

WR1204

Household Waste Prevention

Evidence Review:

L3 m3-9 (T) – Small Group Approaches
to Behaviour Change

A report for Defra's
Waste and Resources Evidence Programme

October 2009

This research was commissioned and funded by Defra. The views expressed reflect the research findings and the authors' interpretation. The inclusion of or reference to any particular policy in this report should not be taken to imply that it has, or will be, endorsed by Defra

Table of Contents

1.1	Evidence reviewed	1
1.2	Topline summary of findings	2
1.3	Key findings	3
1.4	Opportunities for progressing small group approaches	6
1.5	Barriers to progressing small group approaches	6
1.6	Researchers' recommendations	6
1.7	Practical issues and lessons	8
1.8	References	8

© Brook Lyndhurst 2009

This report has been produced by Brook Lyndhurst Ltd under/as part of a contract placed by Defra. Any views expressed in it are not necessarily those of Defra. Brook Lyndhurst warrants that all reasonable skill and care has been used in preparing this report. Notwithstanding this warranty, Brook Lyndhurst shall not be under any liability for loss of profit, business, revenues or any special indirect or consequential damage of any nature whatsoever or loss of anticipated saving or for any increased costs sustained by the client or his or her servants or agents arising in any way whether directly or indirectly as a result of reliance on this report or of any error or defect in this report.

L3 m3-9 (T) Small group approaches to behaviour change

This paper provides an overview of a particular type of approach for encouraging behaviour change on waste prevention. The small group behaviour change models reviewed here differ substantially from more usual approaches to waste campaigns. Their main point of difference is that they target small groups of volunteer individuals with on-going advice and support, rather than delivering mass communications to a general population in a target area. The evidence review provides insights on:

- Approaches used in small group models
- What works?
- Who gets involved?
- Barriers to changing behaviour; to delivering the models
- Impact on attitudes, behaviours and waste
- Diffusion of innovation in social practice
- Monitoring and evaluation

The evidence reviewed in this paper focuses on just one of the consumer engagement approaches outlined in module **L2 m3**. Related modules are:

L1 m1 Executive Report	L2 m3 Consumers – engaging L2 m6 Monitoring & evaluation	L3 m3/3 (D) Impacts of public campaigns and interventions L3 m3/4 (T) Attitudes & behaviour – food waste L3 m3/5 (T) Attitudes & behaviour – home composting L3 m3/6 (T) Attitudes & behaviour - reuse L3 m3/7 (T) Attitudes & behaviour – everyday actions around the home L3 m6/1 (D) Approaches to monitoring & evaluation
------------------------	---	--

(D) denotes a briefing paper providing more background detail; (T) indicates a short focused topic briefing

1.1 Evidence reviewed

Evidence is drawn from two WREP¹ projects which investigated these approaches in depth and a pilot project run by WRAP, as follows:

- *Promoting durable change in household waste and energy use behaviour* (Global Action Plan (GAP) et al, 2008, WR0114)²;
- *Small Changes Big Difference. Towards a Materials Resource Authority: Promoting Practical Waste Prevention and Exploring Options for Resource Management* (Hampshire County Council and Brook Lyndhurst (2008) WR0117);
- *Love Food Champions* (WRAP and the Women's Institute (2008))

For ease of reading, these three sources are referred to throughout as, respectively, GAP, Hampshire and WRAP LFC.

¹ Defra's Waste and Resources Evidence Programme; WRAP is the Waste and Resources Action Programme.

² In reviewing GAP's evidence we have also drawn on their unpublished report submitted to Defra's EAF evaluation.

In addition to these main sources, the paper draws on findings from other examples identified in the literature, including synthesis reviews of practice conducted for WREP: *Project REDUCE Monitoring & Evaluation - Developing tools to measure waste prevention*, (Waste Watch, 2006, WR0105); and *Establishing the behaviour change evidence base to inform community based waste prevention and recycling* (CBBC) (Brook Lyndhurst, 2006, WR504).

Finally, reference is made to the evaluation of Defra's Environmental Action Fund (EAF), which supported 34 community projects, many of which were group-based behaviour change models aiming to promote sustainable lifestyles, including waste (Defra, 2009).

1.2 Topline summary of findings

Small group approaches can achieve noticeable behavioural change and significant reductions in waste among the volunteers taking part. These approaches tend to encourage people who were already green in outlook to take on more pro-environmental behaviours. Drawing from the two studies where weight reduction was measured, participants reduced their waste by ~ 1 to 2 kg per household per week.

Small group models seem to be an especially effective way of breaking into routine habits and helping people to develop new ones with confidence.

Key aspects are:

- Having regular contact and feedback with participants over a period of months;
- Providing practical tips and advice; and
- Social support from like-minded others that comes from working in groups.

Small groups, together with competent and enthusiastic facilitation, are fundamental to the success of these approaches. Sharing tips in groups helps people to localise, or customise, the information provided by the project team and so embed it in their own everyday life. Training for facilitators is also crucial.

Making waste visible through participants' self-weighing activity complements the effects of group working and the activity suggestions. Self-weighing appears to work well where the group is small and the facilitator has direct and regular contact with the group. It did not work in Hampshire where there was less outreach resource for facilitating this activity.

The model seems to attract a very particular kind of person – usually female, moderately affluent and with existing green intentions, even if their pro-environmental behaviour lags some way behind. Participants generally display the characteristics of Defra's Positive Green segment but also Waste Watchers and Concerned Consumers³.

While these approaches can achieve significant behavioural changes, their inherently resource intensive nature makes them difficult to scale up, or for local authorities to adopt them as a mainstream solution for promoting waste prevention. They may have a role to play in a toolkit of

³ Defra's environmental segmentation model identifies seven clusters within the population, each displaying distinctive attitudes and beliefs towards the environment. See <http://www.defra.gov.uk/evidence/social/behaviour> for details.

measures to promote waste prevention, acting as a complement to mass communication approaches by providing real world examples of what is possible if the suggested actions are adopted.

1.3 Key findings

Approaches used in small group models

Approaches used in the GAP, Hampshire and WRAP LFC projects are summarised in the table overleaf. There are four defining characteristics or principles of these approaches:

- Recruitment of a group of like-minded volunteers who make a commitment to reduce their waste or their impact on the environment;
- Engagement with, or facilitation of, the group over a period of time (4 months to 1 year in the projects above) providing practical advice, tips, and hands-on support;
- Participants work together in a social setting to talk about the issues, consider what the options are for changing their lifestyles, and share tips;
- Participants are involved in monitoring their own behavioural change impacts.

The GAP and WRAP LFC both achieved all four; the Hampshire project had less success in addressing the social learning and participant monitoring features, for reasons outlined under 'what worked' below.

What worked?

Recruiting through existing social or institutional networks can provide good reach to already receptive audiences so that resources can be targeted at those more likely to adopt the advice given (Hampshire and GAP).

GAP has found that 'semi facilitated' models run through partner organisations are more cost effective than groups it facilitates directly (EAF). Hampshire found that partner organisations were an effective way to recruit participants but not to sustain engagement with them (see Barriers, below).

Group working is reported to be fundamental to the success of these approaches. Positive aspects of groups that were mentioned include:

- Social reasons are important for getting involved - the group is a locus for socialising and making new friends;
- People can share tips;
- Sharing tips allows the information provided by the project team/facilitator to be customised to the needs of the individuals in the group, including specific local information;
- Peer support helps people embed new habits even if they encounter teething problems;
- The group builds new social norms which act as a source of personal accountability – group members may strive for consistency in their actions having signalled their green self-identity by become part of the group (e.g. not being seen with a supermarket carrier bag when you have committed to reusing your own).

	GAP Eco Teams	Hampshire Small Changes Big Difference	WRAP Love Food Champions
Who was involved?	Global Action Plan University of East Anglia New Economics Foundation	Hampshire County Council Brook Lyndhurst Local 'delivery organisation' partners	WRAP The Womens Institute
Target audience for groups	Local communities nationwide Groups of 5-10 individuals	Individuals in Hampshire at key 'moments of change' in their lives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retirement new parents parents of children at school workplace (to explore if this can be catalyst for action at home, rather than as a moment of change) 	Nationwide - local communities in areas where there are WI groups Groups of up to 10 individuals
Recruitment approach	Door knocking target areas <i>or</i> Through partner organisations, such as local authorities, businesses or community organisations 1,899 recruited	Identified through 'communities of interest' – local membership groups or social organisations associated with the moments of change above Target was to recruit as many members of each partner community organisation as possible, up to 3,000. 400 individuals recruited	A WI member volunteered to become a Love Food Champion, then recruited non-WI members in their local area to form a group, whihc the champion then facilitated 81 households recruited
Engagement approach	GAP either provides a group facilitator or trains a group facilitator	HCC recruited 12 'delivery' organisations to act as facilitators – from local NCT groups, University of the Third Age groups, local schools & a family learning centre	WI member recruited as Love Food Champion then trained in engagement methods and project content
Engagement tools	Informed by community action practice & social learning theory Workbook and monthly meetings Focus on sustainable behaviours One behaviour goal addressed each month in group meeting ; waste subject of one meeting	Informed by Defra 4Es & Jackson review of behaviour change models (2005) Lifestyle diary/organiser Monthly (or termly) activity suggestions or challenges mailed to participants Monthly 'lifestyle theme' (e.g. cooking) Waste was a core focus in each theme	Informed by national Love Food Hate Waste & WI participation in Eco Teams Workbook and monthly topic meetings Topics focus on causes of food waste (buying, storing, portioning, leftovers) Champions have flexibility to add activities/suggestions
M&E methods	Self-weigh waste before and after topic meeting Data put onto central database which allows for comparison with others and individual feedback In-depth interviews and focus groups by UEA Surveys	Self-weigh waste In-depth interviews & focus groups Baseline and follow up surveys Intention to use collection round data and waste analysis but proved not possible (see M&E)	Store food waste in kitchen caddy, estimate volume, then use conversion factor to estimate weight of waste – one week before and one week at end of project (four months)

Table 1 Approaches to small group behaviour change

A consistent theme in the evidence is that groups need time (several months at least) for the social dynamics to become established, for participants to develop confidence to share information freely, and to take on board new actions.

Hampshire found that (unfacilitated) groups can sometimes develop negative views of the project which are then easily transmitted through the wider member network.

The Hampshire project also found that being a member of a social group or network did not necessarily mean that people had strong social bonds with each other. A key lesson here was that it cannot be taken for granted that members of existing social organisations will necessarily work together without commitment from a motivated and well connected facilitator drawn from the membership. WRAP's LFC showed that the facilitator was consistently the aspect ranked highest by group members, above the information provided and activities undertaken.

Other aspects of the approaches that contribute to their success are:

Suggested behaviours 'fit' well with current lifestyles. Changes that fit easily within present lifestyles are more likely to be taken up. GAP explained this outcome with reference to 'economies of scale' – as people take on more behaviours the 'cost' (e.g. effort or inconvenience) reduces over time for adopting other behaviours.

If given a choice, however, participants will tend to choose the easiest options (Hampshire, EAF). There is an inherent tension in these models between maximising engagement by not challenging participants too far, and pushing them to take on difficult but high impact behaviours (Hampshire, EAF). One option is to target behaviours very specifically (within the context of everyday living) so that the 'call to action' is obvious (as in, for example, GAP or WRAP LFC).

Breaking into habits. Regular meetings or repeat contact over a period of time are shown to be an effective means of overcoming habitual, non-cognitive, behaviour. Habits are identified in the theoretical literature as one of the key blocks on behaviour change (see [L2 m3](#) and [L3 m3/2 \(D\)](#) for further discussion of habits⁴). These particular engagement models give participants the space to try out new habits over time; support from the group (or repeat contact in Hampshire) helps to embed the habits and act as a reminder to stick to them.

Practical advice and tips. These are an essential part of the engagement package, together with on-going contact with participants to disrupt habits.

- GAP noted in particular that 'localising' the information through group discussion in the Eco Teams makes standard information materials more relevant and actionable by the group.
- WRAP LFC similarly noted that participants often used their workbooks as a starting point for developing their own ideas on preventing food waste.
- Hampshire too found a strong call for localisation (or customisation) of information which it was able to do in part by feeding back participants' tips through regular newsletters (in the absence of effective groups).

Making waste visible. GAP and WRAP LFC both used participant self-weighing of waste as a means of measuring performance but also, importantly, to make the waste visible to the participants. Both found that visibility – including shock about how much was produced - affected the attitudes and behaviour of

⁴ In relation to pro-environmental behaviour more widely work is currently underway for Defra to investigate *Unlocking habits to enable pro-environmental behaviours*. Defra, EV0502
October 2009

participants. There was less commitment to weighing from participants in the Hampshire groups so this was a less effective behaviour change tool there.

GAP points out that being able to see immediate results through weighing reinforces a sense of personal control, efficacy and satisfaction (all flagged as important in behaviour change theories – see L2 m3). Equally, Hampshire found that *not* achieving a change in the waste being measured could be demotivating.

Overall, GAP concluded that it is the *combination* of group activity with participant weighing and measuring which is key to the success of its Eco Team model.

Feedback. GAP and Hampshire both highlighted the importance of providing regular feedback to participants to keep them engaged and interested. In GAP's Eco Teams, feedback is personalised and benchmarked against others, which is enabled by a central database onto which facilitators from groups all over the country record performance data.

Who gets involved?

Evidence from GAP, Hampshire and Defra's EAF shows very clearly that these approaches are most attractive to:

- Those with prior green interests and intentions (even though these intentions may be latent rather than active);
- Women - often middle aged or older - who are moderately affluent.

We could speculate that the female bias reflects the still gendered division of household tasks - which are generally the target behaviours in these models.

GAP reported that its Eco Team participants generally align with Defra's 'Positive Green', 'Concerned Consumers' or 'Waste Watcher' segments. Though Hampshire did not classify on this basis, their evidence points to the same there; in particular the Retired group displayed many of the characteristics of Defra's 'Waste Watchers' and participants more generally had stronger than average environmental attitudes.

Hampshire, GAP and the EAF found that these approaches encourage those with existing green intentions to take further steps and/or finally act on things they had been meaning to do for a while. Hampshire found this effect was often greater among people who were relatively new to green thinking rather than those with a long-term green self-identity (which was often defined solely by high recycling).

The Hampshire project set out to explore whether 'moments of change' in people's lives could act as a hook to engagement⁵. It found that becoming a new parent was more effective than entering retirement; parents of children in primary school were receptive to suggestions, and the institutional framework of school life provided a useful framework for groups to operate in.

Barriers – to changing behaviour

Neither GAP nor WRAP LFC report extensively on barriers, whereas these are considered in depth in Hampshire. The Hampshire research identified the following as key barriers to behavioural change:

Generic barriers – which are often cited in other pro-environmental behaviour change studies and in the EAF evaluation, including:

⁵ Further research is currently underway by the New Economics Foundation for Defra to investigate *Moments of change as opportunities for influencing behaviour*. Defra EV0506.
October 2009

- Lack of time
- Lack of personal responsibility - blaming government and retailers for waste
- Wanting to follow rather than take the initiative
- Not wanting to stand out from the crowd by being obviously green

Context specific barriers – in the workplace group, the social norm was such that participants were generally reluctant to show their pro-environmental commitment openly. In some of the other groups, lack of support from influential people within the membership organisations acted as a block.

Conceptualising waste reduction – participants often retained a belief that *recycling waste* was the main route to achieving *waste reduction*, despite considerable communications effort to counter this impression and giving tips on how to do prevention. The qualitative research revealed a sense that many people were only receptive to messages that fitted with their own definition of “reduction” and did not want to take action beyond that. Some active participants became pre-occupied with materials that cannot presently be recycled where they live.

Consumer identity - Hampshire concluded that a fundamental barrier to waste prevention exists at a much higher societal level as a result of the fabric of consumer culture, which shapes people’s identities with respect to waste. GAP made a similar point about the need for interventions to take into account the fabric (or ‘patterning’) of everyday life and a need to appreciate how change is possible within the micro-context of existing habits and family relationships.

Hampshire further noted participants’ fears that choices would be restricted if they opted for low waste products, or that alternatives would be sub-optimal, which acted as a block on consideration of options that would generate less waste. This applied especially to less mainstream options such as vegetable box deliveries, but also to more usual options as well (e.g. stopping junk mail).

Specifically in relation to food waste, WRAP LFC noted some of the ‘external’ factors that participants think act as barriers (though no ‘internal’ or personal barriers were reported):

- The role of retailers and grocery brand owners, including lack of in-store advice on how to prevent waste;
- Food promotions – which are seen to encourage food waste;
- Lack of information about food collections for composting by local authorities;
- Lack of information on packaging;
- What role schools could play in educating children about food waste.

Barriers - to delivering small group models

Key barriers evident in the source reviewed were:

- The time and resource needed to establish groups, both where they are being set up from scratch (WRAP LFC, GAP) but also where they are being set up inside membership organisations (Hampshire, EAF).
- Lack of (or the essential requirement for) high level support within the host organisations (Hampshire, EAF);
- The amount of resource needed to deliver intensive engagement approaches (Hampshire);
- Recruitment and retention issues that are specific to working through volunteer facilitators. These approaches rely fundamentally on committed and highly motivated facilitators.

- Both WRAP LFC and Hampshire found that people with the right motivation might not have the time or confidence to run groups.
- In Hampshire, motivation dwindled during the project in some organisations which then had an adverse impact on the outcomes.
- Both WRAP LFC and GAP Eco Teams paid considerable attention to supporting the facilitators, including initial training. EAF also found that support for facilitators/champions/ambassadors enhanced their ability to be effective.

Reflecting its experience of the resource and recruitment issues, WRAP LFC indicated that any future Love Food Champions groups would be run through existing social groups. The Hampshire experience suggests, however, that this does not work automatically and that attention needs to focus on how the groups will be facilitated whichever recruitment channel is adopted.

Impact – attitudes

Significant impacts on the knowledge and attitudes of participants were reported in all three of the main sources reviewed.

In GAP Eco Teams, 94% reported that they were doing more than before the Eco Team to reduce their environmental impact and 81% said that the Eco Team was “effective” or “very effective” in encouraging them to make small changes in their lifestyle.

In Hampshire, feelings of personal responsibility increased even though they were already high to start with. Participants’ willingness and capacity to reduce waste also showed a measurable increase. Notably, the proportion thinking that government and retailers should mainly be responsible for reducing waste decreased. Attitudes related to shopping also changed, including a significant decline in the proportion who believe packaging is unavoidable (from 80% to 61%, n=103, constant sample).

Love Food Champions reported improved skills and increased confidence about managing and preparing food so that they would waste less.

Impact – behaviours

For most people, the behaviour change resulting from their involvement was a ‘next step’ from what they were already doing, rather than a step change in behaviour. Both Hampshire and GAP, however, noted that a few were ready to adopt actions that are generally considered more challenging (e.g. flying less or installing solar water heating). In Hampshire’s case, the very small number of people reporting this had already been thinking about ‘greening’ their homes before the project started. The context in which this ‘next step’ was taken was crucial - that is, the on-going and intensive engagement with participants.

In Hampshire and GAP, **home composting** and small changes in **shopping behaviour** (e.g. avoiding packaging) stood out as areas where participants had done the most in relation to waste prevention (in both cases, changes in energy behaviours were also recorded).

In addition, Hampshire reported that more participants had started recycling items that are less usually recycled, such as clothes, batteries and furniture. Participants also started composting a wider range of materials than previously (according to survey responses).

While there were some successes, Hampshire noted that the project did not entirely overcome the intention-action gap. Some aspects of waste prevention proved especially resistant to change, notably avoiding wasteful offers when food shopping and preventing junk mail (even though participants were given help to join the MPS and stickers for their doors).

WRAP has developed a survey-based metric for estimating the proportion of the population that can be considered *committed food waste reducers*. Among Love Food Champions this rose from 5% prior to the groups to 29% after, which compares to a national average of 17%. Group members also noticed knock-on cost savings and healthy eating benefits as a result of the behavioural changes they made to reduce food waste.

Impact - -waste

GAP and WRAP LFC were able to show significant weight reductions on the basis of self-weighing (GAP) or estimation (WRAP LFC):

- GAP Eco Team members reduced residual waste by 0.85 kg/hh/wk and total waste by 0.62 kg/hh/wk as a result of increased recycling and source prevention⁶. Eco Team members had lower than national average waste arisings at the start of their involvement but they were still able to reduce them.
- Love Food Champions reduced their food waste from 4.4 kg/hh/wk to 2.2 kg/hh/wk. It should be noted that the champions had higher than average amounts of food waste at the start of the project.

Hampshire was unable to estimate weight reductions (for reasons explained under Monitoring & Evaluation, below) but the surveys showed that 56% of survey respondents (n=133) sent less to landfill each week (18% saying it had reduced “a lot”). Increased recycling was noted but the analysis suggested that not all of the change was attributable to this.

Diffusion of innovation in social practice

GAP suggested that Eco Teams can be a useful locus or starting point for diffusing new ecological practices in communities. Specifically, the group discussions help to ‘localise’ information on what people can do to reduce their impact. Figures reported in earlier research (Brook Lyndhurst, 2005, WR0504) suggested that for every three Eco Team members, seven others had been told about the project by participants (a ratio of just over 1 to 2.3).

Hampshire further showed that the direct participants had talked to an additional 1,600 people beyond the project, including a few individuals who had photocopied and passed on materials, or put together activity packs for friends (a ratio of 1 to 4).

Monitoring and evaluation

Conventional methods for monitoring household waste do not work for small group approaches. Key issues include households being geographically dispersed and the numbers involved being too small for any changes to be detectable in waste collection round data (Hampshire).

As far as a usual practice for these approaches is developing it involves a mix of self-weighing by participants, self-completion survey and qualitative research or feedback (see [L2 m6](#) for further discussion of practice).

Findings on the effectiveness of self-weighing are ambiguous. It seems to work well in a context where the group is small and there is a facilitator (GAP and WRAP LFC), so there is both an expectation and source of accountability for taking action. Hampshire noted that their project did not have strong enough peer group mechanisms (or enough outreach resource as a substitute) to reinforce weighing activities. As a result, the diary data collected was returned too inconsistently, or too incompletely, to provide statistically robust data.

⁶ This data is sourced from GAP’s EAF report to Defra, not from WR0114.
October 2009

In all three studies, formal qualitative research and anecdotal feedback provided rich insight into how the advice is received, issues to do with group/social dynamics, and the real underlying barriers to behaviour change.

Having undertaken a trial (with just four households) Hampshire suggested that it would be useful to investigate waste compositional analysis in such models. This would validate self-weighting results and identify whether the fractions being targeted (e.g. junk mail) were indeed being reduced.

1.4 Opportunities for progressing small group approaches

Recent evidence shows that small group approaches can achieve significant behavioural change and waste prevention among the volunteers taking part. WRAP LFC noted that its model was successful in getting seemingly disinterested people enthused and engaged in preventing food waste.

There is also some evidence that the models create enduring change by supporting participants to build new habits into their everyday lives (GAP).

Significant moments of change in people's lives – when their habits are already being disrupted – may offer opportunities for communicating with people about waste prevention. The pilot research reported here has suggested that new parents are a promising target group (Hampshire). More research is needed to substantiate these early findings; research is currently underway for Defra.

Small group approaches may also act as a locus for the creation of new pro-environmental social practices that are then diffused into the wider community, but much more research is required to establish whether this is, in fact, the case.

1.5 Barriers to progressing small group approaches

While these approaches can achieve significant changes, they have so far been run on only a moderate scale (fewer than 4,000 people for Eco Teams⁷, which is the largest to date). Their inherently intensive nature makes them difficult to scale up, or for local authorities to adopt as a mainstream solution for promoting waste prevention. The Hampshire project reported costs of £500 per participant; GAP report that their more established model can be run for far less than this where it is run in partnership with another organisation or business (Case Study report in WR0501). Defra's Greener Living Fund will provide further evidence of running behavioural change programmes in partnership with membership organisations.⁸

Reflecting on the resource intensive nature of small group models – but also on the possible knock-on community and media benefits of the volunteers' activity – Hampshire suggested that such models could perhaps be a useful complement to mass engagement approaches, as a means of exemplifying the central objectives of a campaign or initiative.

1.6 Researchers' recommendations

Many recommendations are made in the evidence reviewed. The following are some of the main ones.

From GAP:

⁷ All programmes, including the WREP sample.

⁸ <http://www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/how-do-we-work/third-sector/strategy/greener-living-fund.htm> .

- Policy aimed at encouraging behavioural change should seek to encourage gradual (but not insignificant) shifts in daily routines. Targeted behaviours need to be synchronised with existing lifestyles;
- Such policies therefore need to understand and take into account how the target behaviour(s) will fit into the 'micro' context in which lifestyles operate (i.e. everyday life and family structures). Further exploration of the 'bundles' of routines that represent everyday life for less green households need to be explored as part of this.
- Making waste visible to people is an important motivation for reducing it and measures that help to do this should be considered.
- The final report provides detailed recommendations on segmentation and targeting of Eco Teams with respect to Defra's segments (discussed in [L3 m3/8 \(T\) Consumer segmentation](#); and see footnote 3, above). In summary, the authors suggested that Eco Teams are most relevant to segments 1-3 ('Positive Greens', 'Waste Watchers' and 'Concerned Consumers') but there are also opportunities to extend into segments 4 and 5 ('Cautious Participants' and 'Sideline Supporters').

From Hampshire:

- Local Authorities contemplating this type of approach need to consider the mechanisms and costs for outreach and facilitation very carefully, since facilitation has been shown to be fundamental to its success.
- More research-based best practice evidence is required, including costs and expected behavioural outcomes. Action research may be appropriate to test how these approaches could be part of an overall toolkit of approaches, including M&E methods;
- It may be worth local authorities exploring the feasibility of having a dedicated team of community outreach advisors within the authority who could address different aspects of sustainability (energy, waste etc) with local communities on a rolling basis. Workers from this team could be seconded onto special projects as needed, and this may represent a more cost effective option than external recruitment of outreach for each individual project.
- Any messaging on waste prevention needs to take into account the barriers that arise through consumer culture and identity. Messages need to be persuasive but not threatening, nor too weird or too green. National level campaign campaigns may be needed to help change social norms and clarify what people are being asked to do to "reduce" waste (i.e. that it is different but complementary to recycling).
- Further action research on the 'moving house' moment of change may be worthwhile as long as suitable monitoring and evaluation mechanisms can be identified.
- Hampshire also makes specific recommendations on monitoring and evaluation (in favour of mixed methods) which are incorporated into the review of M&E approaches in [L3 m6/1 \(D\)](#).

WRAP LFC recommendations are specific to future roll-out of that model. A principal recommendation is that others should take up the model, including existing social groups and other organisations (e.g. those working with younger people, local authorities or businesses). WRAP would also recommend that the target audience is widened to include, for example, men, younger people and those on low incomes.

1.7 Practical issues and lessons

Drawing across all the sources, the principal lessons for recruiting and running small group behaviour change approaches are:

- Running groups through partner organisations can provide access to large and receptive audiences;
- But partner organisations need to be fully committed to the objectives of the project and able to provide or support volunteers who will facilitate and sustain groups. Reasonable time needs to be set aside to build relationships with partners or groups;
- Committed and good facilitation is crucial to the success of the approach; reasonable time needs to be set aside for recruiting volunteer facilitators; training is essential and on-going support is desirable;
- Key elements of the 'package' offered to participants are frequent contact (to break down habits) and practical tips (to build confidence);
- Group working is invaluable - it helps to localise/customise the advice offered and provides social support as people try out new behaviours (what GAP calls a "training ground");
- Self-weighing helps to make the problem of waste visible and immediate, and participants can get a sense of satisfaction from seeing their waste decrease (though it can be de-motivating where this does not happen).

1.8 References

Brook Lyndhurst (2006), Establishing the behaviour change evidence base to inform community based waste prevention and recycling (CBBC). WR504.

Burgess, J. (2006) Foundation Document – An International Academic-Policy Review of Demand Side Waste Management Behaviour Change Projects, 2006-2008. WR0114.

Changeworks (Fletcher, S.I., Tucker, P. Speirs, D.) (2008) The Waste Wise Armadale Project. Final report.

Defra (2009) Evaluation of the Environmental Action Fund 2005-8. A Review of Sustainable Consumption and Production Projects (SCP2.2). Brook Lyndhurst for Defra.

Global Action Plan, Nye, M. and Burgess, J. (School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia) (2008) Promoting durable change in household waste and energy use behaviour. (WR0114)

Global Action Plan (2008) EcoTeams Evaluation Report for Defra's EAF (unpublished).

Hampshire County Council and Brook Lyndhurst (2008) Small Changes Big Difference Towards a Materials Resource Authority: Promoting Practical Waste Prevention and Exploring Options for Resource Management. WR0117.

NLWA (North London Waste Authority) (2009) North London Watch Your Waste Week – 4th to 12th October 2008.

Waste Watch (2006) Project REDUCE Monitoring & Evaluation - Developing tools to measure waste prevention. WR0105.

Waste Watch (2007a) Project REDUCE Monitoring & Evaluation - Developing tools to measure waste prevention. Campaign evaluation report: 'What not to waste'. WR0105.

Waste Watch (2007b) Project REDUCE Monitoring & Evaluation – Developing tools to measure waste prevention. Campaign evaluation report: 'Test the Water'. WR0105

Wickens, S. (RoWan - Ross-shire Waste Action Network) (2005) Waste Free Households project. Final report.

WRAP and the Women's Institute (2008) Love Food Champions.

Basis of this report

The material in this paper is derived from a large scale evidence review of household waste prevention conducted by Brook Lyndhurst, the Social Marketing Practice and the Resource Recovery Forum for Defra's Waste and Resources Evidence Programme.