surveys. A purposive approach was utilized in order to reach the targeted population of both current and developing K-12 teachers (justification is discussed in Section 1.2).<sup>1</sup> Ultimately we received a total of 346 responses, 154 to the food survey, and 192 to the waste survey.

### 2.2. Limitations of this survey

This survey design only measured the respondents' knowledge and behaviors at a static point in time. From this data alone we cannot conclude that an intervention (such as an education program) which increases an individual's knowledge in the different domains will correspondingly increase their participation in sustainable behaviors. Our survey enables us to examine the relationship between knowledge and behaviors and whether certain types of knowledge predict participation in behaviors but this survey on its own is not sufficient on its own to draw conclusions about interventions. In order to better evaluate the relationship between *changes* in the knowledge domains and *changes* in behavior a panel sample or other type of research design is needed. Additionally, the survey's quantification of subjective knowledge is not intended to yield precise measurements but rather to elicit broad patterns and relationships among a large population that would not be possible with the typical qualitative or case study approach to studying subjective knowledge.

### 2.3. The variables and data analysis

The results from the surveys were loaded into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) v. 20.0 which was subsequently used for all the analysis. We calculated the Cook's distance—the most widely used statistical test for measuring the influence of an individual observation (Kim and Storer, 1996)—to discover which respondents exerted undue influence on the results. For the food survey, five respondents were found to be outliers with undue influence and therefore were removed; reducing the number of responses used in the data analysis to 149. For the waste survey, six respondents were found to be outliers and were removed, making the final sample size for the waste survey 186.

In order to examine the knowledge domains as predictors of behavior, composite indices were created for each knowledge and behavior domain. This was done by calculating an individual's mean response to each group of questions (e.g., there were 11 questions which measured the respondent's declarative knowledge about food sustainability, and the mean of the answers to these questions was used to form the respondent's declarative

<sup>1</sup> Professors teaching courses ranging from early childhood, history of teaching, technology and education, education policy, and science education, agreed to disseminate the survey to their students. To increase the sample size and diversity of teachers the survey was also sent out nationally via the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) list-serv.

**Table 2**

Reliability measured by Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ ) and means for knowledge domain and behavior indices.

Domain	Food			Waste		
	N	$\alpha$	Mean (standard deviation)	N	$\alpha$	Mean (standard deviation)
Declarative	11	.739	3.58 (.53)	11	.768	3.78 (.50)
Procedural	8	.761	3.28 (.72)	7	.813	3.38 (.83)
Effectiveness	10	.769	3.24 (.56)	12	.766	3.58 (.64)
Social	11	.606	3.42 (.47)	9	.749	3.55 (.56)
Behavior	9	.673	2.92 (.50)	9	.764	3.38 (.65)

knowledge index). When multiple questions are used to measure the same thing (e.g., knowledge in a given domain), as was done in this survey, these items should be correlated with one another (Bland and Altman, 1997). For example, the way an individual answers one declarative food question should be consistent with the way they answer the other declarative food questions. As seen in Table 2, the composite scores for each domain were internally consistent and reliable based on the Cronbach's alpha.<sup>2</sup>

We collected standard demographic data such as gender, race, and age, as well as the respondents' political affiliation, state of residence, income, and whether or not they have ever taken a sustainability course (see Table 3). Researchers have found that gender, ethnicity, political orientation and income can impact sustainable values, attitudes, and behaviors (Gossard and York, 2003; Larson et al., 2011), therefore it was necessary to account for the contribution these variables might have in predicting sustainable behaviors. Additionally, we controlled for home ownership and presence of household curbside recycling programs because other researchers have found that household commingled recycling programs increase participation in recycling and home ownership may impact other sustainable waste behaviors (i.e., composting) (Gamba and Oskamp, 1994).

Descriptive statistics were calculated for all of the socio-demographic items for both the food and waste survey respondents. We compared the demographics of the respondents for this survey to demographic information collected by the National Center for Education on public school teachers in the United States (Feistrizer, 2011) and found our sample populations to be similar to the general population of teachers.

### 3. Results

We used ordinary-least squares (OLS) regressions to test our hypothesis that increased knowledge in procedural, effectiveness and social domains will predict increased participation in sustainable behaviors while increased declarative knowledge will not. The indices of the four knowledge domains were utilized as the independent variables, while the socio-demographic and other variables were included as controls. The overall sustainable behavior indices for food and waste were the main dependent variables analyzed but we also investigated the relationship of the knowledge domain indices with individual and sets of related behaviors. This model enables a straightforward interpretation of the regression results; the larger the coefficients for a knowledge domain index means the more important that domain is in predicting an individual's participation in sustainable behaviors (their behavior index score).

Except for a couple of cases discussed later in this section, the control variables were *not* significant in the OLS regressions and

**Table 3**

Overview of the control variables.

	Food, N = 149	Waste, N = 186	Type of variable
% Female	60%	66%	Dichotomous
% Anglo/White	83%	85%	Dichotomous
Age			
<30	12%	9%	Continuous
30–40	25%	24%	
40–50	25%	28%	
50+	38%	39%	
Curbside recycling (Yes)		73%	Dichotomous
House (Yes)	79%	86%	Dichotomous
Sustainability course (Yes)	14%	15%	Dichotomous
Region of residence (Yes – AZ)	37%	50%	Dichotomous
Political orientations			
Very liberal	9%	10%	dichotomous
Liberal	32%	27%	
Moderate	32%	33%	
Conservative	20%	18%	
Very conservative	1%	4%	
Other	6%	8%	
Income under			
\$20,000	4%	3%	continuous
\$20,000–\$34,999	11%	9%	
\$35,000–\$59,999	24%	25%	
\$60,000–\$89,000	26%	25%	
\$90,000 or more	22%	27%	
Did not report	13%	11%	

thus are not reported in the main body of the paper (see Appendix B for results including control variables). In addition to the standard analyses, we also looked at the Variance Influence Factor<sup>3</sup> (VIF) for each of the knowledge domain indices in order to assess multicollinearity. As can be seen in Table 4, the VIF is below 4 for each index, indicating that the knowledge domains were *not* too closely inter-related to be utilized as independent variables.

In Table 4 we report the OLS regression results for our principal model. Overall, the knowledge domain indices appear to be a fairly good model for predicting behaviors, with an adjusted  $R^2$  value of .577 for the food behavior regression and .787 for the waste behavior regression. It is interesting to note that both the  $R^2$  values and Cronbach's alphas were higher for the waste knowledge domain indices and regressions as compared to those for food. Previous research has shown that food behaviors are more complex and difficult to change than waste behaviors (Redman, 2013). These results further bolster this finding, showing sustainable food behaviors to be harder to predict based on the knowledge domains as compared with waste behaviors.

The results from these regressions support the basic hypothesis that we proposed when beginning this research. Declarative knowledge was *not* a statistically significant predictor of sustainable behaviors in either of these models (and had a standardized beta coefficient near zero). This means that having more declarative knowledge did not make a survey participant any more likely to participate in the relevant Sustainable behaviors. This provides further empirical evidence to the case for de-emphasizing declarative knowledge when targeting individual behaviors. On the other hand the indexes we created to measure knowledge in the other three domains *did* predict participation in various sustainable behaviors. Procedural and social knowledge about food were significant, positive predictors of increased participation in sustainable food behaviors. On the waste side, increased procedural,

<sup>2</sup> The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient normally ranges between 0 and 1 and the closer Cronbach's alpha coefficient is to 1.0 the greater the internal consistency of the items in the scale (Bland and Altman, 1997).

<sup>3</sup> The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) is a widely used measure for assessing multicollinearity issues (O'Brien, 2007). Typically a VIF of 10 or even one as low as 4 has been used as rules of thumb to indicate serious multicollinearity.

**Table 4**  
OLS regression coefficients and standard errors for food and waste behavior indices.

Independent variable	Food behaviors index				Waste behaviors index			
	Unstandardized		Standardized beta	VIF	Unstandardized		Standardized beta	VIF
	B	Std. error			B	Std. error		
Declarative knowledge	.065	.065	.069	1.780	-.120	.068	-.091	2.351
Procedural knowledge	.195	.063	.282**	2.944	.246	.050	.313***	3.498
Effectiveness knowledge	.108	.077	.122	2.621	.308	.063	.302***	3.317
Social knowledge	.465	.068	.437*	1.454	.472	.060	.404***	2.322
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.577				.787			
F	17.807				53.445			
N	149				186			

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

effectiveness and social knowledge all predict increased sustainable behavior to the highest degree of statistical significance we measured ( $p < .001$ ). For both the food and waste regressions, increases in social knowledge indicated the largest predicted increases in sustainable behavior of any of the knowledge domains.

The food and waste behavior indices were constructed from a number of distinct behaviors that previous research indicated may have different drivers and benefits of action to the individual (e.g. people may eat less meat to reduce their carbon footprint and eat less processed foods for improved health). As such, we created behavior sub-indices based on theoretical categorization as well as correlations (Pearson's rho values between the individual behaviors). The indices created for food behaviors include (factors that represent the sustainable actions for each index are noted in parenthesis): 1.) meat eating behaviors (low levels of chicken and beef consumption and high frequency of meat-less meals), 2.) processed food purchasing (low levels of fast foods and pre-packaged food purchasing, and frequent purchasing of whole foods), and 3.) sustainable food purchasing (frequently purchasing organic or local foods). For waste we created three indices: 1.) recycling (frequently recycling at home and at campus/school), 2.) reducing waste through purchasing practices (purchasing products with less packaging, and products made from post-consumer materials and using reusable bags when checking-out at a store), 3.) reusing (frequently reusing bottles, napkins, and bags).

As seen in Table 5, the knowledge domain indices predict less of the variation of these narrower behavior indices than for the overall behavior indices (as measured by the adjusted R<sup>2</sup> values). Again, declarative knowledge was *not* a significant predictor of any of these behavior sub-indices. On the other hand, increased social knowledge was a highly statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ) predictor of increases for all six of the behavior indices tested here. Effectiveness knowledge was consistently a positive predictor for all the waste indices while procedural knowledge was found to be significant in predicting meat consumption, reducing and reusing behaviors. Another interesting result emerged from the recycling sub-index. The two behaviors which made up the index, frequency of recycling at home and recycling at school, were found to be significantly correlated to a greater extent than any other two behaviors ( $\rho = .623^{***}$ ). This suggests a strong connection between behaviors done at school and behaviors done at home.

While in general the control variables included in this study were not statistically significant, in two cases particular variables proved revealing about the interplay between individual agency and structural issues. This research focuses on the agency of individuals to make behavioral changes in their lives which are essential for society to transition to sustainability. Yet there are serious structural constraints to achieving a sustainable transition solely through individual agency (e.g. government policy, existing infrastructure, available technology, etc.). In this case, the existence of recycling infrastructure (curbside recycling) is a very significant

predictor of increased frequency of recycling (standardized beta = .230,  $p < .001$ ), a result which shouldn't be surprising based on previous research (Gamba and Oskamp, 1994), but reinforces the necessity of supportive structural systems. Similarly, frequency of purchasing local foods appears to be somewhat dependent on an individual's geographic location. Survey respondents who lived in Arizona were significantly less likely to purchase local food as often as the rest of the population (standardized beta =  $-.250$ ,  $p < .01$ ). The influence of geographic location on local food purchasing may be an indication of situational or structural constraints associated with the fact that Arizona's cities have fewer farmer's markets per capita than other comparable US cities (Jilcott et al., 2011).

#### 4. Discussion

While there is variation in terms of how the knowledge domains interact with the individual behaviors, declarative knowledge is consistently *not significant* in terms of predicting participation in sustainable behaviors. Our finding that more declarative knowledge does not predict greater participation in sustainable behaviors for food or waste is in line with other studies that have found declarative knowledge to be mostly ineffective in promoting environmentally responsible behaviors (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002; Pooley and O'Connor, 2000). The implication of this finding for sustainability education is that if we hope to foster transformative change, we must shift away from educational approaches that focus primarily on declarative knowledge. Additionally, this survey found no correlation between participating in a sustainability course and behaving sustainably, reaffirming that current sustainability

**Table 5**  
OLS regression coefficients for food and waste behaviors separated into like categories.

Independent variable	Meat eating index ( $n = 3$ , $n = 3$ , $\alpha = .693$ )	Processed foods index ( $n = 3$ , $\alpha = .454$ )	Sustainable food index ( $n = 3$ , $\alpha = .556$ )	Recycling index ( $n = 2$ , $\alpha = .767$ )	Reduce index ( $n = 3$ , $\alpha = .652$ )	Reuse index ( $n = 3$ , $\alpha = .532$ )
Mean (std)	3.08 (.64)	3.22 (.58)	2.69 (.69)	4.29 (.89)	3.10 (.80)	3.37 (.87)
<i>Coefficients: standardized beta</i>						
Declarative knowledge	-.059	.116	.051	-.142	-.032	-.011
Procedural knowledge	.301*	.093	.051	-.048	.222**	.234*
Effectiveness knowledge	-.126	.171	.274**	.307**	.233**	.293***
Social knowledge	.387***	.360***	.356***	.477***	.305***	.258***
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.229	.315	.365	.415	.604	.548
F	4.649	6.663	8.075	11.102	22.691	18.269
N	149	149	149	185	185	185

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

education is not sufficiently influencing behaviors (most likely due to the focus on declarative knowledge).

In spite of our critiques of declarative knowledge, there is still clearly a place for technical, ecological information in our education system (DuPuis and Ball, 2013). Even though our analysis indicates that declarative knowledge does not predict participation in sustainability-related behaviors, this form of knowledge is still a critical component of sustainability literacy (Monroe, 2003). Additionally, some researchers have suggested that very low amounts of declarative knowledge may form a barrier to action (Kaiser and Fuhrer, 2003; Monroe, 2003). All of our surveyed population was at least in the process of obtaining their undergraduate degree (and many were enrolled or had completed masters and PhD programs) in addition to having made a lifelong commitment to education (as K-12 teachers). We would therefore expect that the mean knowledge domain index scores were substantially higher than would be found among a general population survey, particularly for declarative knowledge (mean scores for food survey = 3.58, waste = 3.78). The high levels of declarative knowledge among participants may have impeded this study from finding a significant negative impact on sustainable behaviors for those with very low levels of declarative knowledge.

The positive and significant impact that procedural, effectiveness, and social knowledge had on predicting an increase in participation of sustainable behaviors (particularly in contrast to declarative knowledge) demonstrates the need to incorporate diverse domains of knowledge into our education strategies. In particular, social knowledge appears to be critical across a wide array of behaviors. In developing strategies for targeting social knowledge, sustainable behaviors should be positively reinforced and positioned as 'normal' and 'desirable.' One way to do this is through consciously modeling sustainable behaviors in the classroom and building sustainable practices into everyday operations at schools. By building sustainable practices (such as composting) into the classroom, students and teachers can gain the necessary knowledge regarding how-to compost (procedural knowledge), while creating a norm of behaving sustainably at school, thus, also increasing social knowledge. Integrating practices in schools that enhance knowledge in the relevant domains is not only critical to promoting sustainable behaviors, but also central to moving beyond surface knowledge regarding sustainability.

In exploring the relationships between the knowledge domains and specific behaviors, it is clear that the knowledge domains interact differently with different behaviors. Composting really stood out as its variance was almost completely predicted by the level of procedural knowledge (standardized beta = .623,  $p < .001$ ), while the other knowledge domain indexes had no significant predictive impact on this particular behavior. This finding suggests that there are different barriers, drivers, and motivations associated with specific behaviors. For composting, lack of procedural knowledge regarding the establishment and maintenance of the system would clearly be a barrier to engaging in composting. In contrast, the purchasing of local foods was highly influenced by social knowledge regarding the desirability of going to farmer's markets. The direct interaction and feedback at farmer's markets made respondents feel 'good' about purchasing local food (mean response = 4.1). The 'good' feeling about purchasing local food does not, however, spill over into the closely related behavior of purchasing organic food in a grocery store. These findings reinforce other researchers' positions regarding the importance of societal interactions as strong motivators for purchasing local foods (Stagl, 2002), whereas many people purchase organic food more for personal health reasons (Padel and Foster, 2005).

While analysis revealed significant variation between individual behaviors, there were clearly more similarities within the food behaviors and waste behaviors than between them. Effectiveness

knowledge, for example, was a significant predictor for eight of the nine waste behaviors but only a couple of the food behaviors. The immediate benefits of choosing sustainable food behaviors are far less direct and far more opaque than for waste behaviors. The lack of highly visible, short-term benefits regarding sustainable food consumption may contribute to the low importance of effectiveness knowledge for predicting food behaviors.

## 5. Conclusion

There is little doubt that progressing toward sustainability will require major political, technological, and other structural changes, but on its own these will be insufficient if individuals do not change as well (e.g., adopt and properly utilize the new technologies or practices). This paper stresses the importance of understanding how individuals perceive the practices and ideas being presented as sustainability solutions. In this research, we emphasized that in addition to the traditional, factual approach to knowledge (declarative and procedural); there are subjective types of knowledge (effectiveness and social) which, as with the nature of subjectivity in general, changes with local and cultural variations in perceptions, beliefs, and desires. The dynamic nature of knowledge was also demonstrated by the finding that different forms of knowledge interact differently with various behaviors, clearly indicating that the knowledge-behavior relationship is not static, nor universal. The diverse relationship between different knowledge domains and behaviors indicates that a combination of different approaches is needed in order to effectively educate for sustainability. Understanding this dynamic interplay between knowledge and behaviors will help sustainability advocates tailor education programs as well as marketing campaigns and product packaging in order to target the motivators and barriers to change.

While this research advanced the use of a multi-dimensional conceptualization of knowledge, each knowledge domain, particularly the subjective domains of knowledge (social and effectiveness) should be explored further. In terms of social knowledge, future sustainability research is needed to investigate the degree to which an individual is influenced by their perception of what their friends and family view as positive or negative, an important aspect of social knowledge which was not looked into by this study. In order to assess this type of social knowledge, questions need to be asked about what the respondent thinks their friends/family do, how much they care about what their friends and family do, and how close their perceptions are to reality. Other studies (on behaviors such as alcohol consumption) have shown that not only are individuals influenced by family and friends differently but also their perception of their peer environment varies from reality (Perkins, 2002). Examining the relationships amongst perception, reality, and peers versus family influence in terms of specific sustainable behaviors, especially given the overall importance of social knowledge revealed by the results presented here, is a critical future step.

K-12 teachers were chosen as the target population for this research based in a large degree on the assumption that teachers can help shape the future of tomorrow by modeling behaviors, establishing norms and imparting both subjective and technical knowledge to their students. However, the student/teacher relationship itself was not the focus of the research conducted here. Further research is needed to explore the relationship between teachers' knowledge and behaviors and how that translates into the classroom and influences the students by either simultaneously surveying teachers and their students or by taking a more intensive, case study approach.

Investigations on how to motivate changes in individuals' behaviors that are necessary for a sustainable future are still in early phases, and significant research is needed to better untangle the relationship between the knowledge domains and sustainable behaviors. However, the results of this research, that non-declarative

forms of knowledge are important to fostering sustainable behaviors among individuals, is hopefully a step in the right direction which can be built upon by further work and applied in ways which foster the needed transition to sustainability.

## Appendix A

### Survey design

The survey regarding food consisted of fifty-one knowledge and behavior questions and the waste survey consisted of forty-nine knowledge and behavior questions. Both surveys utilized a 5-point Likert scale and concluded with an additional section of 16 demographic questions. The scales on both surveys were designed so that the most sustainable response varied between the right and the left side of the scale, since reversing the direction of the ordinal

scale so that no single direction represents a 'sustainable' response can help reduce the incidence of respondents sticking to one side of the scale due to perceived social desirability (Fink, 1995).

The final survey instrument was built using Google Docs "Form" application, which enables one to create a survey with a unique web link where the data are automatically imported into a spreadsheet. The questions were put into groups of 3–5 questions with similar formats, depending on how best to fit the questions on each of the survey's pages. On the first page the participants were informed about the survey and their rights as agreed upon with Arizona State University's (ASU) Institutional Review Board in their approval of the research project. In order to randomly distribute the participants to either the food or waste surveys, they were asked if their birthday was on an even or odd date. If they responded "even" they answered the questions about food and if they responded "odd" they answered the questions about waste.

**Table A1**  
Food questions sorted by domain.

Question text	Knowledge domain (or behavior)	Most sustainable response
The majority of farmland in the United States is run by families.	Declarative	Strongly disagree
How different farming practices impact farmers and farm workers?	Declarative	Excellent
How different farming practices impact the environment?	Declarative	Excellent
Food that is thrown away is a very small part of the amount of waste sent to the landfill in the U.S.	Declarative	Strongly disagree
Eating lower on the food chain (eating plants instead of meat) results in lower environmental impacts.	Declarative	Strongly agree
How food is grown (produced) in the U.S.?	Declarative	Excellent
Certified organic food is only food that is not processed, such as apples and carrots.	Declarative	Strongly disagree
Raising animals for food is a significant source of greenhouse gases.	Declarative	Strongly agree
Factory farms	Declarative	Heard of and know a lot about
Farmer's markets	Declarative	Heard of and know a lot about
Sustainability	Declarative	Heard of and know a lot about
How to find organic foods and drinks in your grocery store?	Procedural	Excellent
How to compost food waste?	Procedural	Excellent
There are places to purchase sustainable food in my neighborhood or nearby.	Procedural	Strongly agree
I know how to identify certified organic foods at the grocery store.	Procedural	Strongly agree
How to find food grown or produced locally in Phoenix and surrounding areas?	Procedural	Excellent
How to read food labels to determine whether synthetic pesticides were used in the production of the food?	Procedural	Excellent
Select sustainable food choices?	Procedural	Excellent
Cook tasty vegetarian meals	Procedural	Excellent
Consume a healthy amount of protein and iron without eating meat.	Procedural	Excellent
Change the types of foods you eat?	Effectiveness	Excellent
Make food choices that promote healthy working environments for the farm workers?	Effectiveness	Excellent
Reduce the amount of waste you produce through your food purchasing decisions?	Effectiveness	Excellent
Reduce your personal impact on the environment through your food choices?	Effectiveness	Excellent
I can make choices about what I eat to lower my impacts on nature and the environment.	Effectiveness	Strongly agree
Change the types of foods your friends eat?	Effectiveness	Excellent
I can make choices about what I eat to improve the lives and livelihoods for farmers or farm workers.	Effectiveness	Strongly agree
It is difficult for me to choose meat-free meal options.	Effectiveness	Strongly disagree
Purchasing locally grown food is inconvenient.	Effectiveness	Strongly disagree
I can make choices about what I eat which improve animal/livestock welfare	Effectiveness	Strongly agree
I like to eat meat every day.	Social	Strongly disagree
I would like to purchase more organic foods.	Social	Strongly agree
I care what my friends think about my food choices	Social	Strongly agree
I like the taste of bottled water more than tap water.	Social	Strongly disagree
My friends enjoy eating at fast food restaurants.	Social	Strongly disagree
I enjoy eating vegetarian (meat free) meals.	Social	Strongly agree
My friends think it is weird to be a vegetarian (or, in other words, to not eat meat).	Social	Strongly disagree
I admire people that eat sustainably.	Social	Strongly agree
Purchasing organic food makes me feel good.	Social	Strongly agree
Purchasing food at a local farmer's market makes me feel good.	Social	Strongly agree
I feel pressured to eat meat by my friends	Social	Strongly disagree
I tend to simply enjoy what I eat without worrying about the consequences.	Behavior	Strongly agree
I ate meals with no meat (chicken, beef, pork, etc.) at all.	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)
Composted your food waste at home.	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)
Chose food with little or no packaging.	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)
Bought organic foods over non-organic ones.	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)
I ate chicken with meals.	Behavior	Never (not at all)
Bought food at a local farmers' market.	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)
I ate out at a fast food restaurant (McDonalds, Taco Bell, etc.).	Behavior	Never (not at all)
I ate beef with meals.	Behavior	Never (not at all)

**Table A2**

Waste questions sorted by domain.

Question text	Knowledge domain (or behavior)	Most sustainable response
Composting	Declarative	Heard of and know a lot about
Recycling	Declarative	Heard of and know a lot about
Sustainability	Declarative	Heard of and know a lot about
Paper grocery bags are the environmentally friendly option.	Declarative	Strongly disagree
My food scraps can be composted instead of thrown away.	Declarative	Strongly agree
Food that is thrown away is a very small part of the amount of waste produced in the U.S.	Declarative	Strongly disagree
Most plastic bottles are recycled in the U.S.	Declarative	Strongly disagree
How food waste decomposes or breaks down in the environment?	Declarative	Excellent
The environmental impact of using disposable plastic bags?	Declarative	Excellent
How much food is thrown away in the United States?	Declarative	Excellent
The environmental impact of using disposable plastic bottles (water/soda bottles)?	Declarative	Excellent
I have a strategy for utilizing reusable beverage containers when I am on-the-go.	Procedural	Strongly agree
I have a strategy for remembering my reusable bags when I go to the grocery store.	Procedural	Strongly agree
How to compost food waste?	Procedural	Excellent
How to sort recyclables such as bottles and cans correctly?	Procedural	Excellent
Install a composting system at home?	Procedural	Excellent
Manage a composting system at home?	Procedural	Excellent
Select paper made from post-consumer content?	Procedural	Excellent
I could easily compost my food scraps.	Effectiveness	Strongly agree
Collecting food scraps for composting creates unwanted odors.	Effectiveness	Strongly agree
Using reusable bags at the grocery store is inconvenient.	Effectiveness	Strongly disagree
Remembering a reusable water bottle is difficult for me.	Effectiveness	Strongly disagree
It is important to reduce the amount of waste I send to the landfill.	Effectiveness	Strongly agree
I know how to make choices about products I buy to reduce the amount of waste I create	Effectiveness	Strongly agree
Reduce the amount of waste you produce through your food purchasing decisions?	Effectiveness	Excellent
Reduce your personal impact on the environment through your waste decisions?	Effectiveness	Excellent
Reduce the amount of waste you create by using reusable cups or bottles for your beverages?	Effectiveness	Excellent
Reduce the amount of waste your household produces?	Effectiveness	Excellent
The quantity of waste you could divert from the landfill by composting your food waste?	Effectiveness	Excellent
The quantity of waste you could divert from the landfill by using reusable bottles/bags/napkins instead of disposable products.	Effectiveness	Excellent
I like the taste of bottled water more than tap water	Social	Strongly agree
I prefer to use disposable products rather than reusable products.	Social	Strongly disagree
My friends expect me to use a reusable water bottle.	Social	Strongly agree
I admire people who are conscious about their waste decisions.	Social	Strongly agree
When I see others carrying reusable bags in the grocery store, I think it is weird.	Social	Strongly disagree
When I see others carrying a reusable water bottle, I think that it is weird.	Social	Strongly disagree
Composting makes me feel good	Social	Strongly agree
Whether your friends recycle or not?	Social	Excellent
Whether your friends compost or not?	Social	Excellent
Recycled plastic bottles, metal cans, and/or paper products while on campus.	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)
Reused water bottles/used a reusable water bottle	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)
Recycled plastic bottles, metal cans, and/or paper products while at home.	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)
Used reusable, washable napkins instead of paper ones.	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)
Composted your food waste at home.	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)
Used cloth or other reusable bags at stores (instead of using plastic or paper bags given at checkout counters).	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)
Chose food with little or no packaging.	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)
Purchased bottled water (in disposable bottle)	Behavior	Never (not at all)
Purchased paper made from post-consumer content.	Behavior	Always (more than 90% of the time)

**Appendix B***Full results including control variables***Table B1**

OLS regression coefficients and standard errors for food and waste behavior indices.

Independent variable	Food behaviors				Waste behaviors			
	Unstandardized		Standardized beta	VIF	Unstandardized		Standardized beta	VIF
	B	Std. error			B	Std. error		
Declarative knowledge	.065	.065	.069	1.780	-.120	.068	-.091	2.351
Procedural knowledge	.195	.063	.282**	2.944	.246	.050	.313***	3.498
Effectiveness knowledge	.108	.077	.122	2.621	.308	.063	.302***	3.317
Social knowledge	.465	.068	.437*	1.454	.472	.060	.404***	2.322
Income	-.026	.027	-.056	1.159	.040	.022	.070	1.256
Age	.036	.025	.089	1.269	-.002	.023	-.003	1.139
Gender (Yes – Female)	.009	.058	.009	1.155	.042	.050	.030	1.153

*(continued on next page)*

**Table B1** (continued)

Independent variable	Food behaviors			Waste behaviors					
	Unstandardized		Standardized beta	VIF	Unstandardized		Standardized beta	VIF	
	B	Std. error			B	Std. error			
Race (Yes – white/anglo)	-.164	.075	-.125*	1.195	.169	.065	.091*	1.065	
Political views (Yes – liberal/very liberal)	.097	.060	.096	1.200	-.026	.050	-.020	1.179	
House (Yes)	-.052	.070	-.043	1.133	-.068	.066	-.036	1.059	
Geographical location (Yes – AZ)	-.074	.064	-.072	1.372	-.026	.049	-.020	1.226	
Sustainability course (Yes)	.099	.083	.069	1.162	.102	.065	.056	1.090	
Curbside recycling bin (Yes)	–	–	–	–	.081	.052	.055	1.092	
Constant	.237	.295	–	–	-.60	.244	–	–	
R <sup>2</sup>	.611			.802			–		
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.577			.787			–		
F	17.807			53.445			–		
Sig.	<.001			<.001			–		
N	149			186			–		

\**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001.**Table B2**

OLS regression coefficients for food and waste behaviors separated into like categories.

Independent variable	Meat eating index ( <i>n</i> = 3, $\alpha$ = .693)	Processed foods index ( <i>n</i> = 3, $\alpha$ = .454)	Sustainable food index ( <i>n</i> = 3, $\alpha$ = .556)	Recycling index ( <i>n</i> = 2, $\alpha$ = .767)	Reduce index ( <i>n</i> = 3, $\alpha$ = .652)	Reuse index ( <i>n</i> = 3, $\alpha$ = .532)
Mean (std)	3.08 (.64)	3.22 (.58)	2.69 (.69)	4.29 (.89)	3.10 (.80)	3.37 (.87)
<i>Unstandardized beta (standardized beta)</i>						
Declarative knowledge	-.071 (-.059)	.126 (.116)	.065 (.051)	-.252 (-.142)	-.051 (-.032)	-.020 (-.011)
Procedural knowledge	.268 (.301)*	.075 (.093)	.049 (.051)	-.051 (-.048)	.214 (.222)**	.245 (.234)*
Effectiveness knowledge	-.144 (-.126)	.175 (.171)	.334 (.274)**	.427 (.307)**	.293 (.233)**	.399 (.293)**
Social knowledge	.534 (.387)***	.444 (.360)***	.522 (.356)***	.756 (.477)***	.437 (.305)***	.402 (.258)***
Income	-.010 (-.017)	-.035 (.064)	-.034 (-.053)	-.111 (-.128)	.019 (.024)	.001 (.002)
Age	.009 (.017)	.030 (.063)	-.035 (-.062)	.040 (.051)*	.088 (.127)*	.071 (.094)
Gender (Yes – Female)	-.111 (-.085)	.032 (.027)	.098 (.070)	-.137 (-.073)	.004 (.002)	.145 (.079)
Race (Yes – white/anglo)	-.046 (-.027)	-.096 (-.063)	-.293 (-.163)*	.408 (.162)*	.404 (.178)***	.067 (.027)
Political views (Yes – liberal/very liberal)	.031 (.024)	.079 (.068)	.107 (.076)	-.110 (-.060)	.081 (.049)	.006 (.003)
House (Yes)	-.236 (-.152)	.017 (.012)	.015 (.009)	.224 (.087)	-.399 (-.173)***	-.260 (-.104)*
Geographical location (Yes – AZ)	-.136 (-.103)	.028 (.023)	-.185 (-.130)	.081 (.046)	-.086 (-.053)	.067 (-.039)
Sustainability course (Yes)	.097 (.052)	.117 (.071)	.170 (.086)	.078 (.031)	.186 (.083)	.171 (.070)
Curbside recycling bin (Yes)	–	–	–	.460 (.230)***	.086 (.047)	.042 (.021)
Constant ( <i>B</i> )	1.424	.469	-.171	.692	-.464	-.419
R <sup>2</sup>	.292	.370	.416	.456	.632	.580
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.229	.315	.365	.415	.604	.548
F	4.649	6.663	8.075	11.102	22.691	18.269
Sig.	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
N	149	149	149	185	185	185

\**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001.**Table B3**

OLS regressions for individual food and waste behaviors.

Independent variable	Bought organic	Bought local	Composted	Bottled water
Mean (std)	2.58 (.95)	2.45 (.93)	2.18 (1.4)	3.52 (1.00)
<i>Unstandardized beta (standardized beta)</i>				
Declarative knowledge	.034 (.019)	.007 (.004)	.016 (.006)	-.389 (-.195)
Procedural knowledge	.065 (.049)	.065 (.050)	1.051 (.623)***	.257 (.215)
Effectiveness knowledge	.271 (.160)	.496 (.297)*	.001 (.000)	.115 (.074)
Social knowledge	.747 (.360)***	.261 (.129)	.329 (.132)	.345 (.194)
Income	.029 (.033)	-.052 (-.059)	.245 (.062)	.036 (.037)
Age	-.046 (-.059)	-.040 (-.052)	.339 (.084)	.074 (.085)
Gender (Yes – Female)	.035 (.018)	.192 (.101)	-.030 (-.008)	.078 (.037)
Race (Yes – white/anglo)	-.369 (-.145)	-.300 (-.120)	-.051 (-.018)	-.533 (-.186)*

Table B3 (continued)

Independent variable	Bought organic	Bought local	Composted	Bottled water
Political views (Yes – liberal/very liberal)	.230 (.120)	.079 (.042)	–.040 (–.014)	.047 (.022)
House (Yes)	.105 (.046)	.218 (.097)	.077 (.028)	.025 (.009)
Geographical location (Yes – AZ)	.004 (.002)	–.481 (–.250)**	–.443 (–.141)*	–.213 (–.107)
Sustainability course (Yes)	.091 (.033)	.221 (.082)	–.167 (–.137)*	.110 (.039)
Curbside recycling bin (Yes)			.149 (.109)	.186 (.083)
Constant (B)	–1.059	.091	–2.827	2.443
R <sup>2</sup>	.296	.271	.516	.192
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.232	.205	.479	.130
F	4.659	4.143	14.027	3.118
Sig.	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
N	146	147	185	185

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

## References

- Ajzen, I., 1985. From intentions to actions: a theory of planned behavior. In: Kuhl, J., Beckmann, J. (Eds.), *Action–control: From Cognition to Behavior*. Springer, Heidelberg, pp. 11–39.
- Barr, S., Gilg, A., Ford, N., 2005. Defining the multi-dimensional aspects of household waste management: a study of reported behavior in Devon. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 45 (2), 172–192.
- Bland, J.M., Altman, D.G., 1997. Statistics notes: Cronbach's alpha. *BMJ* 314 (7080), 572.
- 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. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 58 (6), 1015–1026.
- Cortese, A., March–May 2003. The critical role of higher education in creating a sustainable future. *Plann. Higher Educ.*, 15–22.
- DuPuis, E., Ball, T., 2013. How not what: teaching sustainability as process. *Sustain. Sci. Pract. Policy* 9 (1), 64–75.
- Eriksson, O., Carlsson Reich, M., Frostell, B., Björklund, A., Assefa, G., Sundqvist, J.O., Thyselius, L., 2005. Municipal solid waste management from a systems perspective. *J. Clean. Prod.* 13 (3), 241–252.
- Feistritz, E., 2011. Profile of Teachers in the US 2011. National Center for Education Information.
- Fink, A., 1995. *How to Ask Survey Questions*. Sage Publications.
- Freeman, A., 2013. America's Coolest Green Schools. <http://www.takepart.com/photos/green-schools-america> (accessed 04.04.13).
- Frisk, E., Larson, K.L., 2011. Educating for sustainability: competencies & practices for transformative action. *J. Sustain. Educ.* 2.
- Funtowicz, S., Ravetz, J., 2003. Post-normal Science. International Society for Ecological Economics. Retrieved from: <http://korny10.bke.hu/angol/ravetz2003.pdf>.
- Gamba, R.J., Oskamp, S., 1994. Factors influencing community residents' participation in commingled curbside recycling programs. *Environ. Behav.* 26 (5), 587–612.
- Gossard, M.H., York, R., 2003. Social structural influences on meat consumption. *Hum. Ecol. Rev.* 10 (1), 1.
- Heller, M.C., Keoleian, G.A., 2003. Assessing the sustainability of the US food system: a life cycle perspective. *Agric. Syst.* 76 (3), 1007–1041.
- Hungerford, H.R., Volk, T.L., 1990. Changing learner behavior through environmental education. *J. Environ. Educ.* 21 (3), 8–22.
- Jilcott, S.B., Keyserling, T., Crawford, T., McGuirt, J.T., Ammerman, A.S., 2011. Examining associations among obesity and per capita farmers' markets, grocery stores/supermarkets, and supercenters in US counties. *J. Am. Diet. Assoc.* 111 (4), 567–572.
- Joseph, K., 2006. Stakeholder participation for sustainable waste management. *Habitat Int.* 30 (4), 863–871.
- Kaiser, F.G., Fuhrer, U., 2003. Ecological behavior's dependency on different forms of knowledge. *Appl. Psychol.* 52 (4), 598–613.
- Kates, R.W., Parris, T.M., 2003. Long-term trends and a sustainability transition. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 100 (14), 8062–8067.
- Kelder, S.H., Perry, C.L., Klepp, K.-I., Lytle, L.L., 1994. Longitudinal tracking of adolescent smoking, physical activity, and food choice behaviors. *Am. J. Public Health* 84 (7), 1121–1126.
- Kim, C., Storer, B.E., 1996. Reference values for cook's distance. *Commun. Stat. Simul. Comput.* 25 (3), 691–708.
- Kollmuss, A., Agyeman, J., 2002. Mind the gap: why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior? *Environ. Educ. Res.* 8 (3), 239–260.
- Larson, K.L., Wutich, A., White, D., Muñoz-Erickson, T.A., Harlan, S.L., 2011. Multi-faceted perspectives on water risks and policies: a cultural domains approach in a Southwestern City. *Hum. Ecol. Rev.* 18 (1), 75–87.
- Leiserowitz, A., Kates, R.W., Parris, T.M., 2005. Do global attitudes and behaviors support sustainable development? *Environ. Sci. Policy Sustain. Dev.* 47 (9), 22–38.
- Luepker, R., Johnson, C.A., Murray, D., Pechacek, T., 1983. Prevention of cigarette smoking: three-year follow-up of an education program for youth. *J. Behav. Med.* 6 (1), 53–62.
- McKenzie-Mohr, D., 2000. New ways to promote proenvironmental behavior: promoting sustainable behavior: an introduction to community-based social marketing. *J. Soc. Issues* 56 (3), 543–554.
- McKenzie-Mohr, D., 2011. *Fostering Sustainable Behavior: an Introduction to Community-based Social Marketing*. New Society Publishers.
- Monroe, M., 2003. Two avenues for encouraging conservation behaviors. *Hum. Ecol. Rev.* 10 (2), 113–125.
- Moore, J., 2005. Is higher education ready for transformative learning? *J. Transform. Educ.* 3 (1), 76–91.
- Nolet, V., 2009. Preparing sustainability – literate teachers. *Teach. Coll. Rec. Voice Scholar. Educ.* 111 (2), 409–442.
- O'Brien, R., 2007. A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Qual. Quant.* 41 (5), 673–690.
- Orr, D., 1991. What Is Education for? the Learning Revolution (Ic#27). Context Institute, pp. 52–59.
- Padel, S., Foster, C., 2005. Exploring the gap between attitudes and behaviour: understanding why consumers buy or do not buy organic food. *Brit. Food J.* 107 (8), 606–625.
- Perkins, H.W., 2002. Social norms and the prevention of alcohol misuse in collegiate contexts. *J. Stud. Alcohol. Suppl.* (14), 164–172.
- Pooley, J.A., O'Connor, M., 2000. Environmental education and attitudes: emotions and beliefs are what is needed. *Environ. Behav.* 32 (5), 711–723.
- Ramsey, J.M., 1993. The effects of issue investigation and action training on eighth-grade students' environmental behavior. *J. Environ. Educ.* 24 (3), 31–36.
- Redman, E., 2013. Advancing educational pedagogy for sustainability: developing and implementing programs to transform behaviors. *Int. J. Environ. Sci. Educ.* 4 (1), 1–34.
- Rogers, E.M., 2003. *Diffusion of Innovations*. Simon and Schuster.
- Rowe, D., 2007. Education for a sustainable future. *Science* 317 (5836), 323–324.
- Schultz, P.W., Nolan, J.M., Cialdini, R.B., Goldstein, N.J., Griskevicius, V., 2007. The constructive, destructive, and reconstructive power of social norms. *Psychol. Sci.* 18 (5), 429–434.
- Simmons, B., Volk, T., 2002. Conversations with environmental educators: a conversation with Harold Hungerford. *Int. J. Sustain. Higher Educ.* 9 (1), 68–86.
- Stagl, S., 2002. Local organic food markets: potentials and limitations for contributing to sustainable development. *Empirica* 29 (2), 145–162.
- Sterling, S.R., 2001. *Sustainable Education: Re-visioning Learning and Change*. Green Books for the Schumacher Society.
- Stern, P., 1999. Information, incentives, and proenvironmental consumer behavior. *J. Consum. Policy* 22 (4), 461–478.
- Stern, P., 2000. New environmental theories: toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior. *J. Soc. Issues* 56 (3), 407–424.
- Stir, J., 2006. Restructuring teacher education for sustainability: student involvement through a "strengths model". *J. Clean. Prod.* 14 (9–11), 830–836.
- Trumbo, C.W., O'Keefe, G.J., 2001. Intention to conserve water: environmental values, planned behavior, and information effects. A comparison of three communities sharing a watershed. *Soc. Nat. Resour.* 14 (10), 889–899.
- Tucker, P., Speirs, D., 2003. Attitudes and behavioural change in household waste management behaviours. *J. Environ. Plann. Manage.* 46 (2), 289–307.
- Wright, B., 2000. Environmental NGOs and the dolphin-tuna case. *Environ. Politics* 9 (4), 82–103.
- Zelezny, L., 1999. Educational interventions that improve environmental behaviors: a meta-analysis. *J. Environ. Educ.* 31 (1), 5–14.