# Dynamic Information Provision for Household Water Consumption\*

Boris Wieczorek<sup>†, a, b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, INRAE, Grenoble INP, GAEL, 38000 Grenoble, France <sup>b</sup>Department of Economics, University of Bologna, 40126 Bologna, Italy

May 2, 2025

# Working Paper

#### Abstract

Evidence of the effectiveness of social norms information in increasing pro-social and pro-environmental behavior has been widely reported in the literature and by policy-makers. Static information on social norms has proved effective in influencing marginalized individuals in the areas of water, energy, and others. In this study, I developed a field experiment on household water consumption by implementing a new information policy based on the literature on dynamic norms to influence average individuals, who represent the majority. Dynamic information exploits the spread of pro-social or pro-environmental behaviors in order to promote them. Results show a significant effect of dynamic information on belowaverage households, with a reduction of over 20% of water consumption. Yet their effectiveness disappears over time, suggesting their potential is fully exploited on specific occasions, such as a temporary drought. Finally, I explore explanations for the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the different information provided by cognitive and psychological processes.

**Keywords:** information-based policy, information provision, dynamic information, social norms, norm nudge, water consumption, field experiment.

#### JEL Classification: C93, D04, D12, D63, D83.

<sup>\*</sup>I thank Sabrina Teyssier, Beatrice Roussillon, Veronica Pizziol, Nikos Nikiforakis, Marie Claire Villeval, Nicolas Jacquemet, Erte Xiao, Laurent Muller, Paolo Crosetto, Erik Wengström, and Daniel Llerena for their helpful comments. I am particularly grateful to the technical team at the GAEL laboratory, Erick Raberanto, Cédric Lanu, Gwenaelle Desury, and Emilien Lasguignes for their support. I gratefully acknowledge support from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR) for the projects under the grants ANR-18-WTW7-0002 and ANR-19-CE03-0007, and from the European Research Council (ERC) for the project under the grant 101089107. The author declares no conflict of interest.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>+</sup>Address: Via San Giacomo 3, Bologna, 40126 Bologna, Italy. E-mail address: *boris.wieczorek@unibo.it*.

## 1 Introduction

Essential to the emergence and maintenance of life, water is our most precious resource, but also the most threatened. Although 71% of the Earth's surface is covered by water, only 3% is fresh water, of which an even smaller percentage is available for human use (Feldman, 2013). The restricted water supply is threatened by climate change and increasing water pollution (Konapala et al., 2020). In parallel, water demand is increasing every year due to population growth, rising consumption of goods due to the water needed for the construction process, and improved access to water and goods in developing countries (Jorgensen, Graymore and O'Toole, 2009; Klemeš, 2012). The small amount of water remaining is then shared by sectors with divergent interests, such as agriculture, industry, and domestic consumption. Since it is not possible to increase the amount of water available, it is necessary to reduce demand.<sup>1</sup>

Water-related concerns have been, mainly focused on developing countries since the population from these countries did not have access to enough drinking water (Gadgil, 1998; World Health Organization, 2015). However, climate change alters this trend, making water concern a worldwide priority due to its adverse effects on water supply and demand. On the one hand, climate change is increasing water demand for both domestic and agricultural sectors (Goodchild, 2003; Wada et al., 2013). On the other hand, climate change decreases water supply with rainfall reduction, water pollution, and acidity (Singh and Agrawal, 2008; Amarasinghe et al., 2016). As a consequence, serious water scarcity problems have spread in developed countries, becoming a global concern (UNEP, 2023; Shukla, Skea and Slade, 2022).<sup>2</sup> These problems are especially pronounced in mountainous regions, where it significantly alters precipitation patterns, hydrological dynamics, and hydrogeological conditions, thereby increasing the variability of these interconnected processes (Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change, 2019, 2023; Milano et al., 2015; Buchs, Allain and Pinjon, 2023).

The current study aims to propose a new tool for reducing water demand for domestic consumption. Given the 600% increase in domestic water demand between 1960 and 2014 (Otto and Schleifer, 2020) and the forecast of a further 30% increase by 2050 (Kitamori et al., 2012), urgent actions are needed to regulate consumption. This increase has proved the inadequacy of traditional policies alongside a historically low price of water, which has accustomed households to wasting water (Nauges and Thomas, 2003). Nonetheless, due to the low price elasticity for water (Howe and Linaweaver Jr., 1967; Scheierling, Loomis and Young, 2006), the limited short-term reaction of households (Nauges and Thomas, 2003), and the vital character of water

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Although technologies such as desalination can increase water supply, they are not yet suitable for large-scale low-cost development (S. Mauter and S. Fiske, 2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Spencer and Altman (2010) evaluate that almost one-third of the U.S. will encounter water scarcity issues by 2050.

(Agthe and Billings, 1987), it is essential to explore policy options that are not pricebased.

The provision of information makes it possible to influence behavior through targeted, low-cost policies that do not constrain behavior (Haaland, Roth and Wohlfart, 2023). While information policies involving only best practices and their consequences have little effect on individual behaviors (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002; Owens and Driffill, 2008; Han, Hsu and Sheu, 2010), recent literature has introduced a promising new type of information provision through the components of social norms (Allcott, 2011; Ahn, Kim and Kim, 2020; Borg, Curtis and Lindsay, 2020). Social norms are implicit rules emerging from endogenous interactions among agents and differing across populations and cultures that lead individuals to adopt a specific type of behavior (Bicchieri, 2005, 2016). They are constituted of descriptive beliefs, which refer to beliefs about the behaviors adopted by a reference group, and normative beliefs, which refer to beliefs about the social appropriateness of behaviors by a reference group. Several studies have focused on the use of so-called static information on social norms, revealing the realized behaviors and/or the social appropriateness of behaviors of a reference group at a given point in time, to influence pro-environmental behaviors (Cialdini, 2003; Schultz et al., 2007; Allcott, 2011; Ayres, Raseman and Shih, 2013; Bolton, Dimant and Schmidt, 2021; Bicchieri and Dimant, 2023). Regarding the water sector, Ferraro, Miranda and Price (2011); Bernedo, Ferraro and Price (2014); Brent, Cook and Olsen (2015); Otaki, Ueda and Sakura (2017); Landon et al. (2018) have succeeded in reducing overall domestic water consumption by providing information on efficient and average household consumption both in short and long-term.<sup>3</sup> Despite their effectiveness in reducing overall water consumption, these policies have only significantly affected high-water users, with little or no effect on average consumers (Landon et al., 2018; Bhanot, 2021). As average consumers represent the majority of actors (for example of the Gaussian form of the distribution of water consumption, see Otaki, Ueda and Sakura (2017) in Japan, Bergel, Kotowski and Woyciechowska (2016) in Poland, and Hussien, Memon and Savic (2016) in Iraq), an improvement in their behavior would substantially affect the average. In addition to having a major impact, this will influence high-water users all the more.

To target average consumers, I have developed an intervention based on the use of so-called dynamic information on social norms, revealing the spread of pro-social or pro-environmental behavior of a reference group at a given period of time. The underlying assumption behind this mechanism is that people tend to assume that a change in one direction will continue in the future (Markman and Guenther, 2007; Hubbard, 2015). Therefore, in order to conform to new trends, individuals may be

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Similarly, Tiefenbeck et al. (2018); Andor et al. (2023); Fang et al. (2023) find a strong effect of realtime feedback in water consumption of showering with the implementation of a specific device.

willing to adopt these pro-social and pro-environmental behaviors.

Sparkman and Walton (2017) and Mortensen et al. (2019) are the only studies, to the best of my knowledge, that have proven the effectiveness of dynamic information through experiments in the psychological literature.<sup>4</sup> Sparkman and Walton (2017) conducted information provision experiments, changing the semantics of the information from static to dynamic. Results show that dynamic information about social norms has a greater impact than static messages on the intention to consume less meat, the choice of a meatless meal in a cafe, and the use of full-load washing machines in a university residence. Likewise, Mortensen et al. (2019) show the greater impact of dynamic information over static information on the water used in a toothbrushing task in the laboratory, and on time-donation to help an environmental organization by completing an additional survey.

In this study, I test the implementation of information provision using dynamic social norms information with a framed field experiment (Harrison and List, 2004) to reduce the domestic water consumption of average households. The advantages of this application of dynamic information on domestic water consumption are twofold. First, application to real behavior in its natural environment over a long period reduces concerns regarding the experimenter's demand effect and increases the robustness and external validity of the results. Second, the private nature of domestic water consumption reduces the observability of realized behaviors, which attenuates the effect and pressure of social norms (Nyborg et al., 2016), turning the results of this study into a lower bound on the potential effect of dynamic information provision.

I recruited 171 similar households of the Auvergne-Rhône Alpes region (France) for a 7-week experiment, eliciting water consumption through weekly measures of their water meter. After categorizing households into four categories of water consumption, the baseline group received a static information-based intervention, and the treatment group received a dynamic information-based intervention. I focus on Medium households divided into two categories, below and above average, by a discontinuity relative to average consumption.

The results show that the dynamic information-based intervention induces an immediate significant reduction in water consumption for Medium households below the average that did not respond to the initial static information-based intervention (27.7% per household on average, i.e., 205.2 liters per week). By contrast, Medium households above the average did not react significantly, either immediately or persistently. In addition to the main results, I have also explored explanations for the effectiveness

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Recent replication study Aldoh, Sparks and Harris (2021) find no effect of dynamic information on replication of Sparkman and Walton (2017) outside the US. Fuhrmann-Riebel et al. (2024) tested a static normative information provision and a dynamic descriptive information provision on a signature to a municipality's recycling program, finding no average treatment effect but a small positive effect for individuals who underestimated the proportions associated with the information provided.

of information provision with cognitive and psychological processes. I implemented a normative assessment of water-related behavior (Krupka and Weber, 2013) to observe if social norms information impacts behavior through a revision of social norms' beliefs. An emotional assessment of the information provision ("PANAS - Positive and Negative Affect Schedule" (Watson, Clark and Carey, 1988)) has been implemented to observe how reactive and nonreactive households perceive information provision. The components of the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991) have been investigated to observe which components are the most affected by the information provision and thus should be targeted in order to favor behavioral changes. On one side, results show that effective dynamic information-based intervention involved more positive emotional reactions and induced an appropriate belief revision of elements motivating behavior related to the theory of planned behavior. On the other side, information-based interventions do not alter normative perceptions of water-related behavior.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the design and methodology of the experiment. The results are presented in section 3. In section 4, I discuss the implications of the findings and conclude.

## 2 Experimental procedures and design

## 2.1 Procedures

The framed field experiment took place in the Auvergne-Rhône Alpes region of France between May 30 and July 18, 2023. I recruited 201 households for the study, of which 171 completed the experiment, from the laboratory panel of "true consumers" of GAEL laboratory.<sup>5</sup> Households who completed the survey were all living in an apartment with a washing machine and 74.27% with a dishwasher. Households were divided into 4.68% single-person households, 40.35% 2-person households, 23.98% 3-person households, 25.73% 4-person households and 5.26% 5-8-person households. Participants earned 20€ for correctly sending their water meter every week and completing the end-of-experiment survey. Moreover, they could earn an additional 5€ in the end-of-experiment survey. The timeline of the study, as well as the incentive, were common knowledge. At the time of the study, participants only knew that they were participating in a study on water consumption in the region. Personal data conformity with GDPR has been registered in INRAE's registries.

## 2.2 Design

**The task.** The water consumption of participating households was measured using weekly photos of their water meters for 7 weeks (8 photos). Every Tuesday morning, participants received an email telling them to add their water meter to their personal cloud storage space. If participants forgot to send a photo of their water meter, they received a first reminder at noon and a second one in the evening (see Supplementary subsection S4.1 for details). Participants who did not upload their photos were progressively excluded from the study each week.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>This study was preregistered on AsPredicted #131119 (see Supplementary subsection S4.4). The lower-than-expected number of participants did not alter the focus on average consumers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>On the 14.92% attrition (30 households), 56.67% (17 households) of the attrition happened during Phase 1 (before any intervention), 26.67% (8 households) during Phase 2 (after the first static intervention), 13.33% (4 households) during Phase 3 (after the treatment intervention), 3.33% (1 household) at the end-of-experiment survey (See Table S3 in the Supplementary).



### Figure 1: Different phases of the design

The study is divided into 4 phases over 7 weeks in a between-subject design. During the first four weeks, all participants followed the same script, composed of two phases: phase 1, with no intervention, and phase 2, with a static intervention based on water consumption relative to household size (see Figure 2). At the end of week 4 (phase 2), participants were divided into treatments through a stratified random sampling technique, taking into account the information provision of phase 2, the reference household size, the availability of a dishwasher, and whether or not they had reduced their consumption by at least 5% during the second phase (See detail in Table S2 in the Supplementary). During the last 3 weeks (phases 3 and 4), 47.37% (81) households were in the baseline group, and 52.63% (90) households were in the treatment group.

**Phase 1 - Classification into water consumption categories.** During the first two weeks, water consumption is evaluated without any intervention to segregate households into 4 consumption categories: Efficient households, Medium-Low households, Medium-High households, and High households. The dissociation between the two medium categories was carried out to observe the impact of dynamic information on the discontinuity regarding the overall mean. This discontinuity is justified by the different households' reactions that depend on their consumption compared to the average. Indeed, Landon et al. (2018) and Bhanot (2021) found a reducing effect of information provision with closeness to the representative average household until no effect for households below the average. The thresholds dividing households into the 4 categories are 200, 448, and 770 liters per person on average for phase 1.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, 8.19% (14) households were classified as Efficient, 38.60% (66) households as Medium-Low, 38.01% (65) households as Medium-High, and 15.20% (26) households as High (average households characteristics for each category are available in Table S1 in Supplementary).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Household segregation thresholds between categories were chosen to exclude outliers from Medium categories while maintaining the highest possible proportion of households in the Medium categories (see Figure S1 in Supplementary).

**Phase 2 - Construction of Dynamic information condition.** On Wednesday of the first week of this phase, static information-based interventions were delivered by email to all participants according to their consumption level (see Figure 2). These interventions have been introduced to induce an initial reduction in consumption to build the dynamic information-based intervention for phase 3. In addition, participants received a personal link to a web page containing their information-based intervention as well as information on water conservation practices (see subsection S4.2 in Supplementary). During the second week, participants received emails with reminders to visit their web page. After the second phase, participants were assigned to treatment groups.



Figure 2: Static information-based interventions

Static information-based interventions have been inspired by those of Bhanot (2021). They are made of two components: descriptive and normative information. The descriptive information depicts the relative water consumption of the household with that of "Efficient Households" (in blue) and that of "Average households" (in grey). The normative information depicts the social appropriateness of the consumption of the household with an emoji and a color (red, yellow, or green) associated with the emoji, as well as the household consumption description.

**Phase 3 - Provision of Dynamic information vs. Static information.** On Wednesday of the first week of this phase, participants in the treatment group received a dynamic information-based intervention (see Figure 3), while participants in the baseline group received the same static information-based intervention as in phase 2. In addition, participants received a personal link to a web page identical to phase 2, with the updated information intervention. During the second week, participants received emails with reminders to visit their web page.

![](_page_8_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Figure_2.jpeg)

Dynamic information-based intervention is made of two components: descriptive and normative information. The descriptive information depicts a spread toward reduced water consumption by at least 30% of the households in the study. The normative information depicts the social appropriateness of this behavioral change with a pictogram evoking the gathering, as well as the color green. Between the second and the first phase, 45.61% of households effectively reduced their consumption by at least 10% (64.28%, 33.33%, 49.29%, and 57.69% respectively, for Efficient, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High categories). Consequently, the dynamic information-based intervention announced (the highest threshold possible with respect to these reductions) that at least 30% of the participants in the experiment had reduced their water consumption during the second phase.

**Phase 4 - Observation of persistent effects.** For the last week, water consumption has been evaluated without any intervention.

## 2.3 Survey

At the end of the seventh week, I controlled various cognitive and psychological processes to assess better how information-based interventions lead to behavior change. These assessments respond to the gap in the literature highlighted by Bicchieri (2023) (see Supplementary subsection S4.3 for details).

First, I assessed the appropriateness of water-related behavior to observe if the information provision impacts behavior through a revision of social norms' beliefs. As the information provision is based on social norms information, it may be that the information changes the perception of the norms of the households, which results in a change of behavior. To this end, I implemented the Krupka and Weber (2013) methodology framed on water conservation behavior as well as water wasting behavior. The Krupka and Weber (2013) methodology consists of a coordination game where participants must determine the level of social appropriation of 12 water-related behaviors, in our case, provided by the largest number of participants. The correct answers on a randomly selected component earn participants an additional 5. For example, participants were asked to identify the modal answer on how socially (in)appropriate it is to "take showers lasting less than 5 minutes" as well as to "not take showers lasting less than 5 minutes". The incorporation of both positive and negative narratives ensures a reliable estimation of the prevailing injunctive norm.

Second, I elicited the emotional response to each information-based intervention to determine whether the information provision's effectiveness could be associated with the affect they generate in the households. While emotions are often under-exploited in economic literature, research has shown their importance and mitigating effect on direct and indirect behavior (Elster, 1998; Loewenstein, 2000; Drouvelis and Grosskopf, 2016; Jin and Atkinson, 2021). As a consequence, I implemented a "PANAS - Positive and Negative Affect Schedule" (Watson, Clark and Carey (1988); French version by Caci and Baylé (2007)) on each information-based intervention to measure the affect they generate in receptive households. The Watson, Clark and Carey (1988) methodology consists of asking participants about their emotional response to the provided interventions, using 10 positive and 10 negative descriptors on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". For example, participants were asked if they (dis)agree the specific information provided generated feelings of "Interest" or "Pride".

Third, I measure components of the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) to see which components are the most affected by the information provision and thus should be targeted in order to favor a behavioral change. To this end, I implemented several questions assessing *Perceived Behavioral control* (i.e., implementing water conservation practices is "possible"/"easy"/"under control" ...), *Attitude toward conservation* (i.e., water conservation practices are associated to "change in daily live"/"extra time or effort"), and *Personal norms* (i.e., the environment is "important and fragile"/"increasing natural disasters"/"legitimately shaped by humans"). Moreover, *Expected results*, *Past/Current water conservation Behaviors/Equipment* were elicited as additional components correlated with water conservation behavior (Chaudhary et al., 2017; Clark and Finley, 2007; Lam, 2006).<sup>8</sup>

Lastly, I collected household socio-demographic information, including residential characteristics and the number of inhabitants in the household for each week of the study.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>See subsection S4.3 in Supplementary for the list of questions.

## 3 Results

In this study, I focus on the water consumption of the Medium-Low and Medium-High categories, which are the targeted population of the intervention. Household characteristics across categories are presented in Table S1 in the Supplementary, the affectation across strata is represented in Table S2 in the Supplementary, and the attrition is represented in Table S3 in the Supplementary. I present the aggregated data for all categories, including Efficient and High categories. However, these latter categories are excluded from statistical analysis due to the insufficient statistical power resulting from their limited sample sizes.

### 3.1 Water evaluation and treatment effect

With regard to the discontinuity implemented in the Medium categories, I began by studying the variation in consumption before treatment induced by the first static information in phase 2.

Although water consumption was reduced by at least 10% for 33.33% of households in the Medium-Low category and for 49.29% of households in the Medium-High category between phases 1 and 2, only the Medium-High category is coupled with a significant evolution across these phases (Wilcoxon signed-rank comparing water consumption between phase 1 and phase 2, z=1.91, p=0.056 for Medium-High category, z=1.45, p=0.148 for Medium-Low category). This may be explained by the disparate reactions within categories, leading to an average increase of 16.08% (i.e., 123.71 liters per week) for the Medium-Low category and an average reduction of 6.98% (i.e., 92.43 liters per week) for the Medium-High category. The variation in water consumption between phases 1 and 2 are significantly different across categories (Wilcoxon ranksum test comparing variation of water consumption of Medium-Low with Medium-High categories between phase 1 and phase 2, z=2.49, p=0.012), which led them to be studied separately for the study. In addition, the implemented regression will be analyzed separately in order to maintain a clean control group before the treatment effect.

These results are consistent with Landon et al. (2018) and Bhanot (2021), which find little to no effect of static information on average consumers, with a stronger effect for the above-average consumers than under-average consumers.

The effect of the treatment compares the impact of dynamic information provision with that of repeated static information provision (phase 3). Figure 4A-B represent respectively household consumption by category and treatment, and household percentage change in water consumption compared to week 1 by category and treatment.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>The fragmentation of the high category is induced by its low number of households combined with a high standard deviation (1251) due to the presence of outliers. In comparison, the Medium-ILw and

![](_page_12_Figure_0.jpeg)

#### Figure 4: Evolution of consumption over weeks

*Notes:* **A** represents the average weekly water consumption by category and treatment. **B** represents the average percentage change in water consumption compared to the first week by category and treatment.

As illustrated in Figure 4B, the Medium-Low category has reduced significantly more their consumption with the dynamic information (average reduction of 10.76%) than with the static information (average increase of 11.43%) in phase 3 (Wilcoxon ranksum test comparing variation in consumption of dynamic and static information in the Medium-Low category between phase 3 and phase 2, z=2.61, p=0.009). In contrast, the Medium-High category responded in the same way to both information (average reduction of 8.81% and 6.30%, respectively, for dynamic and static information, Wilcoxon ranksum test comparing variation in consumption of dynamic and static information, Statistical tests indicate that dynamic information leads to a significant and large reduction in water consumption in the Medium-Low category.

Delving into heterogeneity effects within a category, I investigated the treatment effect according to the reduction of water consumption in Phase 2. The reduction of water consumption in Phase 2 is represented by a dummy taking value 1 if a house-hold has reduced its water consumption in Phase 2 by at least 5%. This characteristic has been included in the stratified random sampling technique assigning households into treatment and control groups, balancing their existence across treatments. The segregation of households according to their reduction in phase 2 shows a stronger significant effect of the dynamic information in the Medium-Low category for households that have not reduced their consumption in phase 2 for an average reduction of 26.81% (Wilcoxon ranksum test comparing variation in consumption in phase 2

Medium-High categories have similar standard deviations of 518 and 585, respectively.

in the Medium-Low category between phase 3 and phase 2, z=3.14, p=0.001), and no effect from those that have reduced their consumption in phase 2 (Wilcoxon ranksum test, z=1.02, p=0.311). Regarding the Medium-High category, no significant reduction from the treatment has been found in phase 3, whatever the reduction of water in phase 2. As represented in Figure 5, the dynamic information only leads to a significant and large reduction in water consumption in the Medium-Low category for households that have not reduced their water consumption in phase 2.

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Figure 5: Evolution of water consumption

*Notes:* Percentage change compared to the first week for Medium-Low category segregated according to reduction in phase 2. The reduction dummy is attributed to households that have reduced their consumption by at least 5% in phase 2.

I used ordinary least squares regression clustered at the household level to model the difference in difference of water consumption with control for household characteristics. The results confirm the significant decrease in water consumption following the dynamic information on the Medium-Low category. Modeling until week 5 to measure the immediate effect of the dynamic information, I find a significant average treatment effect with a reduction in water consumption of 22% (i.e., 133.8 liters, see Table S4 in Supplementary) for the Medium-Low category (model (1) in Table 1). The integration of cross-variables controlling for the reduction in water consumption in phase 2 (following the first static information – model (2)) enables us to identify that the dynamic information only affected households who did not reduce their consumption in phase 2, for an average reduction of 27.7% (i.e., 205.2 liters, see Table S4 in Supplementary). However, the effect of the dynamic information does not persist over time (see model (1) and (2) in Table 2 and Table 3). Modeling until week 6, the treatment effect decreased to 14.9% on all Medium-Low households and to 20.1% on Medium-Low households that have not reduced water consumption by at least 5% in phase 2. Modeling until week 7 for the ex-post evaluation phase without intervention, the treatment effect became not significant. Regarding the Medium-High category, I do not find immediate nor persistent effects of the dynamic information (model (3) and (4) in Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3).

These results emphasize the large and significant immediate impact of dynamic information on Medium-Low households for households that have not reduced their consumption in phase 2, with no persistent difference between the dynamic information and the repetition of static information. Meanwhile, Medium-High households did not respond differently to dynamic information, either immediately or persistently, compared to the repetition of static information.

Week 1 to 5	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-High
Ln(Consumption)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment x Post	-0.220**	-0.277***	0.007	0.051
	(0.088)	(0.093)	(0.079)	(0.091)
Treatment	-0.033	-0.030	0.011	0.021
	(0.073)	(0.069)	(0.065)	(0.060)
Post	0.050	0.050	-0.111	-0.113*
	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.067)	(0.067)
Living area size $(m^2)$	0.0009	0.001	0.003	0.003
0	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Dishwasher	0.055	0.061	0.032	-0.005
	(0.115)	(0.106)	(0.076)	(0.075)
Paying for water	-0.137	-0.140	-0.187*	-0.140
	(0.120)	(0.114)	(0.108)	(0.112)
Nb. Men	0.167***	0.163***	0.196***	0.192***
	(0.055)	(0.049)	(0.053)	(0.056)
Nb. Women	0.244***	0.225***	0.109*	0.135**
	(0.050)	(0.052)	(0.064)	(0.063)
Nb. Son	0.316***	0.292***	0.106	0.075
	(0.045)	(0.047)	(0.076)	(0.076)
Nb. Daughter	0.254***	0.217***	0.166***	0.193***
	(0.064)	(0.053)	(0.058)	(0.058)
Income	0.041	0.036	-0.002	0.011
	(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.026)	(0.028)
Owner	-0.102	-0.052	-0.075	-0.102
	(0.103)	(0.101)	(0.101)	(0.098)
Reduction		-0.219***		-0.149**
		(0.077)		(0.067)
Treatment x Post x Reduction		0.157		-0.069
		(0.189)		(0.104)
Observations	330	330	325	325
Clusters	66	66	65	65
$R^2$	0.37	0.41	0.35	0.38

Table 1: Average treatment effects on Water consumption until week 5

*Notes*: \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01. Average marginal effects of Ordinary Least Squares models. Regression was conducted on weeks 1-5, clustered at the household level, with standard errors in parentheses. Men and Women are over 13 years old, while Son and Daughter are under 13 years old. Reduction represents a dummy variable taking value 1 for a reduction of water consumption of at least 5% during Phase 2.

Week 1 to 6	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-High
Ln(Consumption)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment x Post	-0.149**	-0.201**	0.005	0.052
	(0.074)	(0.080)	(0.064)	(0.083)
Treatment	-0.033	-0.030	0.013	0.023
	(0.075)	(0.072)	(0.067)	(0.061)
Post	0.038	0.038	-0.099*	-0.099*
	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.052)	(0.052)
Living area size $(m^2)$	0.0003	0.0004	0.003	0.003
C C	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Dishwasher	0.051	0.062	0.047	-0.002
	(0.114)	(0.104)	(0.085)	(0.082)
Paying for water	-0.116	-0.118	-0.201*	-0.151
	(0.112)	(0.104)	(0.112)	(0.116)
Nb. Men	0.159***	0.155***	0.178***	0.175***
	(0.055)	(0.049)	(0.053)	(0.056)
Nb. Women	0.244***	0.225***	0.104	0.133**
	(0.050)	(0.052)	(0.064)	(0.063)
Nb. Son	0.317***	0.294***	0.120	0.088
	(0.046)	(0.048)	(0.077)	(0.077)
Nb. Daughter	0.244***	0.206***	0.159***	0.189***
	(0.068)	(0.056)	(0.056)	(0.057)
Income	0.038	0.033	0.002	0.017
	(0.035)	(0.032)	(0.028)	(0.030)
Owner	-0.110	-0.0624	-0.088	-0.117
	(0.100)	(0.099)	(0.104)	(0.099)
Reduction		-0.223***		-0.153**
		(0.077)		(0.070)
Treatment x Post x Reduction		0.137		-0.096
		(0.164)		(0.107)
Observations	396	396	390	390
Clusters	66	66	65	65
$R^2$	0.36	0.40	0.33	0.36

Table 2: Average treatment effects on Water consumption until week 6

*Notes*: \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01. Average marginal effects of Ordinary Least Squares models. Regression was conducted on weeks 1-6, clustered at the household level, with standard errors in parentheses. Men and Women are over 13 years old, while Son and Daughter are under 13 years old. Reduction represents a dummy variable taking value 1 for a reduction of water consumption of at least 5% during Phase 2.

Week 1 to 7	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-High
Ln(Consumption)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment x Post	-0.070	-0.136	-0.006	0.061
	(0.077)	(0.074)	(0.066)	(0.060)
Treatment	-0.018	-0.014	0.020	0.028
	(0.077)	(0.074)	(0.066)	(0.060)
Post	0.011	0.009	-0.087**	-0.087**
	(0.050)	(0.050)	(0.036)	(0.036)
Living area size $(m^2)$	0.0005	0.0004	0.003	0.003
0	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Dishwasher	0.024	0.042	0.056	0.012
	(0.117)	(0.107)	(0.090)	(0.086)
Paying for water	-0.138	-0.137	-0.194*	-0.149
	(0.119)	(0.107)	(0.116)	(0.118)
Nb. Men	0.163***	0.159***	0.184***	0.183***
	(0.059)	(0.052)	(0.055)	(0.058)
Nb. Women	0.229***	0.212***	0.115*	0.143**
	(0.050)	(0.052)	(0.064)	(0.063)
Nb. Son	0.339***	0.315***	0.140*	0.111
	(0.047)	(0.049)	(0.078)	(0.078)
Nb. Daughter	0.280***	0.242***	0.170***	0.199***
	(0.064)	(0.052)	(0.056)	(0.056)
Income	0.043	0.037	0.003	0.017
	(0.036)	(0.033)	(0.028)	(0.031)
Owner	-0.094	-0.042	-0.101	-0.125
	(0.104)	(0.102)	(0.103)	(0.099)
Reduction		-0.251***		-0.132**
		(0.077)		(0.070)
Treatment x Post x Reduction		0.168		-0.112
		(0.151)		(0.106)
Observations	458	458	452	452
Clusters	66	66	65	65
$R^2$	0.34	0.39	0.33	0.36

Table 3: Average treatment effects on Water consumption until week 7

*Notes*: \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01. Average marginal effects of Ordinary Least Squares models. Regression was conducted on weeks 1-7, clustered at the household level, with standard errors in parentheses. Men and Women are over 13 years old, while Son and Daughter are under 13 years old. Reduction represents a dummy variable taking value 1 for a reduction of water consumption of at least 5% during Phase 2.

## 3.2 Cognitive and psychological processes

In this part, I investigate the role of cognitive and psychological processes on the impact of information-based policies on water consumption. I will now refer to participants instead of households, as only one member of each household took part in the survey.

**Normative assessment** Table 4 shows the average normative appropriateness of water conservation and water waste behavior for each treatment and category.<sup>10</sup> Results show no significant differences between categories or treatments that might have been induced by the different information presented. Whereas Figure S2 in the Supplementary shows the relatively shared knowledge of the social appropriateness of water conservation behaviors (with a concentration of 87% of participants with a positive score above 0.5), it also shows a broader disparity of the social inappropriateness of water wasting behavior (with only 61% of participants with a negative score under -0.5). These results suggest that it could be more effective to reinforce the social inappropriateness of wasting behaviors, and hence to revise beliefs, rather than highlight the social appropriateness of conservation behaviors, which may not alter the value attached to norms. However, OLS regression of water variation in phase 3 by Cognitive and Psychological processes (Table S7 in the Supplementary) find no effect from social appropriateness of water conservation/wasting behavior. The normative assessment of water conservation and wasteful behavior is neither influenced by the provision of information, nor is it responsible for the reduction in water consumption in phase 3.

Table 4: Normative assessment of water-related behaviors.

	Efficient	Medium-Low	p-value	Medium-High	High
	participants	participants	of Mediums	participants	participants
Water conservation behavior with DI	0.551	0.677	0.524	0.707	0.722
<i>p-value</i> of DI vs SI		0.344		0.551	
Water conservation behavior with SI	0.725	0.733	0.710	0.788	0.712
Water wasting behavior with DI	-0.352	-0.509	0.952	-0.521	-0.375
<i>p-value</i> of DI vs SI		0.594		0.558	
Water wasting behavior with SI	-0.625	-0.473	0.309	-0.551	-0.640

*Notes*: Score between -1 and 1, with -1 referring to low level and 1 to high level. *p-value* given by Wilcoxon ranksum statistical test. DI refers to Dynamic Information, and SI to Static Information.

**Emotional assessment** Table 5 shows the average arousal for positive and negative valences in response to each policy implemented in phase 3.<sup>11</sup> Results show that the dynamic information induced significantly more positive emotion for both Medium categories (Wilcoxon ranksum test z=2.16, p=0.030 for Medium-Low, and z=1.95, p=0.051 for Medium-High), as well as less negative emotion in the Medium-High category (Wilcoxon ranksum test z=4.35, p<0.000). However, Table S7 in the Supplementary finds no link between emotional valence induced by the information provision and the reduction of consumption in phase 3. Dynamic information induces stronger positive emotions than static information in Medium participants and less negative emotion

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>Average normative appropriateness score represents the average of 12 items (for more detail see section S3 and subsection S4.3 in Supplementary).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>Average arousal score represents the average of 10 items (for more detail see section S3 and subsection S4.3 in Supplementary).

in Medium-High participants, but emotions do not seem to directly contribute to the reduction in water consumption in phase 3.

	Efficient	Medium-Low	p-value	Medium-High	High
	participants	participants	of Mediums	participants	participants
Positive emotions with DI	0.144	0.132	0.356	0.107	0.13
<i>p-value</i> of DI vs SI		0.030**		0.051*	
Positive emotions with SI	0.453	0.004	0.852	-0.009	-0.15
Negative emotions with DI	-0.639	-0.654	0.864	-0.714	-0.497
<i>p-value</i> of DI vs SI		0.169		0.000***	
Negative emotions with SI	-0.7	-0.488	0.001***	-0.271	-0.075

Table 5: Emotional evaluation of information-based policies.

*Notes*: Score between -1 and 1, with -1 referring to low level and 1 to high level. *p-value* given by Wilcoxon statistical test. DI refers to Dynamic Information, and SI to Static Information.

**Theory of planned behavior assessment** Table S8 in the Supplementary shows the average score for components related to the theory of planned behavior by category and treatment.<sup>12</sup> Results show that participants provided with the dynamic information exhibited significantly more *Personal norms* in the Medium-Low category (Wilcoxon ranksum test z=2.04, p=0.041), as well as significantly more Perceived control and significantly less *Expected results* in the Medium-High category (Wilcoxon ranksum z=3.05, p=0.002 for perceived control, and z=2.06, p=0.040 for expected result). In addition, Table S7 in the Supplementary shows that *Personal norms* significantly explain a part of the reduction in per capita water consumption during phase 3 for the Medium-Low category, while *Expected results* significantly explain a part of the reduction during phase 3 for the Medium-Low category favors the reduction of water consumption, the decrease in *Expected results* exhibited with the dynamic information in the Medium-Low category favors the reduction of water consumption, the decrease in *Expected results* exhibited with the dynamic information in the Medium-Low category favors the reduction of water consumption, the decrease in *Expected results* exhibited with the dynamic information in the Medium-High category.

**Cognitive and psychological processes** In this section, we have seen that dynamic information is correlated with several elements linked to cognitive and psychological processes, suggesting that information impacts these components. While the provision of information does not appear to impact behavior through perceived social norms, its effectiveness and ineffectiveness appear to be mediated by emotional responses and some components of the theory of planned behavior. In the Medium-Low category, individuals who have received the dynamic information feature greater arousal of positive emotions and *Personal norms*. *Personal norms* had a significant impact on reducing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>Information on the construction of each component are available in section S3 and subsection S4.3 of Supplementary.

water consumption in phase 3, which may explain the effectiveness of the information policy in this category. In the Medium-High category, individuals who have received the dynamic information feature lower *Expected results*. However, as this element is linked to the reduction of water consumption, this may explain the ineffectiveness of the information policy in this category.

## 4 Discussion

This article examines the efficacy of information provision in the field of water consumption in influencing average consumers, who represent the majority of the population. I implemented a new type of information, using dynamic information about the social norms, in face to traditional static information about the social norms.

By creating a discontinuity in the information provided between below- and aboveaverage households, the dynamic information revealed an immediate significant average treatment effect only on below-average consumers who had not responded to the first static information (average decrease of 27.7%, i.e., 205 liters per household per week). This reduction can be partly explained by the increased *Personal norms*, which positively correlate with the provision of dynamic information. Meanwhile, aboveaverage households have not reacted to the policy, either immediately or persistently. The policy's ineffectiveness on above-average households can be partly explained by a reduction in Expected Results, which negatively correlated with the provision of dynamic information. The difference in reactions between the two Medium categories to the information provision may be explained by households' social preferences. Although the participating households are all very similar and located in the same area, their initial water consumption was the sole factor determining their category assignment. Given their overall similarity, it can be assumed that there is an initial difference in their sensitivity to water consumption. This sensitivity may explain the differing reactions to the same information. Households that are sensitive to water issues are more likely to emphasize the information provided, while households insensitive to water issues may find it irrelevant (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986; Frewer, Howard and Shepherd, 1998; Pavey and Sparks, 2009). Concordant information is better received and more effective than conflicting information (Akerlof and Dickens, 1982; Frey, 1982). Additionally, since the information provision relies on components of social norms, the effectiveness of the information is influenced by the household's connection to the reference group (Bicchieri, 2005; Bicchieri and Mercier, 2013; Bicchieri and Dimant, 2022), a criterion that non-water-sensitive households may not meet.

The effect of providing information based on social norms on below-average consumers is promising. Firstly, it shows that it is possible to use information on social norms to influence average behavior. Secondly, since it concerns a large proportion of individuals, this change could have a considerable impact on the evolution of the average. It could, therefore, contribute to creating new norms that will eventually impact personal preferences. Thirdly, it reminds us of the effect of information provision, which can be used to increase the pro-social and pro-environmental behavior of most individuals at low cost without changing the incentives.

The results of this paper have significant implications for public policy on wa-

ter management. I show how low-cost information provision can induce an average reduction of over 27.7% (i.e., 205 liters) of domestic water consumption for belowaverage households per week, which represents a considerable quantity on a city scale. For example, in a city of 500,000 inhabitants with around 30-40% below-average households, the water saved in one week is equivalent to the amount of water needed to produce 60,000-80,000 kilograms of potatoes.<sup>13</sup> However, as I have only observed an immediate effect from the implemented policy, it should be used on specific occasions, such as during a period of drought. In addition, since the design does not allow for the isolation of the dynamic information's effect alone, it is possible that this effect essentially serves to counteract a backfire triggered by the preceding static information. This suggests that, in the context of public policy implementation without targeted households, the conventional reliance on static information may be more effective when complemented by dynamic information. These results are especially important as domestic water-related behaviors are private behaviors that are less subject to social pressure (Nyborg et al., 2016). Consequently, the use of dynamic information on visible behaviors could have greater and long-lasting effects.

Nevertheless, due to the limitations of the sample in this experiment, neither the implementation of a true control group nor a comprehensive analysis of the impact of dynamic information on overconsumers was feasible. Future research endeavors would be instrumental in reinforcing these findings, enhancing their validity, and broadening their applicability. First, it would enable us to test the provision of dynamic information on different samples. On the one hand, this will allow us to apply the policy to a larger number of households and eliminate any link with potential field specificity. On the other hand, it will enable us to test cross-cultural implications. Cultural differences could imply different attitudes to social norms, as well as different appreciations towards the water. Secondly, it would enable the isolated implementation of dynamic information provision, in contrast to the current approach, which is preceded by an initial static information provision. The inclusion of a pure control group would allow for a precise assessment of the standalone effect of dynamic information, thereby determining whether its impact stems from an independent influence on behavior or essentially serves to mitigate an initial adverse reaction to static information. Lastly, further research is needed to clarify the relationship between information policy, behavior, and psycho-cognitive processes for the development of more effective policies. For instance, the levels of spread of behavior, as well as the number of provisions of information, should be investigated in order to observe these implications and optimize the effectiveness of information-based policies. Similarly, the role of beliefs in the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup>Otaki, Ueda and Sakura (2017) Bergel, Kotowski and Woyciechowska (2016), Hussien, Memon and Savic (2016), as well as this study, found a distribution of water consumption of households following a Gaussian. (Pimentel et al., 1997) estimated that 1 kilogram of potatoes required 500 liters of water.

decision-making process could be investigated more; for example, Fuhrmann-Riebel et al. (2024) find an effect of dynamic information only for individuals who underestimate the trend.

As the urgency of climate change grows, it is essential to encourage the widespread adoption of prosocial and pro-environmental behavior (Zhang et al., 2007; Shukla, Skea and Slade, 2022; Pörtner et al., 2022). Information-based policies can play a crucial role in accelerating this shift by reinforcing feedback and amplifying social contagion (Lenton et al., 2022). Implementing such policies during tipping points towards green behaviors might enable reaching optimal levels of sustainability in our systems (Lenton et al., 2023; Pizziol and Tavoni, 2024).

## References

- **Agthe, Donald E., and R. Bruce Billings.** 1987. "Equity, Price Elasticity, and Household Income Under Increasing Block Rates for Water." *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 46(3): 273–286.
- Ahn, Insook, Soo Hyun Kim, and Munyoung Kim. 2020. "The Relative Importance of Values, Social Norms, and Enjoyment-Based Motivation in Explaining Pro-Environmental Product Purchasing Behavior in Apparel Domain." Sustainability, 12(17): 6797.
- Ajzen, Icek. 1991. "The theory of planned behavior." Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2): 179–211.
- Akerlof, George A., and William T. Dickens. 1982. "The Economic Consequences of Cognitive Dissonance." *The American Economic Review*, 72(3): 307–319. Publisher: American Economic Association.
- **Aldoh, Alaa, Paul Sparks, and Peter R. Harris.** 2021. "Dynamic Norms and Food Choice: Reflections on a Failure of Minority Norm Information to Influence Motivation to Reduce Meat Consumption." *Sustainability*, 13(15): 8315.
- Allcott, Hunt. 2011. "Social norms and energy conservation." Journal of Public Economics, 95(9): 1082–1095.
- Amarasinghe, Pradeep, An Liu, Prasanna Egodawatta, Paul Barnes, James McGree, and Ashantha Goonetilleke. 2016. "Quantitative assessment of resilience of a water supply system under rainfall reduction due to climate change." *Journal of Hydrology*, 540: 1043–1052.
- Andor, Mark A., Lorenz Goette, Michael K. Price, Anna Schulze Tilling, and Lukas Tomberg. 2023. "Differences in How and Why Social Comparison and Real-Time Feedback Impact Resource Use: Evidence from a Field Experiment."
- **Ayres, Ian, Sophie Raseman, and Alice Shih.** 2013. "Evidence from Two Large Field Experiments that Peer Comparison Feedback Can Reduce Residential Energy Usage." *The Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 29(5): 992–1022.
- Bergel, T., T. Kotowski, and O. Woyciechowska. 2016. "Daily Water Consumption For Household Purposes and its Variability in a Rural Household." *Journal of Ecological Engineering*, Vol. 17(nr 3).
- Bernedo, María, Paul J. Ferraro, and Michael Price. 2014. "The Persistent Impacts of Norm-Based Messaging and Their Implications for Water Conservation." *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 37(3): 437–452.

- **Bhanot, Syon P.** 2021. "Isolating the effect of injunctive norms on conservation behavior: New evidence from a field experiment in California." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 163: 30–42.
- **Bicchieri, Cristina.** 2005. *The Grammar of Society: The Nature and Dynamics of Social Norms.* Cambridge University Press.
- **Bicchieri, Cristina.** 2016. *Norms in the Wild: How to Diagnose, Measure, and Change Social Norms.* Oxford University Press.
- **Bicchieri, Cristina.** 2023. "Norm nudging and twisting preferences." *Behavioural Public Policy*, 7(4): 914–923.
- **Bicchieri, Cristina, and Eugen Dimant.** 2022. "Nudging with care: the risks and benefits of social information." *Public Choice*, 191(3): 443–464.
- **Bicchieri, Cristina, and Eugen Dimant.** 2023. "Norm-Nudging: Harnessing Social Expectations for Behavior Change."
- **Bicchieri, Cristina, and Hugo Mercier.** 2013. "Self-serving biases and public justifications in trust games." *Synthese*, 190(5): 909–922.
- **Bolton, Gary, Eugen Dimant, and Ulrich Schmidt.** 2021. "Observability and social image: On the robustness and fragility of reciprocity." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 191: 946–964.
- **Borg, Kim, Jim Curtis, and Jo Lindsay.** 2020. "Social norms and plastic avoidance: Testing the theory of normative social behaviour on an environmental behaviour." *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 19(6): 594–607.
- Brent, Daniel A., Joseph H. Cook, and Skylar Olsen. 2015. "Social Comparisons, Household Water Use, and Participation in Utility Conservation Programs: Evidence from Three Randomized Trials." *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists*, 2(4): 597–627. Publisher: The University of Chicago Press.
- **Buchs, Arnaud, Sandrine Allain, and Samuel Pinjon.** 2023. "Revealing pluralism within the commons. Commoning for water security in the Alps."
- **Caci, H, and F Baylé.** 2007. "L'échelle d'affectivité positive et d'affectivité négative." *Première traduction en francais. Congrès de l'Encéphale, Paris*, 25–27.
- Chaudhary, Anil Kumar, Laura A. Warner, Alexa J. Lamm, Glenn D. Israel, Joy N. Rumble, and Randall A. Cantrell. 2017. "Using the Theory of Planned Behavior to Encourage Water Conservation among Extensin Clients." *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 58(3): 185–202.

- **Cialdini, Robert B.** 2003. "Crafting Normative Messages to Protect the Environment." *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12(4): 105–109.
- **Clark, William A., and James C. Finley.** 2007. "Determinants of Water Conservation Intention in Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria." *Society & Natural Resources*, 20(7): 613–627.
- **Drouvelis, Michalis, and Brit Grosskopf.** 2016. "The effects of induced emotions on pro-social behaviour." *Journal of Public Economics*, 134: 1–8.
- **Elster, Jon.** 1998. "Emotions and Economic Theory." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 36(1): 47–74. Publisher: American Economic Association.
- Fang, Ximeng, Lorenz Goette, Bettina Rockenbach, Matthias Sutter, Verena Tiefenbeck, Samuel Schoeb, and Thorsten Staake. 2023. "Complementarities in behavioral interventions: Evidence from a field experiment on resource conservation." *Journal of Public Economics*, 228: 105028.
- Feldman, David L. 2013. Water. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ferraro, Paul J., Juan Jose Miranda, and Michael K. Price. 2011. "The Persistence of Treatment Effects with Norm-Based Policy Instruments: Evidence from a Randomized Environmental Policy Experiment." *American Economic Review*, 101(3): 318–322.
- **Frewer, Lynn J., Chaya Howard, and Richard Shepherd.** 1998. "The influence of initial attitudes on responses to communication about genetic engineering in food production." *Agriculture and Human Values*, 15(1): 15–30.
- **Frey, Dieter.** 1982. "Different levels of cognitive dissonance, information seeking, and information avoidance." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(6): 1175–1183. Place: US Publisher: American Psychological Association.
- Fuhrmann-Riebel, Hanna, Ben D'Exelle, Kristian López Vargas, Sebastian Tonke, and Arjan Verschoor. 2024. "Correcting misperceptions about trends and norms to address weak collective action — Experimental evidence from a recycling program." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 128: 103046.
- Gadgil, Ashok. 1998. "Drinking Water in Developing Countries." *Annual Review of Energy and the Environment*, 23(1): 253–286.
- **Goodchild, C. W.** 2003. "Modelling the Impact of Climate Change on Domestic Water Demand." *Water and Environment Journal*, 17(1): 8–12.
- Haaland, Ingar, Christopher Roth, and Johannes Wohlfart. 2023. "Designing Information Provision Experiments." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 61(1): 3–40.

- Han, Heesup, Li-Tzang (Jane) Hsu, and Chwen Sheu. 2010. "Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior to green hotel choice: Testing the effect of environmental friendly activities." *Tourism Management*, 31(3): 325–334.
- Harrison, Glenn W., and John A. List. 2004. "Field Experiments." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 42(4): 1009–1055.
- Howe, Charles W., and F. P. Linaweaver Jr. 1967. "The impact of price on residential water demand and its relation to system design and price structure." *Water Resources Research*, 3(1): 13–32.
- Hubbard, Timothy L. 2015. "The varieties of momentum-like experience." *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(6): 1081–1119.
- Hussien, Wa'el A., Fayyaz A. Memon, and Dragan A. Savic. 2016. "Assessing and Modelling the Influence of Household Characteristics on Per Capita Water Consumption." Water Resources Management, 30(9): 2931–2955.
- Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change. 2019. Climate Change and Land: IPCC Special Report on Climate Change, Desertification, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Food Security, and Greenhouse Gas Fluxes in Terrestrial Ecosystems. . 1 ed., Cambridge University Press.
- **Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change.** 2023. *Climate Change* 2021 *The Physical Science Basis: Working Group I Contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.* . 1 ed., Cambridge University Press.
- Jin, Eunjoo, and Lucy Atkinson. 2021. "The Moderating Role of Emotion: The Combinatory Effects of Positive Emotion and News Framing Techniques on Climate Change Attitudes." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 98(3): 749–768. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Jorgensen, Bradley, Michelle Graymore, and Kevin O'Toole. 2009. "Household water use behavior: An integrated model." *Journal of Environmental Management*, 91(1): 227– 236.
- Kitamori, Kumi, Ton Manders, Rob Dellink, and A. A. Tabeau. 2012. "OECD environmental outlook to 2050 : the consequences of inaction." OECD.
- Klemeš, Jiří Jaromír. 2012. "Industrial water recycle/reuse." *Current Opinion in Chemical Engineering*, 1(3): 238–245.
- **Kollmuss, Anja, and Julian Agyeman.** 2002. "Mind the Gap: Why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior?" *Environmental Education Research*, 8(3): 239–260.

- Konapala, Goutam, Ashok K. Mishra, Yoshihide Wada, and Michael E. Mann. 2020. "Climate change will affect global water availability through compounding changes in seasonal precipitation and evaporation." *Nature Communications*, 11(1): 3044.
- **Krupka, Erin L., and Roberto A. Weber.** 2013. "Identifying Social Norms Using Coordination Games: Why Does Dictator Game Sharing Vary?" *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 11(3): 495–524.
- Lam, San-Pui. 2006. "Predicting Intention to Save Water: Theory of Planned Behavior, Response Efficacy, Vulnerability, and Perceived Efficiency of Alternative Solutions1." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(11): 2803–2824.
- Landon, Adam C., Richard T. Woodward, Gerard T. Kyle, and Ronald A. Kaiser. 2018. "Evaluating the efficacy of an information-based residential outdoor water conservation program." *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 195: 56–65.
- Lenton, T., D. I. Armstrong McKay, Sina Loriani, J. F. Abrams, S. J. Lade, Jonathan Friedemann Donges, M. Milkoreit, T. Powell, S. R. Smith, C. Zimm, J. E. Buxton, E. Bailey, L. Laybourn, A. Ghadiali, and J. G. Dyke. 2023. "The Global Tipping Points Report 2023."
- Lenton, Timothy M., Scarlett Benson, Talia Smith, Theodora Ewer, Victor Lanel, Elizabeth Petykowski, Thomas W. R. Powell, Jesse F. Abrams, Fenna Blomsma, and Simon Sharpe. 2022. "Operationalising positive tipping points towards global sustainability." *Global Sustainability*, 5: e1.
- **Loewenstein, George.** 2000. "Emotions in Economic Theory and Economic Behavior." *American Economic Review*, 90(2): 426–432.
- Markman, Keith D., and Corey L. Guenther. 2007. "Psychological Momentum: Intuitive Physics and Naive Beliefs." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(6): 800– 812.
- Milano, Marianne, Emmanuel Reynard, Nina Köplin, and Rolf Weingartner. 2015. "Climatic and anthropogenic changes in Western Switzerland: Impacts on water stress." *Science of The Total Environment*, 536: 12–24.
- Mortensen, Chad R., Rebecca Neel, Robert B. Cialdini, Christine M. Jaeger, Ryan P. Jacobson, and Megan M. Ringel. 2019. "Trending Norms: A Lever for Encouraging Behaviors Performed by the Minority." *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 10(2): 201–210.
- Nauges, Céline, and Alban Thomas. 2003. "Long-run Study of Residential Water Consumption." *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 26(1): 25–43.

- Nyborg, Karine, John M. Anderies, Astrid Dannenberg, Therese Lindahl, Caroline Schill, Maja Schlüter, W. Neil Adger, Kenneth J. Arrow, Scott Barrett, Stephen Carpenter, F. Stuart Chapin, Anne-Sophie Crépin, Gretchen Daily, Paul Ehrlich, Carl Folke, Wander Jager, Nils Kautsky, Simon A. Levin, Ole Jacob Madsen, Stephen Polasky, Marten Scheffer, Brian Walker, Elke U. Weber, James Wilen, Anastasios Xepapadeas, and Aart de Zeeuw. 2016. "Social norms as solutions." Science, 354(6308): 42–43.
- **Otaki, Yurina, Kazuhiro Ueda, and Osamu Sakura.** 2017. "Effects of feedback about community water consumption on residential water conservation." *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 143: 719–730.
- **Otto, Betsy, and Leah Schleifer.** 2020. "Domestic Water Use Grew 600% Over the Past 50 Years."
- **Owens, Susan, and Louise Driffill.** 2008. "How to change attitudes and behaviours in the context of energy." *Energy Policy*, 36(12): 4412–4418.
- **Pavey, Louisa, and Paul Sparks.** 2009. "Reactance, autonomy and paths to persuasion: Examining perceptions of threats to freedom and informational value." *Motivation and Emotion*, 33(3): 277–290.
- **Petty, Richard E., and John T. Cacioppo.** 1986. "The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion." In *Communication and Persuasion: Central and Peripheral Routes to Attitude Change.*, ed. Richard E. Petty and John T. Cacioppo, 1–24. New York, NY:Springer.
- Pimentel, David, James Houser, Erika Preiss, Omar White, Hope Fang, Leslie Mesnick, Troy Barsky, Stephanie Tariche, Jerrod Schreck, and Sharon Alpert. 1997. "Water Resources: Agriculture, the Environment, and Society." *BioScience*, 47(2): 97– 106.
- **Pizziol, Veronica, and Alessandro Tavoni.** 2024. "From niches to norms: the promise of social tipping interventions to scale climate action." *npj Climate Action*, 3(1): 1–8.
- Pörtner, Hans-Otto, Debra Roberts, Melinda Tignor, Elvira Poloczanska, Katja Mintenbeck, Andrés Alegría, Marlies Craig, Stefanie Langsdorf, Sina Löschke, Vincent Möller, Andrew Okem, Bard Rama Phd, Daniel Belling, Wolfgang Dieck, Sandra Götze, Tijama Kersher, Philisiwe Mangele, Bastian Maus, Anka Mühle, and Nora Weyer. 2022. Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability Working Group II Contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- Scheierling, Susanne M., John B. Loomis, and Robert A. Young. 2006. "Irrigation water demand: A meta-analysis of price elasticities." *Water Resources Research*, 42(1).

- Schultz, P. Wesley, Jessica M. Nolan, Robert B. Cialdini, Noah J. Goldstein, and Vladas Griskevicius. 2007. "The Constructive, Destructive, and Reconstructive Power of Social Norms." *Psychological Science*, 18(5): 429–434.
- Shukla, Priyadarshi R, Jim Skea, and Raphael Slade. 2022. "Working Group III Contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change."
- Singh, Anita, and Madhoolika Agrawal. 2008. "Acid rain and its ecological consequences." *Journal of Environmental Biology*, 29(1): 15–24.
- Sparkman, Gregg, and Gregory M. Walton. 2017. "Dynamic Norms Promote Sustainable Behavior, Even if It Is Counternormative." *Psychological Science*, 28(11): 1663– 1674.
- **Spencer, Theo, and Peter Altman.** 2010. "Climate Change, Water, and Risk: Current Water Demands Are Not Sustainable." *Climate Change*.
- **S. Mauter, Meagan, and Peter S. Fiske.** 2020. "Desalination for a circular water economy." *Energy & Environmental Science*, 13(10): 3180–3184.
- Tiefenbeck, Verena, Lorenz Goette, Kathrin Degen, Vojkan Tasic, Elgar Fleisch, Rafael Lalive, and Thorsten Staake. 2018. "Overcoming Salience Bias: How Real-Time Feedback Fosters Resource Conservation." *Management Science*, 64(3): 1458– 1476. Publisher: INFORMS.
- **UNEP, United Nations Environment Programme.** 2023. "Measuring Progress: Waterrelated ecosystems and the SDGs." *UNON Publishing Services Section, Nairobi.*
- Wada, Yoshihide, Dominik Wisser, Stephanie Eisner, Martina Flörke, Dieter Gerten, Ingjerd Haddeland, Naota Hanasaki, Yoshimitsu Masaki, Felix T. Portmann, Tobias Stacke, Zachary Tessler, and Jacob Schewe. 2013. "Multimodel projections and uncertainties of irrigation water demand under climate change." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40(17): 4626–4632.
- Watson, David, Lee Anna Clark, and Greg Carey. 1988. "Positive and negative affectivity and their relation to anxiety and depressive disorders." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 97(3): 346–353.
- **World Health Organization.** 2015. *Progress on Sanitation and Drinking Water* : 2015 Update and MDG Assessment. World Health Organization.
- Zhang, David D., Peter Brecke, Harry F. Lee, Yuan-Qing He, and Jane Zhang. 2007. "Global climate change, war, and population decline in recent human history." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 104(49): 19214–19219.

# **Declaration of competing interest**

The author declares no conflict of interest.

# Acknowledgments

This research has received funding from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR) for the projects under the grants ANR-18-WTW7-0002 and ANR-19-CE03-0007.

This research has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme (GREEN TIPPING, grant agreement 101089107).

# Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

## Supplementary materials

## S1 Household classification

![](_page_32_Figure_2.jpeg)

Figure S1: Distribution of household consumption per capita for the first two weeks.

Notes: m- (200), m (448), and m+ (770) represent the boundaries implemented to create categories.

	Efficient	Medium-Low	Medium-High	High
	households	households	households	households
Nb. households	14	66	65	26
Households size	3.28	2.95	2.77	2.92
Living area size $(m^2)$	77.43	75.18	73.34	72.23
Dishwasher (%)	78.57	78.79	75.38	57.69
Paying for Water (%)	78.57	87.88	90.77	76.92
Nb. Men	0.86	1.12	1.14	0.96
Nb. Women	1.43	1.18	1.21	1.23
Nb. Son	0.64	0.41	0.2	0.38
Nb. Daughter	0.36	0.24	0.21	0.35
Income	2.21	2.14	2	1.61
Owner (%)	64.28	66.66	47.69	26.92
Phase 1 consumption	404.61	982.77	1567.42	2632.35
Phase 2 consumption	395.5	1044.629	1521.21	2550.46
Phase 3 consumption	436.61	1001.788	1433.41	2415.17
Phase 4 consumption	382	1037	1429	2182

Table SI: Average hou	sehold charac	teristics by	categories.

*Notes*: Paying for Water is a dummy variable taking value 1 if the household pays directly for its water consumption (as opposed to households whose water charges are included in their rent). Income score thresholds 1=less than 30,000€, 2=between 30,000 and 40,000€, 3=between 40,000 and 50,000€, 4=between 50,000 and 60,000€, 5=more than 60,000€. Men and Women are over 13 years old, while Son and Daughter are under 13 years old. Water consumption in liters per week.

	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-High
	dynamic	static	dynamic	static
Nh households	33	33	33	32
Nile and the Distance of an	07 (01 010/)		32((0.700/))	
Nb. with Disnwasher	27 (81.81%)	25 (75.75%)	23 (69.70%)	26 (81.25%)
Nb. size 1	-	3 (9.09%)	3 (9.09%)	1 (3.12%)
Nb. size 2	12 (36.36%)	12 (36.36%)	15 (45.45%)	14 (43.75%)
Nb. size 3	8 (24.24%)	6 (18.18%)	11 (33.33%)	6 (18.75%)
Nb. size 4	11 (33.33%)	12 (23.36%)	3 (9.09%)	8 (25%)
Nb. size 5	2 (6.06%)	-	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.12%)
Nb. size 6	-	-	-	1 (3.12%)
Nb. size 7	-	-	-	1 (3.12%)
Nb. Men	1.24	1	1.03	1.25
Nb. Women	1.24	1.12	1.12	1.31
Nb. Son	0.48	0.33	0.15	0.25
Nb. Daughter	0.12	0.36	0.21	0.21
Nb. with reduction of 5% in Phase 2	13 (36.36%)	12 (39.39%)	20 (60.60%)	16 (50%)

Table S2: Stratified random sampling composition by categories and treatment for Medium categories.

*Notes*: Nb. size n, count the number of households of size n in the category. Men and Women are over 13 years old, while Son and Daughter are under 13 years old. Water consumption in liters per week.

#### Table S3: Attrition by categories and treatment for Medium categories.

	Without categories	Medium-Low without treatment	Medium-High without treatment	Medium-Low dynamic	Medium-Low static	Medium-High dynamic	Medium-High static	Total	Phase
Week 1	10							10	Phase 1
Week 2	7							7	1111050 1
Week 3									Phase 2
Week 4		2	4					6	1 11050 2
Week 5									Phase 3
Week 6					1			1	1 Hube 5
Week 7							1	1	Phase 4
Total	17	2	4		1		1	25	

Without Categories refers to phase 1, where households did not have any assignment. Without treatment refers to phase 2, where there is no difference between the two Medium categories. dynamic refers to households receiving dynamic information, while static refers to households receiving static information.

# S2 Average treatment effects on Water consumption - OLS

Week 1 to 5	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-High
Consumption	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment x Post	-133.8*	-205.2**	8.80	49.79
	(72.10)	(85.71)	(94.94)	(113.2)
Treatment	-66.05	-63.83	18.42	31.46
	(63.86)	(62.06)	(98.50)	(91.00)
Post	21.41	21.14	-117.1	-119.2
	(51.80)	(51.94)	(83.37)	(83.60)
Living area size $(m^2)$	0.56	0.67	4.53	4.31
-	(2.24)	(2.17)	(3.38)	(3.27)
Dishwasher	68.93	76.83	46.34	-3.43
	(108.2)	(102.2)	(100.1)	(99.71)
Paying for water	-56.92	-57.38	-327.0**	-265.2
	(105.2)	(102.5)	(152.2)	(159.8)
Nb. Men	148.8***	146.2***	311.1***	305.1***
	(53.52)	(49.22)	(84.43)	(88.88)
Nb. Women	235.5***	220.1***	146.7	181.0*
	(40.78)	(42.18)	(95.69)	(95.30)
Nb. Son	293.6***	275.2***	173.4	132.7
	(45.76)	(47.16)	(111.5)	(113.1)
Nb. Daughter	232.9***	202.4***	256.5***	291.8***
	(61.10)	(54.74)	(85.98)	(84.16)
Income	52.62*	48.39*	-4.44	13.99
	(27.36)	(25.21)	(39.63)	(42.23)
Owner	-118.5	-79.90	-47.71	-84.09
	(103.8)	(99.41)	(147.6)	(143.0)
Reduction		-182.0***		-199.3**
		(64.22)		(96.83)
Treatment x Post x Reduction		191.1		-63.97
		(124.6)		(132.7)
Observations	330	330	325	325
Clusters	66	66	65	65
$R^2$	0.41	0.44	0.39	0.42

Table S4: Average treatment effects on Water consumption until week 5

*Notes*: \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01. Average marginal effects of Ordinary Least Squares models. Regression was conducted on weeks 1-5, clustered at the household level, with standard errors in parentheses. Men and Women are over 13 years old, while Son and Daughter are under 13 years old. Reduction represents a dummy variable taking value 1 for a reduction of water consumption of at least 5% during Phase 2.

Week 1 to 6	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-High
Consumption	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment x Post	-58.94	-102.9	22.62	94.89
	(62.38)	(76.35)	(77.55)	(108.1)
Treatment	-67.69	-65.18	18.21	30.71
	(65.48)	(63.76)	(99.45)	(91.29)
Post	6.70	6.52	-123.5*	-123.4*
	(40.73)	(40.83)	(68.94)	(68.93)
Living area size	0.34	0.46	4.30	4.02
	(2.33)	(2.24)	(3.32)	(3.20)
Dishwasher	74.99	83.77	50.33	-7.35
	(106.2)	(99.96)	(105.5)	(104.0)
Paying for water	-40.31	-41.55	-350.6**	-285.4*
	(102.2)	(97.89)	(161.3)	(167.7)
Nb. Men	136.1**	132.6***	292.4***	288.1***
	(53.27)	(48.69)	(82.81)	(86.75)
Nb. Women	230***	214.9***	142.9	180.2*
	(40.89)	(40.97)	(96.98)	(94.54)
Nb. Son	299***	279.7***	179.8	137.2
	(47.37)	(48.69)	(109.8)	(110.9)
Nb. Daughter	218.1***	187.0***	240***	279.1***
	(62.03)	(54.47)	(79.85)	(78.55)
Income	48.11*	43.92*	-3.93	16.17
	(27.97)	(26.08)	(40.55)	(43.20)
Owner	-128.7	-89.20	-53.84	-90.95
	(103.3)	(99.73)	(148.2)	(141.9)
Reduction		-185.0***		-199.8**
		(64.78)		(97.49)
Treatment x Post x Reduction		115.6		-119.4
		(118.5)		(133.9)
Observations	396	396	390	390
Cluster	66	66	65	65
$R^2$	0.38	0.41	0.37	0.40

Table S5: Average treatment effects on Water consumption until week 6

*Notes*: \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01. Average marginal effects of Ordinary Least Squares models. Regression was conducted on weeks 1-6, clustered at the household level, with standard errors in parentheses. Men and Women are over 13 years old, while Son and Daughter are under 13 years old. Reduction represents a dummy variable taking value 1 for a reduction of water consumption of at least 5% during Phase 2.

Week 1 to 7	Medium-Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	Medium-High
Consumption	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment x Post	18.99	8.25	14.25	110.1
	(84.49)	(122.2)	(60.30)	(94.99)
Treatment	-58.90	-54.89	33.38	43.71
	(69.31)	(66.50)	(97.59)	(89.19)
Post	-9.67	-9.58	-106.7**	-106.3**
	(38.38)	(38.33)	(45.10)	(45.06)
Living area size	0.06	0.18	3.24	3.00
	(2.31)	(2.25)	(3.03)	(2.90)
Dishwasher	65.20	68.86	56.48	-4.01
	(108.0)	(100.2)	(106.3)	(102.6)
Paying for water	-43.37	-48.48	-344.9**	-283.2*
	(109.9)	(103.0)	(159.0)	(164.5)
Nb. Men	152.9***	150.4***	310.1***	304.8***
	(56.62)	(52.19)	(82.45)	(85.73)
Nb. Women	229.4***	217.7***	181.4*	215.2**
	(44.27)	(43.79)	(92.25)	(88.97)
Nb. Son	336.2***	316.7***	203.9*	162.1
	(50.50)	(50.77)	(113.2)	(114.0)
Nb. Daughter	276***	250.5***	260.4***	300.0***
	(72.24)	(63.93)	(78.42)	(76.11)
Income	30.10	27.0	-2.20	17.75
	(31.29)	(29.20)	(39.45)	(42.29)
Owner	-101.1	-57.0	-74.68	-109.1
	(106.6)	(102.7)	(144.3)	(137.6)
Reduction		-183.3***		-187.1*
		(65.31)		(95.67)
Treatment x Post x Reduction		27.2		-156.3
		(145.1)		(132.6)
Observations	462	462	455	455
Cluster	66	66	65	65
$R^2$	0.33	0.35	0.39	0.41

Table S6: Average treatment effects on Water consumption until week 7

*Notes*: \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01. Average marginal effects of Ordinary Least Squares models. Regression was conducted on weeks 1-7, clustered at the household level, with standard errors in parentheses. Men and Women are over 13 years old, while Son and Daughter are under 13 years old. Reduction represents a dummy variable taking value 1 for a reduction of water consumption of at least 5% during Phase 2.

## S3 Cognitive and Psychological processes

Table S7 shows the correlation between Cognitive and Psychological processes of respondents with water consumption of households. "Appropriateness of water conservation/wasting behavior" score represents the average of 12 items. "Positive/Negative valence from phase 3 information provision" represents the average of 10 items. "Personal norms" score represents the average of 5 items. "Expected results" score represents the average of 3 items. "Attitude toward water conservation" score represents the average of 5 items. "Perceived behavioral control" score represents the average of 7 items. "Conservation Behaviors" score represents the average of 9 behaviors. "Conservation Equipment" represents the average of 6 equipments. All items are taken from a 5-point Likert scale (see section S4.3 for details).

	Medium-Low	Medium-High
	(1)	(2)
Appropriateness of water conservation behavior	0.038	0.122
	(0.120)	(0.087)
Appropriateness of water wasting behavior	-0.188	-0.014
	(0.153)	(0.187)
Positive valence from phase 3 information provision	-0.034	0.073
	(0.107)	(0.137)
Negative valence from phase 3 information provision	0.086	-0.009
	(0.092)	(0.097)
Personal norms	-0.306**	0.390
	(0.129)	(0.276)
Expected results	0.024	-0.324**
	(0.146)	(0.142)
Attitude toward water conservation	-0.141	-0.037
	(0.283)	(0.369)
Perceived behavioral control	-0.120	-0.033
	(0.113)	(0.107)
Change of conservation behavior	0.158	-0.476
	(0.365)	(0.308)
Change of conservation equipment	-0.583*	0.122
	(0.317)	(0.580)
Nb. Men	-0.136**	-0.005
	(0.060)	(0.037)
Nb. Women	-0.089	0.002
	(0.078)	(0.053)
Nb. Son	-0.048	0.033
	(0.050)	(0.073)
Nb. Daughter	-0.167**	-0.040
	(0.075)	(0.059)
Observations	66	65
$R^2$	0.276	0.256

Table S7: Variation of water consumption in phase 3 vs. phase 2

*Notes*: \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01. Average marginal effects of Ordinary Least Squares models, with standard errors in parentheses. All scores range between -1 and 1.

## S3.1 Theory of planned behavior, and related components

Table S8 shows the scores of components from Theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), Related component (Chaudhary et al., 2017; Clark and Finley, 2007; Lam, 2006), and Additional information (appearing relevant to the author).

	Efficient	Medium-Low	p-value	Medium-High	High
	participants	participants	of Mediums	participants	participants
Theory of planned behavior					
Perceived control with DI	0.325	0.193	0.247	0.314	0.028
<i>p-value</i> of DI vs SI		0.102		0.002***	
Perceived control with SI	0.257	0.028	0.997	0.027	0.143
Attitude toward water conservation with DI	0.633	0.612	0.982	0.615	0.573
<i>p-value</i> of DI vs SI		0.301		0.540	
Attitude toward water conservation with SI	0.62	0.576	0.059*	0.641	0.590
Personal norms with DI	0.789	0.685	0.246	0.642	0.567
<i>p-value</i> of DI vs SI		0.041**		0.379	
Personal norms with SI	0.84	0.570	0.058*	0.653	0.554
Related components					
Expected Result with DI	0.630	0.576	0.196	0.495	0.544
<i>p-value</i> of DI vs SI		0.148		0.071*	
Expected Result with SI	0.567	0.470	0.040**	0.614	0.409
Anterior Conservation Behaviors with DI	0.839	0.761	0.326	0.731	0.548
<i>p-value</i> of DI vs SI		0.857		0.800	
Anterior Conservation Behaviors with SI	0.866	0.751	0.384	0.719	0.616
Additional information					
Current Conservation Behaviors with DI	0.852	0.882	0.270	0.848	0.763
<i>p-value</i> of DI vs SI		0.042**		0.755	
Current Conservation Behaviors with SI	0.911	0.804	0.623	0.833	0.747
Anterior Conservation Equipment with DI	0.204	0.253	0.643	0.535	0.389
<i>p-value</i> of DI vs SI		0.932		0.804	
Anterior Conservation Equipment with SI	0.253	0.495	0.809	0.521	0.379
Current Conservation Equipment with DI	0.537	0.561	0.956	0.566	0.4
<i>p-value</i> of DI vs SI		0.446		0.723	
Current Conservation Equipment with SI	0.633	0.505	0.660	0.542	0.394

Table S8: Direct and related components to Theory of planned behavior.

*Notes*: Score between -1 and 1, with -1 referring to low and 1 to high levels. *p-value* given by Wilcoxon statistical test. DI refers to Dynamic Information, and SI refers to Static information.

## S3.2 Normative evaluation

Figure S2 regroups answers of both Medium categories. In the Figure, the more a participant is on the top of the ordinate, the more he perceives water conservation behavior as socially appropriate. Similarly, the more a participant is on the left of the abscissa, the more he perceives water-wasting behavior as socially inappropriate. As a consequence, the top-left part represents a perception of a strong norm in favor of water conservation behavior; the bottom-right part represents a perception of a strong norm in favor of water wasting behavior; the middle-center and the top-right represent a perception of an absence of norm; the bottom-left represent nothing logical; the other intermediary parts represent ambiguous norms.

![](_page_39_Figure_2.jpeg)

Figure S2: Normative evaluation of water behavior

## S4 Instruction - Translated from French into English

### S4.1 Weekly-email

In this section, text tags represent variations according to weeks and participants. In addition, the texts in red only concern the second weeks of the phases with information provision (phases 2 and 3).

## Beginning of the study

Subject: Water consumption study

Good morning,

Week 1

The water consumption survey you're taking part in starts today. We want to remind you that you must take a photo of your water meter(s) every Tuesday (the photo must not have been taken in advance) and submit it to us via the link provided (available below). If you forget to send a photo or make a mistake in the file you submit, you'll receive a reminder at this email address. You will be compensated  $20 \in$  for submitting your photos for the 7-week study period. In addition, the final questionnaire will allow you to earn an extra 5 $\in$  depending on your answers to clearly marked questions. We invite you to take a photo of your water meter now and send it to us at https://cloud.univgrenoble-alpes.fr/s/{{ Code }}. Please do not share this link. Your photo must have

been taken today to be eligible for payment.

We thank you in advance for the photo,

If you have any problems, please get in touch with us at the following email address: gael-ecoexp@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr .

Best regards

The Experimental Economics Team

## First weekly e-mail

Subject: Water consumption study

Good morning,

Week {{ Week }}

We invite you to take a photo of your water meter and send it to us at https://cloud.univgrenoble-alpes.fr/s/{{ Code }}. This link is unique to you; please do not share it. Your photo must have been taken today to be eligible for payment.

We also remind you to consult the first results of the study at the following link {{ Link }}. Please do not share this link with others.

We thank you in advance for the photo,

If you have any problems, please get in touch with us at the following email address: gael-ecoexp@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr .

Best regards

The Experimental Economics Team

## Second weekly e-mail

Subject: Reminder of water consumption study Good morning, Week {{ Week }} We have not received the photo of your water meter.

Please take a picture of your water meter and send it to us at https://cloud.univgrenoble-alpes.fr/s/{{ Code }}. This is your own link, so please don't share it. Your photo must have been taken today to be eligible for payment.

We also remind you to consult the first results of the study at the following link {{ Link }}. Please do not share this link with others.

We thank you in advance for the photo,

If you have any problems, please get in touch with us at the following email address: gael-ecoexp@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr .

Best regards

The Experimental Economics Team

## Third weekly e-mail

Subject: Latest water consumption study reminder

Good morning,

Week {{ Week }}

This is the last reminder for the water consumption study.

We have not received your water meter photo. You must take a picture of your meter today to be eligible for payment.

If you don't, we'll remove you from the study, and you won't receive any more emails about it.

We invite you to take a photo of your water meter and send it to us using the link https://cloud.univ-grenoble-alpes.fr/s/{{ Code }}. This link is unique to you, so please don't share it. Your photo must have been taken today to be eligible for payment.

We also remind you to consult the first results of the study at the following link {{ Link }}. Please do not share this link with others.

We thank you in advance for the photo,

If you have any problems, please get in touch with us at the following email address: gael-ecoexp@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr .

Best regards

The Experimental Economics Team

## Information provision email

Subject: Water consumption study

Good morning,

Week {{ Week }}

After these {{ Week }} weeks of study, we have some results to share with you.

{{ Information\_Provision }}

If you don't see an image displayed, you will find it at the link provided below.

We invite you to visit the following page, which includes information on household water consumption {{ Code }}. Please do not share this link with others.

You can visit this page as often as you like over the next two weeks.

Apart from consulting the page provided below, you have no further action to take until next Tuesday.

If you have any problems, please get in touch with us at the following email address: gael-ecoexp@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr .

Best regards

The Experimental Economics Team

## S4.2 Web page information

## Water is essential, let's save it!

![](_page_43_Figure_2.jpeg)

Information about your water consumption

#### Information about French water consumption

#### Water consumption in France

- French households consume an average of 220 m3 of water per year. This represents a major source of expenditure, as well as a significant environmental impact.
- Adopting the right habits, combined with the installation of certain inexpensive devices, can save up to 40% of water consumption costs.
- Household water consumption breaks down as follows: 39% for hygiene, 20% for sanitary, 12% for laundry, 10% for washing up, 6% for cooking, 6% for gardening, 6% for miscellaneous, and 1% for drinks.

#### **Environmental** issues

- Rising temperatures are reducing river and groundwater flows, drying out soils and making water less available.
- At the same time, water requirements are increasing, whether for agriculture, for the growing number of households, or for increased industrial production.

#### **Best practice**

- Turning off water faucets as soon as they are no longer needed prevents unnecessary water loss.
- Watch out for water leaks and dripping taps, to avoid unnecessary water loss.

#### Reducing water consumption for laundry and dishwashing

- Using machines only when they are full reduces overall water consumption.
- Use "eco" modes or short cycles to reduce water consumption for each machine.
- Using rinse trays for hand-wash dishes rather than leaving the water running for each item, as well as using the rinse water from one group of items as wash water for the next group, saves a significant amount of water.

#### Water reduction in the bathroom

- Turning off the water when soaping your hands, head or body, as well as when shaving or removing make-up, saves a significant amount of water.
- Using a timer or music to control your showering time from 3 to 5 minutes (i.e. the time of less than two songs), saves a significant amount of water.

#### Equip yourself with energy-saving appliances

- For laundry and dishwashing. Installing appliances that consume less water (A, A+, A++ energy label) saves water in the long term.
- For sinks and showers. Fitting a mixer tap, thermostatic mixer tap, aerator, economizer, mousseur or eco-showerhead can reduce the flow of water out of the faucet, saving up to 70% water each time you use it.
- For toilets. Fitting a dual-flush system, Eco-WC pads or Eco-WC bags can reduce the amount of water per flush, saving up to 50% water per use.

Envoyer

### S4.3 Survey

## Assessment of household water consumption

This questionnaire concludes the household consumption survey. You must complete it to the end in order to validate your participation and allow us to pay your compensation for this survey.

During the survey, you will have the opportunity to win an additional 5 euros for questions that are distinctly marked. Please answer all questions honestly.

![](_page_45_Picture_4.jpeg)

\*On this page, you will read about various decisions facing a person, "individual A".

After reading the description of the situation, you will be asked to evaluate the different choices available to individual A and to decide, for each of the possible actions, whether that action would be "socially appropriate" and "consistent with moral or proper social behavior" or "socially inappropriate" and "inconsistent with moral or proper social behavior". By "socially appropriate", we mean an action that most people would consider "correct" or "ethical". Another way of understanding what we mean is that if individual A were to make a socially inappropriate choice, someone else might be angry with individual A for doing so.

In each of your responses, we would like you to answer as truthfully as possible, based on your opinions of what constitutes socially appropriate or socially inappropriate behavior.

If this page is selected in the random draw, we will also randomly select one of the possible choices that individual A might make. For the selected choice, we will determine which answer was chosen by the greatest number of people among the participants in this study. If you give the same answer as the one chosen most often by other people, you'll receive an extra  $\in$ 5.

Let's assume that Individual A is a well-off person living in an apartment in the Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes region.

The table below lists the possible choices available to Individual A. For each choice, please indicate whether you think this option is very socially inappropriate, somewhat socially inappropriate, somewhat socially appropriate or very socially appropriate. To indicate your answer, select the corresponding box. Don't forget that you'll earn money ( $\in$ 5) if your answer to a randomly chosen question is the same as the most common answer given by participants in this study.

	Very socially inappropriate	Somewhat socially inappro- priate	Somewhat socially appropriate	Very socially appropriate
Turn off faucet while brushing teeth or soa- ping face and hands				
Hand-wash several kit- chen utensils at the same time and use the rinse water from one group of utensils as wash water for the next group.				
Rinse all your dishes in the same water				
Turn off tap immedia- tely after use				
Take showers lasting less than 5 minutes				

Avoid letting the water run in the shower while he shampoos his hair and soaps his bo- dy.		
Avoid launching under- filled laundry machines		
Avoid launching under- filled dishwashers		
Use "eco" modes and short cycles		
Use energy-saving ap- pliances for laundry and dishes		
Use energy-saving ap- pliances for sinks and showers		
Use energy-saving toi- let fixtures		

#### Suivant

### Bonus Questions 2/2

This page is one of two that will allow you to win an extra 5€.

If this page is selected in the random draw, one of the questions below will be randomly selected as the one to win the extra  $5 \in$ .

To win the extra 5€, you must find the answer most frequently given by participants in this survey.

\*On this page, you will read about various decisions facing a person, "individual A".

After reading the description of the situation, you will be asked to evaluate the different choices available to individual A and to decide, for each of the possible actions, whether that action would be "socially appropriate" and "consistent with moral or proper social behavior" or "socially inappropriate" and "inconsistent with moral or proper social behavior". By "socially appropriate", we mean an action that most people would consider "correct" or "ethical". Another way of understanding what we mean is that if individual A were to make a socially inappropriate choice, someone else might be angry with individual A for doing so.

In each of your responses, we would like you to answer as truthfully as possible, based on your opinions of what constitutes socially appropriate or socially inappropriate behavior.

If this page is selected in the random draw, we will also randomly select one of the possible choices that individual A might make. For the selected choice, we will determine which answer was chosen by the greatest number of people among the participants in this study. If you give the same answer as the one chosen most often by other people, you'll receive an extra  $\in$ 5. Let's assume that Individual A is a well-off person living in an apartment in the Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes region.

The table below lists the possible choices available to Individual A. For each choice, please indicate whether you think this option is very socially inappropriate, somewhat socially inappropriate or very socially appropriate. To indicate your answer, select the corresponding box. Don't forget that you'll earn money ( $\in$ 5) if your answer to a randomly chosen question is the same as the most common answer given by participants in this study.

	Very socially inappropriate	Somewhat socially inappro- priate	Somewhat socially appropriate	Very socially appropriate
Do not turn off the tap while brushing teeth or soaping face and hands				
Do not hand-wash se- veral kitchen utensils at the same time and use the rinse water from one group of utensils as wash water for the next group.				
Do not rinse all your dishes in the same wa- ter				
Do not close the tap immediately after use				
Do not take showers lasting less than 5 mi- nutes				
Let the water run in the shower while he shampoos his hair and soaps his body.				
Launching underfilled laundry machines				
Launching shallow dis- hwashers				
Do not use "eco" or short-cycle modes				
Do not use energy- saving appliances for laundry and dishes				
Do not use energy- saving appliances for sinks and showers				
Do not use energy- saving toilets				

# Visual of the third week of study

![](_page_48_Figure_1.jpeg)

Which of the following statements best describes your experience?Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous

- 🔘 I remember this visual
- 🔿 I do not remember this visual

🔘 I am sure I have not seen this visual

#### \*How did you feel about the visual above?

#### Use the following scale to answer:

• Strongly disagree • Somewhat disagree • Undecided • Somewhat agree • Strongly agree

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Interested					
Jittery					
Excited					
Distressed					
Strong					
Ashamed					
Scared					
Hostile					
Enthusiastic					
Proud					
Upset					
Alert					
Guilty					
Inspired					

Nervous			
Determined			
Attentive			
Irritable			
Active			
Afraid			

Suivant

## Visual of the fifth week of study

![](_page_49_Figure_3.jpeg)

\*Which of the following sentences best describes your experience?Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous

- 🔘 I remember this visual
- 🔘 I do not remember this visual
- 🔘 I am sure I have not seen this visual

#### \*How did you feel about the visual above?

#### Use the following scale to answer:

#### • Strongly disagree • Somewhat disagree • Undecided • Somewhat agree • Strongly agree

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Interested					
Jittery					
Excited					
Distressed					
Strong					
Ashamed					
Scared					
Hostile					
Enthusiastic					
Proud					
Upset					
Alert					
Guilty					
Inspired					
Nervous					
Determined					
Attentive					
Irritable					
Active					
Afraid					

# What do you think of water conservation practices?

er conservation practio	ces is :			
le réponse ci-dessous				
<ul> <li>Somewhat not possible for me</li> </ul>	O Undecided	Somewhat pos- sible for me	O Possible for me	
er conservation praction e réponse ci-dessous	es is :			
Somewhat not easy for me	O Undecided	Somewhat easy for me	O Easy for me	
er conservation practic ne réponse ci-dessous	es is :			
<ul> <li>Somewhat not under my control</li> </ul>	Undecided	<ul> <li>Somewhat un- der my control</li> </ul>	O Under my control	
ter conservation practi ne réponse ci-dessous	ces is :			
<ul> <li>Somewhat does not depend on me</li> </ul>	O Undecided	Somewhat de- pend on me	O Depends on me	
ter conservation praction praction praction praction praction praction praction practication pra	ces is :			
Somewhat not	O Undecided	Somewhat prac-	O Practical for me	
	er conservation practic er conservation practic er conservation practic er conservation practic essy for me er conservation practic easy for me er conservation practic somewhat not under my control ter conservation practic ne réponse ci-dessous Somewhat does not depend on me ter conservation practic ne réponse ci-dessous Somewhat does not depend on me	er conservation practices is : er conservation practices is : ne réponse ci-dessous Somewhat does not depend on me ter conservation practices is : ne réponse ci-dessous Somewhat not undecided undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided Undecided	er conservation practices is : er conservation practices is : ne réponse ci-dessous Somewhat not undecided Somewhat de- pend on me ter conservation practices is : ne réponse ci-dessous Somewhat does not depend on me Somewhat not Somewhat not Undecided Somewhat de- pend on me ter conservation practices is : ne réponse ci-dessous Somewhat not Somewhat not Som	er réponse ci-dessous   Somewhat not possible for me sible for me er conservation practices is : nu der my control Undecided Somewhat under my control ter conservation practices is : nu der my control ter conservation practices is : nu depend on me me pend on me pend on me pend on me reforme ci-dessous Somewhat does nu depend on me reforme ci-dessous Somewhat does nu depend on me reforme ci-dessous Somewhat does nu depend on me reforme ci-dessous Somewhat does nu dudecided Somewhat grac. Practical for me

# What do you think of water conservation practices?

*Water conservati • Veuillez sélectionner	on practices won't chan une réponse ci-dessous	ge my daily life:			
Strongly disa- gree	Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	
*Water conservati • Veuillez sélectionner	on practices do not requ une réponse ci-dessous	uire extra time or phy	sical effort:		

What do	What do you think of the environment?							
*The natural envir • Veuillez sélectionner	ronment is very importai une réponse ci-dessous	nt and fragile:						
Strongly disa- gree	Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree				
*In recent years, r • Veuillez sélectionner	natural disasters have be une réponse ci-dessous	come more frequent	t and more severe:					
Strongly disa- gree	Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree				
*Human beings h	ave the right to modify r	ature to meet their o	daily needs:					
Veuillez sélectionner	une réponse ci-dessous							
Strongly disa- gree	Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree				

*Water is a very ir • Veuillez sélectionner	nportant natural resourd une réponse ci-dessous	ce:			
Strongly disa- gree	Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	
*Reducing water of • Veuillez sélectionner	consumption is a way of une réponse ci-dessous	protecting the enviro	onment:		
Strongly disa- gree	O Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	

Suivant

# Water-saving behaviors and devices

	Comportements antérieurs à l'étude		Comportements durant l'étude	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
I cook with as little water as possible				
I used to soak pots and pans instead of etting the water run when I washed the dishes.				
When I hand-washed several kitchen utensils at the same time, I used the rinse water from one group of utensils as wash water for the next.				
I turned off the tap while brushing my teeth or soaping my face and hands.				
I avoided letting the water run in the shower while I shampooed my hair and soaped my body.				
I filled my washing machine as much as possible				
I filled my dishwasher as much as pos- sible				
I was thinking of "eco" modes and short cycles				
I took showers lasting less than 5 mi- nutes				

	Appareils antérieurs à l'étude		Appareils achetés durant l'étude		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Water-saving washing machines					
Low-water consumption dishwasher					
Sink flow-reducing mixer valve					
Shower head to reduce shower flow					
Dual-flush system					
istallation to reduce the amount of wa-					

Water conservat	ion practices can solve w	ater scarcity problem	IS:		
Strongly disa- gree	Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	
Water conservat	i <b>on significantly reduces</b> r une réponse ci-dessous	water bills:			
Strongly disa- gree	Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	

# What is your position on water resources?

*I personally feel of • Veuillez sélectionner	I personally feel obliged to explore ways of reducing my impact on water resources: Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous				
Strongly disa- gree	Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	
*I personally feel ( • Veuillez sélectionner	obliged to minimize my	impact on local water	r resources:		
Strongly disa- gree	Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	
<ul> <li>It is important to</li> <li>Veuillez sélectionner</li> </ul>	use as little water as po une réponse ci-dessous	ssible:			
Strongly disa- gree	Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	
<ul> <li>It is important to</li> <li>Veuillez sélectionner</li> </ul>	encourage my friends a une réponse ci-dessous	and family to protect o	our water resources:		
Strongly disa- gree	Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	
*I should be respo • Veuillez sélectionner	onsible for doing everyth une réponse ci-dessous	ing in my power to p	rotect water resources:		
Strongly disa- gree	Somewhat disa- gree	O Undecided	Somewhat agree	<ul> <li>Strongly agree</li> </ul>	

Informatio	n about you a	and your hous	sehold	
<ul> <li>Please indicate th</li> <li>Veuillez sélectionner u</li> </ul>	e status that best corr ine réponse ci-dessous	esponds to you?		
Veuillez choisir	~			
<ul> <li>Please indicate yo</li> <li>Veuillez sélectionner u</li> </ul>	our highest diploma : ine réponse ci-dessous			
• Au besoin, veuillez pré	éciser le champ 'Autre :'.			
*Please indicate th • Veuillez sélectionner u	e field of study of your	r highest degree:		
Veuillez choisir	~			
<ul> <li>Please indicate yo</li> <li>Veuillez sélectionner u</li> </ul>	our approximate annua une réponse ci-dessous	al household income :		
Less than 30 000€	<ul> <li>Between 30</li> <li>000€ and 40</li> <li>000€</li> </ul>	O Between 40 000€ and 50 000€	<ul> <li>Between 50</li> <li>000€ and 60</li> <li>000€</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>More than 60 000€</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>How do you feel f</li> <li>Veuillez sélectionner u</li> </ul>	inancially : Ine réponse ci-dessous			
O Very limited	🔿 Limit	ted	Comfortable	O Very comfortable
*Do you own your • Veuillez sélectionner u	home? Ine réponse ci-dessous			
O Yes				

*On average over the entire study, how many days a week did	you stay at home most of the day?
Votre réponse doit être comprise entre 0 et 7     Goulum pambre entier pout être incerti dere et character	
e seu un nombre entier peut etre inscrit dans ce champ.	
lour(s)	
1	
*On average over the entire study, how many days a week were	e you completely absent from your home?
• Votre réponse doit être comprise entre 0 et 7	
Seul un nombre entier peut être inscrit dans ce champ.	
lour(s)	
*Please indicate the living area of your home (in square meters	)?
Seul un nombre entier peut être inscrit dans ce champ.	
m²	
*Please enter your postal code :	
9 Seul un nombre entier peut être inscrit dans ce champ.	
*Please indicate the type of your accommodation :	
<ul> <li>Please indicate the type of your accommodation :</li> <li>Ovenillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous</li> </ul>	
Please indicate the type of your accommodation : Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous Apartment	
<ul> <li>Please indicate the type of your accommodation :</li> <li>Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous</li> <li>Apartment</li> <li>House</li> </ul>	
Please indicate the type of your accommodation : Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous Apartment House	
Please indicate the type of your accommodation : Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous Apartment House	
*Please indicate the type of your accommodation : • Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous • Apartment • House *Do you have a swimming pool or Jacuzzi? • Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-descour	
Please indicate the type of your accommodation : Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous Apartment House Do you have a swimming pool or Jacuzzi? Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous	
Please indicate the type of your accommodation : Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous Apartment House *Do you have a swimming pool or Jacuzzi? Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous Yes - I have a swimming pool and jacuzzi	
Please indicate the type of your accommodation : Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous Apartment House Do you have a swimming pool or Jacuzzi? Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous Yes - I have a swimming pool and jacuzzi Yes - I have a pool or jacuzzi	
<ul> <li>*Please indicate the type of your accommodation :</li> <li>*Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous</li> <li>Apartment</li> <li>House</li> <li>*Do you have a swimming pool or Jacuzzi?</li> <li>Yes - I have a swimming pool and jacuzzi</li> <li>Yes - I have a pool or jacuzzi</li> <li>No - I have neither</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>*Please indicate the type of your accommodation :</li> <li>• Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous <ul> <li>Apartment</li> <li>House</li> </ul> </li> <li>*Do you have a swimming pool or Jacuzzi?</li> <li>• Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous <ul> <li>Yes - I have a swimming pool and jacuzzi</li> <li>Yes - I have a pool or jacuzzi</li> <li>No - I have neither</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Please indicate the type of your accommodation :</li> <li>Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous</li> <li>Apartment</li> <li>House</li> <li>Do you have a swimming pool or Jacuzzi?</li> <li>Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous</li> <li>Yes - I have a swimming pool and jacuzzi</li> <li>Yes - I have a pool or jacuzzi</li> <li>No - I have neither</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Please indicate the type of your accommodation :</li> <li>Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous</li> <li>Apartment</li> <li>House</li> <li>Do you have a swimming pool or Jacuzzi?</li> <li>Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous</li> <li>Yes - I have a swimming pool and jacuzzi</li> <li>Yes - I have a pool or jacuzzi</li> <li>No - I have neither</li> <li>Do you have a washing machine?</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>*Please indicate the type of your accommodation :</li> <li>• Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous <ul> <li>Apartment</li> <li>House</li> </ul> </li> <li>*Do you have a swimming pool or Jacuzzi?</li> <li>• Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous <ul> <li>Yes - I have a swimming pool and jacuzzi</li> <li>Yes - I have a pool or jacuzzi</li> <li>No - I have neither</li> </ul> </li> <li>*Do you have a washing machine?</li> <li>• Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>*Please indicate the type of your accommodation :</li> <li>*Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous</li> <li>Apartment</li> <li>House</li> <li>*Do you have a swimming pool or Jacuzzi?</li> <li>Yes - I have a swimming pool and jacuzzi</li> <li>Yes - I have a pool or jacuzzi</li> <li>Yes - I have neither</li> <li>*Do you have a washing machine?</li> <li>Yeuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>*Please indicate the type of your accommodation :</li> <li>P Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous <ul> <li>Apartment</li> <li>House</li> </ul> </li> <li>*Do you have a swimming pool or Jacuzzi?</li> <li>P Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous <ul> <li>Yes - I have a swimming pool and jacuzzi</li> <li>Yes - I have a pool or jacuzzi</li> <li>No - I have neither</li> </ul> </li> <li>*Do you have a washing machine? <ul> <li>P Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Do you have a dishwasher?Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous

O Yes

O No

\*Has the number of people living in your household changed over the weeks? • Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-dessous

 $\bigcirc$  Yes - Some weeks, there were more or fewer residents in my home.

 $\bigcirc$  No - No one stayed at my house for more than 4 days a week during the 7-week study.

Composition of your household - including yourself		
<ul> <li>How many men over 13 are there in your household?</li> <li>Seul un nombre entier peut être inscrit dans ce champ.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>How many women over the age of 13 are there in your household?</li> <li>Seul un nombre entier peut être inscrit dans ce champ.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>How many males under 13 are there in your household?</li> <li>Seul un nombre entier peut être inscrit dans ce champ.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>*How many women under 13 are there in your household?</li> <li>Seul un nombre entier peut être inscrit dans ce champ.</li> </ul>		

Suivant

Change in household composition during	the first week (May 30 to June 6)
During the first week, did your h Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-des	nousehold count one or more people more or less than usual? (For at least 4 days of the week) sous
) No	
Yes - One or more additional persons	
) Yes - One or more less persons	
How many more or fewer peopl	e are affected by the previous question?
veuniez selectionner une reportse crues	SUUS
2 person v	
The first person concerned is :	
Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-des	sous
A man over 13 years old v	
The second person concerned is Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-des A woman under 13	5 : sous
	Suiva
Change in household composition during	second week (June 6 to June 13)
During the second week, did you Veuillez sélectionner une réponse ci-des:	ur household count one or more people more or less than usual? (For at least 4 days of the week)
No	
Yes - One or more additional persons	
Yes - One or more less persons	

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. You have completed the household water consumption survey. Your answers to the different phases of the study will soon be studied in order to proceed with your compensation.

Suivant

You will receive an e-mail and a text message within two weeks, allowing you to receive your compensation.

The Grenoble Applied Economics Laboratory thanks you for your participation.

## S4.4 Preregistration

![](_page_60_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Picture_1.jpeg)

### **CONFIDENTIAL - FOR PEER-REVIEW ONLY**

#### DynEau - Dynamic norms on the field of water consumption, Grenoble, June 2023 (#131119)

Created: 05/04/2023 10:07 AM (PT)

This is an anonymized copy (without author names) of the pre-registration. It was created by the author(s) to use during peer-review. A non-anonymized version (containing author names) should be made available by the authors when the work it supports is made public.

#### 1) Have any data been collected for this study already?

No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

#### 2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?

Dynamic information-based policies induce a greater reduction in water consumption than Statics information-based policies.

#### 3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.

Water consumption calculated from participants' water meters. Each participant will send a picture of their water meter on a weekly basis.

#### 4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?

On the second week, participants will be assigned to treatment and baseline group with stratified random sampling technique taking into account Household characteristics and weekly water consumption. On the fourth week, the treatment group will receive a dynamic information-based policy and baseline group will receive a static information-based policy.

#### 5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.

-Linear regression predicting the water consumption after the intervention with a dummy variable indicating whether the participant received a Dynamic information-based policy or not. We will also conduct the same regression controlling for individual household characteristics and water consumption categories.

-Difference-in-difference models predicting the water consumption after the intervention between treatment and baseline. We will also conduct the same models controlling for individual household characteristics and water consumption categories.

-Independent sample t-tests to test the equality of mean in weekly water consumption between treatment and baseline, as well as between water consumption categories.

-One-sample Wilcoxon rank sum test to test equality of distributions in weekly water consumption between treatment and baseline, as well as between water consumption categories.

#### 6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.

We will exclude participants who do not provide their individual water meter image each week as well as those who do not complete the final survey. Participants who fully comply with the procedures explained before will be considered regardless of their water consumption level.

# 7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.

Our goal is to recruit 300 to 400 participants for this experiment. This range is given due to the uncertainty of number of participating households with similar characteristic.

#### 8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)

We will include an emotional evaluation PANAS (Watson et al., 1988 ; French version by Caci & Baylé, 2007) on each information-based policy to measure the emotional response of participants.

We will include a normative evaluation of water conservation behavior (Krupka and Weber, 2013) to measure the impact of information-based policies on normative assessment of the norms.

Final survey contains several questions for exploratory purposes, assessing Perceived Behavioral control, Attitude toward conservation, Expected results, Past water conservation behavior, Actual water conservation behavior, Personal/Moral norms, Social-demographics information.

Common to two treatments, each participant will received a Statics information-based policy at the week two (built similarly to Bhanot, 2018) in order to induce the first behavioral change needed for the creation of the Dynamic information-based policy. Four Statics information-based policies will be implemented according to the relative position of the participant's consumption to the panel's average and efficient consumption. These four Statics information-based policies constitute the four water consumption categories.