Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY Hirokazu Doi, Nagaoka University of Technology, Japan

*CORRESPONDENCE Eugene Y. Chan 🖾 e34chan@torontomu.ca

RECEIVED 03 August 2023 ACCEPTED 23 August 2023 PUBLISHED 05 September 2023

CITATION

Chan EY, Howie K and Septianto F (2023) Editorial: Discrete emotions in environmental decision-making. *Front. Psychol.* 14:1272343. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1272343

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Chan, Howie and Septianto. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Editorial: Discrete emotions in environmental decision-making

Eugene Y. Chan^{1*}, Katharine Howie² and Felix Septianto³

¹Ted Rogers School of Management, Toronto Metropolitan University, Toronto, ON, Canada, ²College of Business and Economic Development, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS, United States, ³School of Business, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

KEYWORDS

Editorial, environmental decision-making, sustainability, emotions, psychology

Editorial on the Research Topic Discrete emotions in environmental decision-making

Climate change is a pressing global issue that demands immediate attention due to its far-reaching implications not just for the environment but also human well-being. As the Earth's climate continues to warm, extreme weather events, rising sea levels, and habitat destruction threaten ecosystems and livelihoods. The significance of climate change lies in its potential to disrupt the delicate balance of life on our planet. People play a crucial role in addressing this crisis by making informed environmental decisions (White et al., 2019). From adopting sustainable practices in daily life, such as reducing carbon footprints and conserving energy, to supporting eco-friendly policies and technologies, individuals can collectively drive positive change. Without the support of individuals, global warming and the associated negative externalities are expected to continue or intensify.

Consumers' pro-environment decisions are likely influenced by a combination of factors. Environmental awareness, personal values, perceptions of self-efficacy, and social norms play a crucial role in the climate related choices consumers make (Du Bray et al., 2019; Gregersen et al., 2020). Purchasing green products is one of many climate-conscious decisions consumers can make, and the success of environmentally friendly products is shaped by a diverse range of factors (Barbarossa and De Pelsmacker, 2016). Taken together, countless individual and situational attributes interact to shape an individual's attitudes and environmental choices. Empirical research from highly diverse disciplines have sought to provide insights into this consequential and complex domain. As research continues to evolve, a more comprehensive understanding of these factors informs strategies to encourage environmentally-friendly consumer behavior.

For the past few decades, emotion research has demonstrated how emotional valence differentially influences individuals' decision making (Peters et al., 2006). However, there is still very limited understanding regarding how discrete emotions can influence environmental behavior, potentially due to the complex nature of climate change (Pihkala, 2022). Understanding the role of emotions is vital in this setting as research has demonstrated strong predictive power for outcomes like climate mitigation (Xie et al., 2019), preference for energy technologies (Jobin and Siegrist, 2018), and support for policy (Smith and Leiserowitz, 2014). Environmental decisions often involve complex and multifaceted issues with long-term consequences (Larson et al., 2015), and people's emotional responses can heavily influence their attitudes and actions (Davidson and Kecinski, 2022). Positive emotions like empathy and concern for nature can motivate individuals to engage in pro-environmental behaviors, such as recycling or supporting conservation efforts (Berenguer, 2007). Conversely, negative emotions like fear or denial can hinder environmental action or lead to unsustainable practices (Bostrom et al., 2018).

10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1272343

This Research Topic of Frontiers recognizes the emotional underpinnings of environmental decision-making, policymakers, educators, and advocates can tailor their messages and strategies to appeal to people's emotions in ways that inspire positive environmental actions. The first paper in our Research Topic, Shipley et al. focus on two discrete emotions-pride and guilt. The authors how place attachment influence these two discrete emotions, thereby influencing pro-environmental behavior. Then, Sanford et al. focus on social media-specifically, the authors examine Twitter "tweets" and the emotional content they contain as they relate to environmental awareness. The concern for protecting the planet continues to be examined with Seibt et al. addressing how communal sharing relationships evoke an emotion termed "kama muta," thereby expanding an understanding of how sympathy, compassion, and care influence environmental decisionmaking. Myers et al. then shift focus to communication strategies. Specifically, the authors examine how emotions regarding climate change information (not climate change more generally) influence their support for policy measures, focusing on the five emotions of guilt, anger, hope, fear, and sadness. Recognizing the global scope and complexity of climate concerns, Böhm et al. use Appraisal Theory to examine cross-cultural differences in emotional reactions to climate change and climate related actions. Zhang et al. also bring an international scope studying how adolescents' happiness may influence their willingness to protect the environment using data from eight countries. Our penultimate article, Geiger et al. use meta-analysis to investigate the effectiveness of hope in promoting sustainable decisions.

Future research on the role of individuals' emotions in environmental decision-making should further explore how emotional responses vary across different environmental issues and contexts beyond culture (Böhm et al.) and age (Zhang et al.). Investigating whether emotions differ in intensity and directionality depending on the type of environmental concern (e.g., climate change, deforestation, and pollution) and the geographic, cultural, or socio-economic context in which individuals are situated can provide valuable insights for tailoring communication and policy approaches.

Understanding the nuanced emotional landscape surrounding diverse environmental challenges can inform targeted interventions that resonate with individuals' emotional realities, fostering more profound connections to nature and driving meaningful pro-environmental actions. Additionally, research could delve into the interplay between emotions and cognitive processes in online environments as communication these days are largely done using social media (Sanford et al.). Ultimately, these investigations can empower policymakers, educators, and activists to effectively harness emotions as a force for positive environmental change. Indeed, recognizing emotions not toward climate change itself but toward communication (Myers et al.) will further expand how emotions play a role in sustainable decision-making. Policy-makers can design incentives and rewards that trigger positive emotions for adopting eco-friendly behaviors, reinforcing the link between personal well-being and environmental responsibility. Finally, new methods such as meta-analyses (Geiger et al.) can better assess the effectiveness of strategies and interventions beyond traditional psychological methods of surveys and experiments.

Indeed, policy-makers can strategically leverage people's emotions to promote environmentally friendly choices and decisions by employing targeted communication and policy interventions, as Myers et al. has shown. By crafting compelling narratives that evoke empathy and concern for the environment, policy makers can raise awareness about pressing environmental issues and their potential impact on communities and future generations. Utilizing positive emotional appeals, such as hope and optimism (Myers et al.), or guilt, pride and even sympathy (Shipley et al.; Seibt et al.) policy makers can highlight success stories and the transformative potential of sustainable practices, inspiring individuals to take action. By tapping into the emotional dimensions of decision-making, policy makers can foster a sense of shared responsibility and collective action, empowering individuals to become agents of positive environmental change.

Author contributions

EC: Writing—original draft, Writing—review and editing. KH: Writing—original draft, Writing—review and editing. FS: Writing—original draft, Writing—review and editing.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

References

Barbarossa, C., and De Pelsmacker, P. (2016). Positive and negative antecedents of purchasing eco-friendly products: a comparison between green and non-green consumers. J. Bus. Ethics 134, 229–247. doi: 10.1007/s10551-014-2425-z

Berenguer, J. (2007). The effect of empathy in proenvironmental attitudes and behaviors. *Environ. Behav.* 39, 269–283. doi: 10.1177/001391650629 2937

Bostrom, A., Böhm, G., and O'Connor, R. O. (2018). "Communicating risks: principles and challenges" in *Psychological Aspects of Risk and Risk Analysis: Theory, Models, and Applications*, eds M. Raue, E. Lermer, and B. Streicher (New York, NY: Springer), 251–277.

Davidson, D. J., and Kecinski, M. (2022). Emotional pathways to climate change responses. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Change* 13, e751. doi: 10.1002/wcc.751De

Du Bray, M., Wutich, A., Larson, K. L., White, D. D., and Brewis, A. (2019). Anger and sadness: gendered emotional responses to climate threats in four Island nations. *Cross Cult. Res.* 53, 58–86. doi: 10.1177/1069397118759252

Gregersen, T., Doran, R., Böhm, G., Tvinnereim, E., and Poortinga, W. (2020). Political orientation moderates the relationship between climate change beliefs and worry about climate change. *Front. Psychol.* 11, 1573. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01573

Jobin, M., and Siegrist, M. (2018). We choose what we like-affect as a driver of electricity portfolio choice. *Energy Policy* 122, 736–747. doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2018.08.027 Larson, L. R., Stedman, R. C., Cooper, C. B., and Decker, D. J. (2015). Understanding the multi-dimensional structure of pro-environmental behavior. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 43, 112–124. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.06.004

Peters, E., Västfjäll, D., Gärling, T., and Slovic, P. (2006). Affect and decision making: a "hot" topic. J. Behav. Decis. Mak. 19, 79–85. doi: 10.1002/bdm.528

Pihkala, P. (2022). Toward a taxonomy of climate emotions. *Front. Clim.* 3, 738154. doi: 10.3389/fclim.2021.738154

Smith, N., and Leiserowitz, A. (2014). The role of emotion in global warming policy support and opposition. *Risk Anal.* 34, 937–948. doi: 10.1111/risa.12140

White, K., Habib, R., and Hardisty, D. J. (2019). How to SHIFT consumer behaviors to be more sustainable: a literature review and guiding framework. *J. Mark.* 83, 22–49. doi: 10.1177/0022242919825649

Xie, B., Brewer, M. B., Hayes, B. K., McDonald, R. I., and Newell, B. R. (2019). Predicting climate change risk perception and willingness to act. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 65, 101331. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2019.101331