

INFLUENCING CONSUMER BEHAVIOR - BEYOND "EFFICIENCY"

Exploring the Roles of Attitudes, NEBs, and Social Marketing Approaches

Lisa A. Skumatz, Ph.D.,
Skumatz Economic Research Associates,
Inc. (SERA) ©SERA All rights reserved
skumatz@serainc.com

BACKGROUND – TRADITIONAL TO ENHANCED METHODS

- Programs designed toward energy – including outreach / education (exception – low income). Behavior / purchase influence
 - Step beyond → Research on the “human” side
- 3 areas of research provide motivation insights beyond efficiency and savings
 - Community Based Social Marketing (CBSM)
 - Self-efficacy
 - Non-energy benefits (NEBs)

BRIEFS ON OTHER WORK

	<i>Elements</i>	<i>Effects</i>
Energy	Reliable techniques (pre-post, control/treatment) Influencing factors; limited work on outreach methods; small sample issue.	0-12% savings; most 4-7%. Higher (13-15%) from feedback; increase in satisfaction
Advert.	Focus, survey methods; Success at "decision point" / intention. Track quality of copy, "hits". Control/test.	Intent & recall but little quantitative work on purchase or behavior change
Recycl.	Pre/post, seldom control; CBSM non-quantitative; primitive analyses	2-12% diversion; 0-50% target material, other effects (HHW)

Source (SERA 2000)

→ Limited sample size; data / market complexities;

→ Attribution; Little analysis of retention

SERA

COMMUNITY BASED SOCIAL MARKETING (CBSM)

- Traditional education / outreach / advertising to move residents from:
 - Unaware → aware → consider → intent → purchase/modify behavior
 - Led to focus on awareness-product basis
- CBSM approach / focus – incorporate culture, interactions, feelings to encourage behavioral change
 - Address barriers to change
 - Personal approach
 - Pledges and honor commitments
 - Limited quantitative

COMMUNITY BASED SOCIAL MARKETING (CBSM)

- Recommends 5 elements:
 - Commitments to behavioral change
 - Prompts
 - Norms
 - Incentives
 - Communication
- Argues greater...
 - Participation and behavior change
 - Unconverted
 - Retention
- Impacts
 - CFLs in South Africa
 - 100% increases each of 5 years
 - Door to door about education about upcoming program changes – forum for public feedback
 - Pre-post showed 10% increase in savings
 - → Interventions in other fields / consider approach
 - Pledges (paint)
 - Personal (grocery)
 - Outreach tailoring

SELF-EFFICACY

- Traditional “unaware to purchase” on product basis...
 - Consider attitudes as underlying factor to reach “next level” of potential participants – beyond traditional demographic stratification
- Self-efficacy: participant has ability, skill, knowledge, experience to contribute to change / empowerment
- Scaled attitudes – specialized statistical analysis method:
 - What I do makes a difference; future, etc.

SELF-EFFICACY RESULTS

- SMUD Green Energy Focus Groups
 - Reaction to LFG as green energy, WTP premium
 - WTP ← If I don't, who will; important 1st step
 - Control ← why if everyone else doesn't; should be same for everyone
- TVA Renewables
 - Early sign-ups 90%+ agreed/strongly "my actions can make a difference"; 57% disagreed with "only a difference if others do it too"
- Wisconsin FOE upcoming renewables
 - Pre/post showed awareness increased 46-55%
 - Self-efficacy motivated seeking more info to learn about renewables

SELF-EFFICACY RESULTS

- Utah (SERA)
 - 11% higher conservation for: “each responsible”, conservation “easy, common sense to reduce resource use”
- ASE Green Campus Program (SERA)
 - Intern-delivered program
 - 9 attitudinal statements; causal models
 - Strongest behavior change/influence from “make a difference in future”, “each responsible”, “using resources too quickly” – BEYOND quality of information, “exposures”

SELF-EFFICACY RESULTS

- Photovoltaics and Energy Star programs – 3 groups (SERA)
 - ESTAR appliance purchasers
 - Renewables participants
 - Non-participants
 - Scaled on 9 attitudinal statements
- PV: “make a difference”, “impact on future”, “using energy too fast”
- ESTAR: “control costs”, “reduce energy in home”
 - However, also “don’t think I can do much” also purchased – already purchased and done?

SELF-EFFICACY EXAMPLES

- Results / graphics / examples from several SERA projects:
 - ASE Green Campus program
 - Photovoltaics program
 - Energy Star appliance program

SELF EFFICACY RESULTS

- More likely to purchase EE
 - Those who feel what they do makes a difference regardless of what others do
 - Those who believe the amount of energy they use has impact on future generations
 - Those who feel we are using energy too fast
- → Consider advertising local actions to encourage feelings of empowerment to move toward converted – especially for “cutting edge”

(Source: SERA 2004)

SERA

NON-ENERGY BENEFITS

- What are NEBs?
 - Net, attributable, omitted, hard to measure; 3 perspectives
 - Participant NEBs represent “bundle of features”
 - Negative → Barriers
- Motivating consumers... what do they value?
 - SERA research shows NEB results vary by program, region, measures, household characteristics; based on research on >50 programs, residential, comm'l, other

NEB EXAMPLES

- Results / graphics / examples from several SERA projects:
 - Total values of NEBs compared to energy savings
 - Energy Star™ appliance program results – leading NEB categories
 - Real time pricing program
 - Low income weatherization program

MOTIVATING CONSUMERS

- Multiple actors
 - Motivating the “specifiers”, market actors, decision-makers...
 - Differences?
 - Positive / negative?
 - Implications

NEB EXAMPLES

- Results / graphics / examples from several SERA projects:
 - Home Performance with Energy Star™ and Energy Star™ Homes – multiple actors
 - High Performance design program – multiple actors

NEBS RESULTS

- Differences in NEBs → “Disconnects” to be addressed (real vs. perceived)
- Negative NEBs → barriers to be addressed; value of intervention (real vs. perceived)
- → NEBs imply - Sell on features people want to buy – Tide™
 - EE are “already converted” (and not always sure of savings!)
 - Use to craft outreach & program modifications
 - Valuable applications well beyond outreach (C/B, targeting, design...)

CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS

- Theory and results indicate influences beyond demographics and traditional factors...
 - →integrate elements, expand toolkit, → message!
- CBSM
 - Personal link increases impacts and possibly retention – add to toolkit
- Self-efficacy
 - Strong relation with EE purchase and participation
 - Necessary but not sufficient / add nod to financial benefits

CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS

- To change behavior - Emphasize links
 - Persuading that individuals can make a difference may help, perhaps by linking local/small behavior to environmental changes
 - Education efforts toward conservation may consider attitudes and effects to move beyond converted...
- NEBs powerful, useful (inexpensive)
 - Market / design to emphasize program effects (NEBS) that participants value
 - EE may not “sell” best, and don’t have to sell on benefits “we” care about... and easier to “sell” in many cases...! **SELL ON FEATURES THEY VALUE!**
 - Also relevant applications in regulatory “tests”

CONTACT:

Lisa A. Skumatz, Ph.D.

Principal, SERA, Inc.

762 Eldorado Drive, Superior, CO 80027

Phone: 303/494-1178

email: skumatz@serainc.com

www.serainc.com