

Conceptualizing consumption: from theoretical turns towards practical

Understanding why we consume, how our consumption patterns change over time, and what drives continued increases in consumption has become a central concern across disciplines. This literature review discusses the development of theoretical approaches to consumption, starting from more traditional foundations toward frameworks focused on sustainable consumption.

Theorizing consumption in relation to economic production

Early economics, as represented in Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* (1776), viewed consumption as the final stage of production where individuals maximize utility and satisfy their predetermined needs. Thorstein Veblen's *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, published in 1899, is often recognized as the first major theoretical work to critique this perspective. In the context of late 19th-century capitalism, Veblen critiqued neoclassical economics by showing that consumption is not only about meeting needs but also holds symbolic value. Through his concepts of 'conspicuous consumption' and 'conspicuous leisure', he illustrated how material and time are used in ways that are meant to be seen by others, serving to display wealth and reinforce social status (Trigg, 2001).

In 1922, Max Weber developed similar ideas, as he introduced the concept of 'status groups', which he defined as social formations based not on economic position but on shared lifestyles, cultural tastes, and prestige. While Veblen focused on the economic display of wealth, Weber showed how consumption patterns help signal group membership and sustain social boundaries (Waters & Waters, 2016; Weber, 2011). Building on Veblen's insights, Georg Simmel supported the sociological understanding of consumption with his essay *Fashion*, published in *International Quarterly*. Simmel saw fashion as a social process driven by imitation: people adopt styles to fit in with certain groups, which creates a sense of social equality. Yet, because fashion is always changing, it also sets groups apart by distinguishing them from others. In this way, consumption both connects and separates social groups (Simmel, 1957).

The work of Veblen, Weber, and Simmel marked a turning point in sociological thought and recognized consumption's social significance (Hansen & Nielsen, 2023). However, these classical social theorists explored consumption mainly as a tool to support their broader theories about social stratification and group dynamics, rather than examining consumption as a cultural practice

in its own right. Up until the 1970s, the study of consumption was still primarily done by macroeconomists.

The cultural turn, consumption as meaning-making

The cultural turn in consumption studies emerged in the 1970s and 1980s and was a significant shift from viewing consumption as just an economic transaction to understanding it as a cultural practice of meaning-making processes (Warde, 2015). This perspective challenged the dominance of mass culture critiques that had been established by the Frankfurt School, which gained wider academic influence in the 1960s. Its main thinkers, Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, critiqued the “culture industry”, and argued how mass consumption could lead to standardization and loss of critical thinking (Stillerman, 2015). These mass culture critiques viewed consumption as a top-down process where powerful cultural industries manipulated consumers and created a homogenized mass society that eliminated authentic culture.

The cultural turn critiqued the view of consumers as ‘defenseless’ and highlighted consumption's role in identity formation through the late 1980s and 1990s. Pierre Bourdieu's *Distinction*, published in French in 1979 (English translation 1984), provided a theoretical bridge between Frankfurt School pessimism and the more nuanced cultural approaches that followed. Bourdieu redefined the understanding of consumption by stating that people’s tastes and habits reflect their social class. Instead of just being influenced by advertising or income, people use their preferences, such as what to eat, wear, or enjoy, to show who they are and to maintain social differences between classes (Stillerman, 2015; Warde, 2015). Central to the cultural turn was the work of Mike Featherstone, of which *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism* (1991) was most influential, in which he developed a more optimistic understanding of consumption practices. He reconceptualized consumption as “consumer culture”, and emphasized how individuals navigate everyday social interactions through consumption as a means of expressing personal identity (Featherstone, 1991; Blue, 2017; Warde, 2015).

Alongside Featherstone, theorists such as Douglas and Isherwood (1996) contributed to this turn by highlighting consumption's relational character. They argued that individuals use goods not just for personal expression but also to create and sustain social relationships through gift-giving, which can signify life transitions and group membership. Daniel Miller (1987, 1997) further build on this cultural perspective with his “material culture approach”, which explains how people reinterpret mass-produced goods to shape personal or group identities. He uses “objectification” to describe the process of how people create meaningful objects that then shape their identities in return. For example, working-class families take identical public housing apartments and transform the interiors with personal decorations to create a sense of “home,” thereby externalizing their personality into the physical space. The personalized apartment then reflects their identity back to them. Miller’s approach therefore shows how the meaning of products works in both directions. Colin Campbell (1987) also challenged traditional economic explanations by arguing that consumers participate in “hedonistic consumption”, which he described as a never-ending search

for novelty through consuming new goods, in order to satisfy desires and construct authentic personalities. This perspective emphasizes irrational desires that classical economists usually ignore and suggests that people seek meaningful experiences rather than just specific goods with consumption. Together, these theorists helped establish consumption as an active, creative, and culturally meaningful practice rather than passive economic behavior or status competition.

Consumer Culture Theory (CCT), as developed by Eric Arnould and Craig Thompson in 2005, built upon the cultural turn and provided a theoretical framework for marketing scholars to understand consumption and marketplace behaviors (Arnould & Thompson, 2005). Consumers use "market-provided resources", such as brands, products, and advertising imagery, as raw materials for identity construction. They interpret, modify, and transform the meanings of these products based on their cultural backgrounds and social contexts (Arnould & Thompson, 2005). Holt's (2002) work, frequently cited within CCT literature, demonstrates how this process operates in two ways: social groups may reject producers' intended messages and resist societal pressures to consume products in prescribed ways, while producers can simultaneously draw upon subcultural styles and practices to promote their branded goods. Therefore, CCT reveals that consumption practices operate through complex processes where consumers use brands to express identity and sometimes resist dominant meanings, yet these resistant practices may eventually be incorporated back into marketing strategies (Stillerman, 2015).

The practice turn: consumption as everyday routine

The cultural turn shifted the focus of consumption research from just economics to also looking at its symbolic and cultural meanings. However, this shift was also criticized. Critics argued that cultural approaches became too focused on how individuals use consumption for personal identity expression and meaning-making. The emphasis on symbolic consumption, such as of luxury goods or subcultural styles, meant that ordinary, everyday consumption practices were overlooked, and the broader systems in which these consumption practices take place (Blue, 2017; Stillerman, 2015).

In response to these criticisms, recent developments in the sociology of consumption have sought to create a more balanced, practice-driven approach that does not ignore the insights of the cultural turn but integrates them with macro-level phenomena. This approach, identified as the "practice turn" by Schatzki (2001), emphasizes how consumption is shaped by the socio-material organization of everyday life and focuses on the analysis of more mundane forms of consumption. This includes energy consumption (Winther & Wilhite, 2015), mobility practices (Greene & Rau, 2018), and food consumption (Hansen, 2018). Practice theorists recognize that most consumption happens unconsciously as part of everyday practices, as people do not typically think about their energy use when turning on lights or their mobility consumption when taking familiar routes to work. The infrastructural and temporal organization of everyday life shapes these practices (Shove et al., 2020), as well as social norms and expectations about, for example, comfort (Shove, 2003).

While practice theory initially focused on micro-level everyday practices, recent developments are recognizing more how practices do not occur in isolation but are shaped by larger economic and infrastructural systems (Hansen & Nielsen, 2023). Rather than treating demand for consumption as emerging from individual desires or needs, practice theorists argue that demand emerges from social, infrastructural and institutional arrangements (Rinkinen et al., 2020). For example, energy demand results from the intersection of social practices (like heating, cooking, or doing laundry) with available infrastructure and institutional frameworks rather than individual preferences for energy consumption. Some scholars argue that understanding capitalism as a system is fundamental for understanding these arrangements, as capitalism's core features (economic growth, individual ownership, and high product turnover) shape both provision systems and consumption cultures, ultimately leading to "cultures and habits of growth" (Hansen & Nielsen, 2023, p. 33).

3.1 Understanding embeddedness of consumption practices

The practice turn shows how consumption practices are maintained through social, institutional, cultural, and material arrangements rather than individual choices alone. Understanding this embeddedness is crucial for understanding both individual agency and systemic constraints in the development of more sustainable consumption practices.

Firstly, consumption is embedded in social interaction and cooperation. Within social contexts such as households, consumption decisions on shared subjects like meal planning and holiday destinations are made through negotiation processes between members. These stable social environments enable the formation of consumption habits that become automatic and predictable over time (Giulio et al., 2014). However, when these social environments change, because of life events or policy shifts, existing consumption routines become disrupted, which creates moments where individuals must actively choose new consumption practices and potentially establish alternative (more sustainable) long-term patterns (Wood et al., 2005). Secondly, consumption practices serve symbolic functions that reflect individuals' social identity and group membership (Levy, 1999). As established by scholars from the cultural turn, product choices such as mobile phones, cars, and restaurants show peoples' connection with particular lifestyle groups and enable both self-expression and social recognition (Di Giulio et al., 2014). Third, consumer practices are institutionally embedded across different life domains and change according to life stages. Life events, such as the birth of a first child, integrate individuals into institutional systems (family policies) that impose both formal rules (medical examinations, vaccinations) and informal guidelines (parenting norms). These systems and rules result in specific consumption patterns (Schäfer et al., 2012). Fourth, cultural definitions of cleanliness, comfort, luxury, and healthy food vary across societies and influence consumption standards, such as acceptable levels of cleanliness and building temperatures (Shove, 2003). Lastly, consumer consumption choices are largely predetermined by the physical and technological systems that surround individuals. For example, fast food "value meals" determine how much people eat, iPhones only work with specific

chargers and apps, washing machines use preset water amounts, and highway-centered cities discourage walking or cycling (Giulio et al., 2014).

3.2 Individual agency and systemic structures in mobility consumption

Applying this understanding of embedded consumption practices to mobility shows how personal factors interact with systemic structures when making transport decisions. Firstly, personal factors shape transport mode choice through both intentional decision processes and habitual behaviors (Ruhrort & Allert, 2021). These personal factors include comfort preferences for private versus shared transport experiences, ideas of risk regarding safety of transport modes and new transport technologies, and transport choices that reflect lifestyle preferences and personal identity (Pellegrini & Tagliabue, 2024). Personal norms, such as values about environmental responsibility, create feelings of moral obligation that significantly influence sustainable travel choices (Saremi et al., 2021). Next to that, transport mode choice is influenced by both quantitative factors such as speed and cost, and qualitative factors concerning convenience, comfort, and reliability, which interact with individual demographic characteristics and personal circumstances (Rasca & Saeed, 2022).

However, this mobility consumption is embedded in social, institutional, cultural, and material arrangements. First, mobility decisions emerge through social negotiation within households (who uses the car when, carpooling arrangements), workplaces (meeting schedules that require travel), and social networks that influence transport choices (Williams, 2015). Second, transport modes have a symbolic function as well. Research by Cairnes et al. (2014) showed how cars have become an important part of identity creation and social role performance. For instance, car ownership can help young people symbolize their transition to adulthood, while having a multi-purpose vehicle can serve as a symbol of parenthood (Cairnes et al., 2014). Third, mobility practices are institutionally embedded through the decisions made by transport planning authorities and government agencies. These institutions determine whether cities prioritize highways and parking or invest in public transit, cycling lanes, and pedestrian infrastructure (Williams, 2015). Fourth, cultural definitions of appropriate travel distances, acceptable transport modes, and mobility expectations vary across different societies and influence mobility consumption patterns. For example, the study by Dingil et al. (2021) found that individualistic cultures (such as in the US, Australia, Canada) build a more individualistic transport environment, resulting in more automobile mobility consumption, while collective cultures (such as China, Peru, Brazil) tend to use public transportation more. Finally, mobility choices are pre-structured by existing transport infrastructure such as road networks, rail systems, parking availability, and urban layouts. This channels mobility consumption into specific patterns regardless of individual preferences (Williams, 2015). A person living in a car-dependent suburb with no public transit options deals with different mobility constraints than someone in a dense urban area with extensive transport networks.

The interaction between individual agency and social, symbolic, institutional, cultural, and infrastructural systems demonstrates that sustainable mobility transformation requires multi-level interventions rather than focusing solely on individual behavior change.

4. Toward sustainable consumption practices

While practice theory explains how consumption behaviors are embedded, it primarily describes *how* these practices are maintained rather than providing normative guidance for what then constitutes sustainable consumption. To address these gaps, several theoretical frameworks have emerged. Building on the insight that consumption serves daily practices, these frameworks suggest that sustainable consumption requires transforming these practices into sustainable alternatives (Warde, 2015).

4.1 Addressing upper consumption limits: limitarianism

Limitarianism, primarily developed by philosopher Ingrid Robeyns, proposes that there should be upper limits to wealth and income. She states that it is morally wrong to be excessively rich beyond what is needed for a fulfilling life. Limitarianism is based on two arguments: the democratic argument and the unmet needs argument. The democratic argument states that excessive wealth concentration allows the super-rich to disproportionately influence politics and policy-making through campaign funding, lobbying, and media influence, thereby undermining democratic principles of political equality where each citizen should have equal say (Robeyns, 2023). The argument from unmet urgent needs focuses on redistributing surplus wealth to address important societal problems, based on the principle that when some people have more resources than needed for wellbeing or society faces urgent collective challenges like climate change, there is a moral imperative to redistribute that surplus (Robeyns, 2025).

Robeyns states that when considering people's standard of living, the focus should not be on resources themselves but on what those resources enable people to do and be. This means distinguishing between necessary expenditures (like an electric wheelchair for mobility) and luxury consumption (like an expensive scooter for convenience), even when the commodities are similarly priced. Limitarianism therefore serves as a complementary distributive justice principle alongside capabilities approaches, and establishes upper limits on wealth accumulation while capabilities approaches ensure minimum thresholds for human wellbeing (Robeyns, 2023, 2025).

4.2 Addressing lower consumption limits: environmental justice

When addressing the development of more sustainable consumption patterns, attention also must be given to creating environmental justice. Originating from the environmental justice movement of the 1980s, these frameworks recognize that environmental benefits and burdens are unevenly distributed across society, with marginalized communities disproportionately bearing

environmental costs while having limited access to environmental goods (Bullard, 2005). Creating just sustainable consumption movements thus require both reducing overconsumption among those with excessive capabilities while simultaneously expanding capabilities for those who lack basic access to environmental goods (Holland, 2008; Schlosberg & Carruthers, 2010).

Bullard (2005) emphasizes that environmental policies must address both distributive justice (who receives environmental benefits and bears costs) and procedural justice (meaningful participation in decision-making processes). This dual focus is particularly relevant for sustainable consumption initiatives, which risk imposing additional financial burdens on low-income communities through higher prices for sustainable products. Schlosberg (2012) expands this framework by incorporating capabilities and recognition dimensions, and emphasizes that environmental justice requires fair distribution of environmental goods, recognition of diverse community values, and enhancement of capabilities for generating wellbeing. This perspective highlights the need to understand local consumption practices within their social and economic contexts when implementing sustainable consumption programs.

5. From theory to practice in sustainable consumption

Research of Geiger et al. (2018) highlights how existing research and policy attention often focuses on implementing low-impact sustainable behaviors while neglecting the systematic review of which consumption practices actually drive unsustainable outcomes. Therefore, in order to develop not only equitable, but also effective sustainable consumption policies, empirical tools are needed that can identify which embedded consumption practices generate the most significant environmental impacts.

5.1 Need for understanding consumption practice impacts: the Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)

Life cycle assessment (LCA) is a methodology that evaluates the environmental impacts of a product, service, or system throughout its entire life cycle, meaning from material extraction through production, use, and disposal (Hauschild, 2018). The total environmental impact of a product or service is then expressed in standardized units like CO₂ equivalents (Steen-Olsen & Hertwich, 2015). LCA research on the environmental impacts of households' consumption patterns shows that generally, the categories that are most important regarding environmental impacts are food, shelter and mobility (Di Donato et al., 2015; Tukker et al., 2010). Due to the scope of this literature background, the focus will not be on food and shelter, but mobility and manufactured goods, the latter which represents 13% of greenhouse gas emissions of households (manufactured goods 7%, clothing 4%), compared to 20% for mobility (Di Donato et al., 2015).

Within these three consumption categories, specific consumption patterns result in high environmental impacts. In mobility, private car use emerges as the primary contributor, particularly for short distances under 5 kilometers where alternative transport modes remain viable. The usage-

stage is most important when assessing the environmental impacts for conventional vehicles, though indirect impacts become relatively more important for low-carbon alternatives like electric vehicles (Steen-Olsen & Hertwich, 2015). For manufactured goods, energy-using products such as household appliances have a high environmental impact (Tukker et al., 2010), with dishwashers, washing machines, refrigerators, and televisions identified as the most significant contributors (Spreafico & Russo, 2020). Regarding non-electrical goods, paper products, detergents, furniture, and clothes emerge as the most environmentally significant categories due to their combination of high consumption intensity and resource-intensive manufacturing processes (Castellani et al., 2021).

5.2 Enforcing upper consumption limits: implementing sustainable consumption policies

Having identified high-impact consumption practices through LCA, the next step is evaluating policy measures designed to address them. Using policy evaluation research by the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL) and the Netherlands Institute for Transport Policy Analysis (KiM) regarding (mobility) consumption interventions, this section analyzes how different types of policy instruments perform in creating more sustainable consumption behavior.

When it comes to mobility consumption behavior, LCA states that (short distance) mobility by car results in the highest environmental impacts. Table 1, adapted from the KiM analysis on policy measures regarding traffic flow optimization and sustainable travel behavior, shows which measures in a Dutch context have the most effective impacts on enforcing more sustainable mobility consumption habits. Win-win policies and climate-focused policies both show high effectiveness in reducing CO₂ emissions, with financial instruments, regulatory measures, electrification initiatives, among others, being listed as most influential. The remaining two policy categories, which predominantly consist of behavioral interventions, show limited impact. This finding again shows practice theory's main point that policies targeting individual behavior change alone are insufficient for transforming unsustainable consumption practices.

Next to analyzing effective policies, the analysis highlighted important principles for implementing them. First, policies that discourage unsustainable practices (financial disincentives for car use) work best when combined with policies that enable sustainable alternatives (improved cycling infrastructure, enhanced public transport) (Kennisinstituut voor Mobiliteitsbeleid, 2024). This reflects practice theory's insight that sustainable transformation requires both changing structures that maintain unsustainable practices and creating new arrangements that support alternatives. Second, the analysis showed how the effectiveness of interventions depends heavily on local conditions and existing arrangements. The same policy may have different impacts depending on urban density, existing transport infrastructure, cultural norms, and institutional capacity (Kennisinstituut voor Mobiliteitsbeleid, 2024). This aligns with practice theory's emphasis on understanding the specific social, institutional, and material arrangements within which consumption practices are embedded.

Table 1. Policy effectiveness matrix: traffic flow optimization versus CO₂ reduction
 Adapted from Kennisinstituut voor Mobiliteitsbeleid, 2024.

		Traffic flow improvement effectiveness	
		Low/neutral effectiveness (+/-, 0, -)	High Effectiveness (+ or ++)
CO ₂ reduction effectiveness	High effectiveness (+ or ++)	<u>Climate-focused policies</u> <i>Infrastructure investment:</i> - Public transit capacity expansion - Transition to zero-emission vehicles <i>Regulatory measures:</i> - Low emission/car-free zones <i>Financial instruments:</i> - Continued electric vehicle tax incentive plan	<u>Win-win policies</u> <i>Financial instruments:</i> - Elimination of car travel allowances - Fuel tax increases - Usage-based road pricing (congestion/time-based) - Flat-rate road user charging - Distance-based company car taxation - Enhanced fiscal incentives for cycling/transit/carpooling/telework <i>Regulatory measures:</i> - Workplace parking regulations - Reduced parking standards for new developments - Increased parking tariffs - Speed limit reductions <i>Spatial planning:</i> - Urban densification and activity bundling - Improving accessibility in declining regions - Park-and-ride hub development - Transit-oriented development - Logistics hubs and smart coordination - Context-specific traffic optimization measures <i>Infrastructure Investment:</i> - Cycling infrastructure and bike parking facilities - Comprehensive cycling network development - Shared mobility and MaaS platform support <i>Behavioral Interventions:</i> - Intelligent traffic management systems - Peak avoidance incentive programs - E-bike, transit, and sharing trial programs
	Low/Neutral effectiveness (+/-, 0, -)	<u>Limited impact policies</u> <i>Financial instruments:</i> - Public transit fare reductions - Peak/off-peak transit pricing differentiation - Freight transport toll implementation/increases <i>Behavioral interventions:</i> - Workplace-based activity programs - Flexible workspace facility improvements - Remote education initiatives - Sustainable travel awareness campaigns	<u>Traffic flow-focused policies</u> <i>Infrastructure investment:</i> - Minor road infrastructure improvements - Public transit infrastructure development <i>Behavioral interventions:</i> - School and work schedule adjustments <i>Financial instruments:</i> - Reduction of electric vehicle tax benefits

Research analyses by PBL (dilemmas on sustainable consumption, 2013) on sustainable consumption practices further shows how the embedded nature of sustainable consumption preferences. It demonstrates that while consumers express strong support for sustainable consumption in surveys, actual purchasing behavior stays largely the same, with sustainable product market shares remaining low despite ongoing efforts to promote sustainable consumption since the 1970s (Vringer et al., 2013).

The research demonstrates that systemic interventions, such as financial instruments and binding regulations, are far more effective than individual behavior change approaches. Binding measures achieved 42% participation in sustainable consumption compared to only 28% for voluntary approaches, even when voluntary measures included strong moral messages. When participants were offered subsidies, support increased to 57%, demonstrating that reshaping material arrangements through economic incentives is more effective than moral persuasion alone.

Next to that, the research showed that consumers demonstrate "conditional cooperation", meaning that 76% were willing to commit to sustainable consumption when they were assured that others would participate, compared to only 51% willing to make individual commitments. This confirms practice theory's emphasis on social embeddedness, and shows that sustainable choices depend on social contexts rather than individual preferences alone. Next to that, while participants initially preferred less coercive policy measures, satisfaction levels were equally high across all policy types once they were implemented. This suggests that resistance to sustainable consumption policies may reflect concerns about hypothetical restrictions rather than actual experiences of policy implementation.

Maintaining lower consumption limits: attention towards sociocultural diversity

As discussed in 4.2, limitarianism demonstrates that sustainable consumption policies must not only enforce upper limits but also maintain lower consumption limits that ensure basic capabilities for consumption for all consumers. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge that sociocultural diversity creates distinct barriers to adopting sustainable (mobility) behaviors, particularly when these behaviors involve higher costs or require cultural shifts that sustainable policies do not address.

The transition to electric vehicles exemplifies how sustainability policies can potentially exclude vulnerable populations. Research shows that among Dutch consumers with below-modal incomes, only 17% plan to purchase an electric vehicle as their next vehicle, compared to 51% of households earning above twice the modal income. Similarly, policies that make transport more expensive risk creating mobility inequalities for those who already struggle to pay for mobility. 17% of the Dutch population have trouble affording public transport, and therefore will have difficulties affording the more expensive "green" transport options, such as electrification and more public transport travel, that many sustainability policies require (Krabbenborg & Durand, 2024).

The cultural value of transport practices among different cultural groups further makes sustainable behavior adoption difficult. Migrant communities' significantly lower cycling rates, often half those of native Dutch residents, reflect both material barriers (perceived inadequate cycling infrastructure, bicycle theft concerns) and cultural embeddedness (absence of cycling role models, different transportation norms) (Durand et al., 2023). When sustainable mobility policies emphasize cycling promotion without addressing these embedded barriers, they risk excluding certain communities from participation.

To overcome these barriers, sustainable mobility policies must adopt spatially and socially targeted interventions rather than generic approaches. Research by Dalla Longa et al. (2025) highlights how transport-poor households are predominantly located in medium-sized cities and suburban peripheries rather than urban centers. Therefore, policies should prioritize public transport network expansion in these specific areas. Similarly, rather than generic EV subsidies that primarily benefit middle- to high-income individuals' car purchases, policies should provide income-based support for smaller, more affordable sustainable transport options. This includes targeted subsidies for e-bikes, scooters, and car-sharing programs specifically designed for low-income groups, along with location-specific charging infrastructure support in areas with higher concentrations of vulnerable households (Dalla Longa et al., 2025).

6 Conclusion

The evolution of consumption theory, from early economic utility maximization through cultural meaning-making to practice-based embeddedness, reveals that sustainable mobility transformation requires far more than individual behavior change. As demonstrated by Dalla Longa et al. (2025), effective sustainable consumption policies must simultaneously address the social, institutional, cultural, and material arrangements that structure everyday practices. Dutch research reports on (mobility) consumption patterns highlight that systemic interventions, such as financial regulations, regulatory measures, and infrastructure development, are more effective than solely behavior-based and voluntary approaches. Moving forward, effective sustainability policies require a systematic understanding of consumption both theoretically and practically, while using fair consumption limits to design policies that promote sustainable practices for everyone.

Reference list

- Arnould, E. J., & Thompson, C. J. (2005). Consumer Culture Theory (CCT): Twenty Years of Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(4), 868–882. <https://doi.org/10.1086/426626>
- Blue, S. (2017). The sociology of consumption. *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociology*, 2, 265–274.
- Bullard, R. D. (2005). *The quest for environmental justice: Human rights and the politics of pollution* (Vol. 19). Sierra Club Books San Francisco.
- Cairns, S., Harmer, C., Hopkin, J., & Skippon, S. (2014). Sociological perspectives on travel and mobilities: A review. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 63, 107–117.
- Campbell, C. (1987). *The romantic ethic and the spirit of modern consumerism*. Springer.
- Castellani, V., Sanyé-Mengual, E., & Sala, S. (2021). Environmental impacts of household goods in Europe: A process-based life cycle assessment model to assess consumption footprint. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 26(10), 2040–2055. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-021-01987-x>
- Dalla Longa, F., Mulder, P., & Sterkenburg, R. (2025). Stuck in the sustainable mobility transition: A spatial analysis of transport poverty risk in the Netherlands. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 127, 104266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2025.104266>
- Di Donato, M., Lomas, P. L., & Carpintero, Ó. (2015). Metabolism and Environmental Impacts of Household Consumption: A Review on the Assessment, Methodology, and Drivers. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 19(5), 904–916. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.12356>
- Dingil, A. E., Rupi, F., & Esztergár-Kiss, D. (2021). An Integrative Review of Socio-Technical Factors Influencing Travel Decision-Making and Urban Transport Performance. *Sustainability*, 13(18), Article 18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131810158>
- Douglas, M., & Isherwood, B. C. (1996). *The World of Goods: Towards an Anthropology of Consumption*. Psychology Press.
- Durand, A., Huang, B., Zijlstra, T., & Alonso González, M. (2023). *Multiculturele diversiteit in mobiliteit*. Kennisinstituut voor Mobiliteitsbeleid. <https://www.kimnet.nl/documenten/2023/05/25/multiculturele-diversiteit-in-mobiliteit>
- Featherstone, M. (1991). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Geiger, S. M., Fischer, D., & Schrader, U. (2018). Measuring what matters in sustainable consumption: An integrative framework for the selection of relevant behaviors. *Sustainable Development*, 26(1), 18–33.
- Giulio, A. D., Fischer, Daniel, Schäfer, Martina, & Blättel-Mink, B. (2014). Conceptualizing sustainable consumption: Toward an integrative framework. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 10(1), 45–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2014.11908124>

- Greene, M., & Rau, H. (2018). Moving across the life course: A biographic approach to researching dynamics of everyday mobility practices. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 18(1), 60–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540516634417>
- Gupta, J., Chen, Y., & Rammelt, C. (2024). Transport within earth system boundaries. *Npj Sustainable Mobility and Transport*, 1(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44333-024-00005-5>
- Hansen, A. (2018). Meat consumption and capitalist development: The meatification of food provision and practice in Vietnam. *Geoforum*, 93, 57–68.
- Hansen, A., & Nielsen, K. B. (2023). Consumption, Sustainability and Everyday Life. In *Consumption, Sustainability and Everyday Life* (pp. 3–26). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11069-6_1
- Hauschild, M. Z. (2018). Introduction to LCA Methodology. In M. Z. Hauschild, R. K. Rosenbaum, & S. I. Olsen (Eds), *Life Cycle Assessment: Theory and Practice* (pp. 59–66). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56475-3_6
- Holland, B. (2008). Justice and the environment in Nussbaum's "Capabilities Approach" why sustainable ecological capacity is a meta-capability. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(2), 319–332.
- Holt, D. B. (2002). Why Do Brands Cause Trouble? A Dialectical Theory of Consumer Culture and Branding. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(1), 70–90. <https://doi.org/10.1086/339922>
- Kennisinstituut voor Mobiliteitsbeleid. (2024). *Effecten van maatregelen op doorstroming en verduurzaming reisgedrag*. Kennisinstituut voor Mobiliteitsbeleid. <https://www.kimnet.nl/documenten/2024/04/22/effecten-van-maatregelen-op-doorstroming-en-verduurzaming-reisgedrag>
- Krabbenborg, L., & Durand, A. (2024). *Betaalbare mobiliteit?* Kennisinstituut voor Mobiliteitsbeleid. <https://www.kimnet.nl/documenten/2024/08/27/betaalbare-mobiliteit>
- Levy, S. J. (1999). Symbols for sale. *Brands, Consumers, Symbols and Research: Sidney J Levy on Marketing*, 203–212.
- Miller, D. (1987). *Mass consumption and material culture*.
- Miller, D. (1997). *Material culture and mass consumerism*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Nordbakke, S., & Schwanen, T. (2015). Transport, unmet activity needs and wellbeing in later life: Exploring the links. *Transportation*, 42(6), 1129–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-014-9558-x>
- Ó Broin, E., & Guivarch, C. (2017). Transport infrastructure costs in low-carbon pathways. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 55, 389–403. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2016.11.002>
- Otto, I. M., Kim, K. M., Dubrovsky, N., & Lucht, W. (2019). Shift the focus from the super-poor to the super-rich. *Nature Climate Change*, 9(2), 82–84. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0402-3>

Pellegrini, M., & Tagliabue, M. (2024). An overview of psychological factors in mobility choices: The impact on pro-environmental behavior. *Discover Sustainability*, 5(1), 1–13.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-024-00372-6>

Rasca, S., & Saeed, N. (2022). Exploring the factors influencing the use of public transport by commuters living in networks of small cities and towns. *Travel Behaviour and Society*, 28, 249–263.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2022.03.007>

Rinkinen, J., Shove, E., & Marsden, G. (2020). *Conceptualising demand: A distinctive approach to consumption and practice*. Routledge.

Robeyns, I. (2023). *Having too much: Philosophical essays on limitarianism*. Open Book Publishers.

Robeyns, I. (2025). *Limitarianism*. Penguin Books Limited.

Ruhrort, L., & Allert, V. (2021). Conceptualizing the Role of Individual Agency in Mobility Transitions: Avenues for the Integration of Sociological and Psychological Perspectives. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.623652>

Saremi, M., Fallahi, F., Pels, E., Salmani, B., & Covich, M. P. (2021). Ramsey pricing of aircraft landing fees: A case study of Iranian airports. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 90, 100922.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2020.100922>

Schäfer, M., Jaeger-Erben, M., & Bamberg, S. (2012). Life events as windows of opportunity for changing towards sustainable consumption patterns? Results from an intervention study. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 35, 65–84.

Schatzki, T. (2001). Introduction: Practice theory. *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*.

Schlosberg, D. (2012). Climate justice and capabilities: A framework for adaptation policy. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 26(4), 445–461.

Schlosberg, D., & Carruthers, D. (2010). Indigenous struggles, environmental justice, and community capabilities. *Global Environmental Politics*, 10(4), 12–35.

Shahin, M., Ghasri, M., & Abbasi, A. (2024). Exploring the psychological drivers of sustainable transport consumption: The role of Big-Two personality traits. *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation*, 18(7), 547–561. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15568318.2024.2376562>

Shove, E. (2003). Comfort, cleanliness and convenience: The social organization of normality. (*No Title*).

Shove, E., Trentmann, F., & Wilk, R. (2020). *Time, consumption and everyday life: Practice, materiality and culture*. Routledge.

Simmel, G. (1957). Fashion. *American Journal of Sociology*, 62(6), 541–558.

Stillerman, J. (2015). *The sociology of consumption: A global approach*. John Wiley & Sons.

Trigg, A. B. (2001). Veblen, Bourdieu, and conspicuous consumption. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 35(1), 99–115.

Tukker, A., Cohen, M. J., Hubacek, K., & Mont, O. (2010). The Impacts of Household Consumption and Options for Change. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 14(1), 13–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-9290.2009.00208.x>

Veitch, E., & Rhodes, E. (2024). A cross-country comparative analysis of congestion pricing systems: Lessons for decarbonizing transportation. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, 15, 101128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cstp.2023.101128>

Vringer, K., Vollebergh, H., Heijden, E. van der, Soest, D. van, & Dietz, F. (2013). *Dilemma's rond duurzame consumptie*. Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving. <https://www.pbl.nl/publicaties/dilemmas-rond-duurzame-consumptie>

Warde, A. (2015). The Sociology of Consumption: Its Recent Development. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(Volume 41, 2015), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043208>

Waters, T., & Waters, D. (2016). Are the terms “socio-economic status” and “class status” a warped form of reasoning for Max Weber? *Palgrave Communications*, 2(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2016.2>

Weber, M. (2011). Class, Status, Party. In *The Inequality Reader* (2nd edn). Routledge.

Williams, M. D. (2015). *Social Practice Theory and Sustainable Mobility: An Analysis of English Local Transport Planning as a System of Provision*.

Winther, T., & Wilhite, H. (2015). An analysis of the household energy rebound effect from a practice perspective: Spatial and temporal dimensions. *Energy Efficiency*, 8(3), 595–607. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-014-9311-5>

Wood, W., Tam, L., & Witt, M. G. (2005). Changing circumstances, disrupting habits. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(6), 918.