

# The role of gender and self-efficacy in domestic energy saving behaviors: a case study in Lombardy, Italy.

Nicola Rainisio <sup>1\*</sup>, Marco Boffi <sup>1</sup>, Linda Pola <sup>1</sup>, Paolo Inghilleri <sup>1</sup>, Ilaria Sergi <sup>2</sup>, Maura Liberatori <sup>2</sup>

1: Social Psychology Research Group  
Department of Cultural Heritage and Environment  
Università degli Studi di Milano  
Via Festa del Perdono 7, Milano (Italy)  
e-mail: nicola.rainisio@unimi.it (corresponding author), web: unimi.it

2: Energy Efficiency Department  
Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development (ENEA)  
Lungotevere Thaon di Revel 76, Roma (Italy)  
e-mail: ilaria.sergi@enea.it web: enea.it

## Abstract

A deeper understanding of the domestic saving behaviors is crucial for improving Italian energy policies, as the country is still characterized by the dependence on foreign non-renewable sources and by an underestimation of psycho-social and behavioral factors. This research explores the relationship between gender, self-efficacy and energy saving behaviors at the household level in the Lombardy region, Italy. We investigated the characteristics of the well-documented gender gap in energy saving behaviors, to understand if virtuous habits by women are observed also in that context, how gender effects are related with different types of addressed behaviors and the role of self-efficacy in this process. Results suggest that gender effects are not uniformly spread across energy saving behaviors, but interrelated with the local and national culture, following specific patterns. Moreover, data show that domain-specific self-efficacy is gender-sensitive. The study indicates that promoting a gender perspective is a key factor when designing sustainability policies at individual, family, and community level. Moreover, it points to the need for specific strategies dedicated to the various domestic energy saving targets and behaviors, in general and in the Italian context.

## Keywords

Energy saving behaviors; Self-efficacy; Gender; Culture; Italian context.

## 1. Introduction

Although the use of renewable energies is steadily increasing, the Italian context is still largely marked by the use of fossil fuels and natural gas, which satisfy about 70% of the national primary demand (2019, Ministry of Economic Development). In addition, this demand is mainly covered by imports (75% in 2019, *ibidem*), resulting in a strong energy dependence on foreign countries.

1 Residential energy consumption covers a significant portion of this amount, accounting for 20% of  
2 national total energy use in Italy. After a constant growth in the 1990-2010 period, it experienced a  
3 slight decrease during the economic stagnation (2011-2017), returning to an upward trend in more  
4 recent years (ENEA, 2020). According to this scenario, domestic energy saving behaviors play a  
5 crucial role in the national strategies (Ministry of Economic Development, 2017) to promote the  
6 country's energy independence and to mitigate the energy poverty effects, which affects 8.8% of  
7 families (Faiella et al., 2020), but they have been poorly addressed so far.  
8  
9

10 Adopting a psychological perspective, a recent review (Inghilleri et al., 2020) suggested that the  
11 importance assigned to domestic energy saving behaviors and their relatively weak coverage  
12 compared to other technical issues in the Italian scientific panorama characterize the inconsistent  
13 national context. Such inconsistency is among the main barriers that limit Italian society in promoting  
14 a “cultural shift” on energy sustainability issues. The authors also argued that top-down approaches  
15 developed in engineering or economics fields have been historically privileged in Italy,  
16 underestimating the predictive value of studying the psychosocial determinants of citizens' energy  
17 behaviors. Many scholars stressed indeed the importance of investigating socio-cultural and  
18 psychological dimensions of domestic energy consumption and saving (Stern, 1992; Abrahamse and  
19 Steg, 2011), with the aim of better targeting public policies to promote a broader transition towards  
20 more advanced forms of sustainability. Addressing the main socio-demographic variables for this  
21 purpose, numerous national and comparative studies (*see* 2.1) found a gender gap, in favor of women,  
22 in the intensity of energy saving attitudes and the frequency of sustainable behaviors, calling into  
23 question the processes of socialization (*see* Clausen, 1968; Morawski and St. Martin, 2011 for critical  
24 reviews) and education. Self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977; Hanss and Bohm, 2010; *see* 2.1) has not been  
25 adequately included among the possible factors influencing this trend, although it has been related  
26 both to gender differences (Huang, 2012) and to the antecedents of virtuous pro-environmental  
27 behaviors (Thøgersen and Grønhøj, 2010).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 The present research focuses on the role of gender and self-efficacy in energy saving behaviors, with  
2 the aim of developing strategies and policies suitable for the Lombard and Italian cultural context.  
3  
4 The existence of a gender gap regarding energy saving behaviors is investigated, together with the  
5  
6 patterns of relationship between gender and the different types of addressed behaviors. More in  
7  
8 general, gender effects on domain-specific self-efficacy and on the relationship between self-efficacy  
9  
10 and energy saving behaviors is also investigated. The paper is organized as follows: in the next section  
11  
12 the literature on gender differences in sustainable and energy saving behaviors and on self-efficacy  
13  
14 as an antecedent of sustainable behaviors is presented. The Italian psycho-social context regarding  
15  
16 sustainability and energy saving is also briefly tackled. In the subsequent sections a study conducted  
17  
18 in Lombardy, the region with the highest energy demand in Italy, is presented, and its policy  
19  
20 implications are discussed in the final paragraph.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

## 33 **2. Literature Review**

### 34 **2.1 Gender, sustainable behaviors and culture**

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 Since the 1970s, sustainability has become a main topic in social sciences in general, and even more  
44  
45 important in environmental psychology. According to Pol (2007), this issue has impacted the  
46  
47 discipline to the extent that in this phase it can be defined as "environmental psychology for  
48  
49 sustainability". Moreover, it has increasingly been acknowledged that sustainability cannot be  
50  
51 separated from the study of individual and collective behaviors, as the joint research on these issues  
52  
53 can favor the promotion of ecological health and well-being (Winter and Koger, 2014; Rainisio et al.,  
54  
55 2015). In this scenario, the research on sustainable behaviors has been gradually connected to other  
56  
57 existing lines of research, in particular those that study gender and cross-cultural differences, giving  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 life to a fruitful field of studies addressing gender differences in sustainable behavior in different  
2 cultural contexts.

3  
4 The majority of studies focused on this topic converged on the existence of consistent cross-cultural  
5 gender differences in the adoption of sustainable behaviours, although there is no consensus, and the  
6 issue is still under discussion. The classic review by Zelezny et al. (2000), considering 13 behavioural  
7 studies from various countries published in the decade 1988-1998, concluded that in 9 of them women  
8 showed a greater tendency than men towards pro-environmental behaviours, against only one study  
9 with opposite results. In the same article an original study conducted on 14 European, South, and  
10 North American countries confirmed the gender difference. A more recent review (Gifford and  
11 Nilsson, 2014) stated that, compared with the previous results, this gender divide is emerging in a  
12 clearer way in the current literature. A research on 22 countries around the world (Hunter et al., 2004)  
13 found that this gender difference was confirmed in 14 countries (Asia, Europe, North America,  
14 Oceania) when environmentally oriented behaviours in the private sphere are addressed. In contrast,  
15 the number of countries where this gap is significant is reduced to 5 if the public sphere is taken into  
16 account. A similar pattern was highlighted in the Chinese context (Xiao and Hong, 2010), where  
17 women were found to be more active in domestic sustainability behaviors, whereas for public  
18 engagement on these issues (e.g., activism) no differences between men and women have been  
19 detected. Diverging results emerge from other studies, which found no significant differences based  
20 on gender (Scott and Willits, 1994; Eisler, Eisler and Yoshida, 2003). Among these, a study  
21 conducted on a sample of Spanish students (Vicente-Molina et al., 2018) argued that the gender gap  
22 is dependent on the type of addressed behavior and may not exist for specific environmental tasks  
23 and high-level educational targets. Furthermore, it showed that the antecedents of pro-environmental  
24 behavior vary between men and women, as attitudes are not significant for the latter.

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58 This gender difference was generally explained through two connected frameworks. On the one hand,  
59 more generally, it is hypothesized that socialization and educational processes push women to be  
60

1 more focused on the dimensions of care and cooperation in many cultures (Hofstede, 1980; Blocker  
2 and Eckberg, 1997; Eagly, 2009). On the other hand, that consequently they develop specific  
3 personality traits (McCrae and Costa, 1987; 1999) such as more agreeableness and conscientiousness  
4 (Luchs and Mooradian, 2012), less "masculinity" (Hofstede, 2001) and a general orientation to more  
5 ecocentric values (Schultz, 2001; 2002). This latter point has also been stressed by ecofeminism  
6 scholars, who postulated a natural tendency of women towards ecocentric values regardless of the  
7 socialization processes (Diamond and Orenstein, 1990).

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 The gender gap findings on sustainable behaviors are generally confirmed by the results of the fewer  
18 studies which specifically addressed the energy saving behaviors. According to the social-cognitive  
19 approach proposed by Thøgersen and Grønhøj (2010), women are more oriented towards domestic  
20 energy saving, but for men (and not for women) a significant motivational factor is the virtuous  
21 behavior of other household members. Du and Pan (2021) highlighted a difference in the  
22 psychological antecedents of saving behavior between men and women. Attitudes and personal moral  
23 norms have been found to be good predictors of the intentions to undertake sustainable behaviors in  
24 women, but not in men. Moreover, the relationship between intention and behavior was much stronger  
25 for males than females. Similarly, Lee, Park and Han (2013) found higher scores for women on  
26 subjective norms related to energy-efficient lighting and a broader tendency in females to be engaged  
27 in energy saving practices. The authors also stated that energy saving by females is more intense than  
28 for the males as far as household-oriented (private) behaviors are addressed, but this gap disappears  
29 with regard to community/society-oriented behaviors (i.e., purchase of energy efficient lighting,  
30 public policy support). These findings are consistent with the results of other previous studies (Hunter  
31 et al., 2004; Xiao and Hong, 2010) and with the gender socialization theory, as in many cultures the  
32 role of women is mainly confined to the private and domestic dimension. At this regard, Shrestha et  
33 al. (2020) pointed out that, especially in Asia, women provide for the daily management of electricity  
34 as they are much more involved in housekeeping. Although they are the main users, purchase  
35 decisions on electrical appliances are largely entrusted to men.

1  
2 Also, Yang et al. (2016) found a gender gap in favour of females on indirect energy curtailment  
3 behaviours (consumed goods and services) in Chinese urban residents, whereas the difference was  
4 absent on direct ones (household electricity management).  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 11 2.2 Self-Efficacy and sustainable behaviors 12 13 14 15 16 17

18 Perceived self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977), one of the most popular concepts in psychological science,  
19 was defined as individuals' "*beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of*  
20 *performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives*" (Bandura, 1994; p.71).  
21  
22

23 According to this, "*people with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as*  
24 *challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. Such an efficacious outlook fosters*  
25 *intrinsic interest and deep engrossment in activities. They set themselves challenging goals and*  
26 *maintain strong commitment to them*" (*ibidem*).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Therefore, a high level of perceived self-efficacy was found to be related with positive outcomes in  
37 numerous behavioural domains (*see* Bandura, 1997; Sadri and Robertson, 1993; Stajkovic and  
38 Luthans, 1998 for sectorial reviews). It was also integrated (Fishbein and Cappella, 2006) in the  
39 *theory of planned behavior* (TPB; Ajzen, 1991), one of the most influential frameworks to analyze  
40 the pro-environmental behavior antecedents. Accordingly, the role of perceived self-efficacy, and  
41 other similar concepts like *internal locus of control* (Rotter, 1966) and *perceived consumer*  
42 *effectiveness* (PCE) in triggering sustainable behaviors was deeply investigated. In their classic meta-  
43 analysis, Hines et al. (1987) pointed to the internal locus of control, namely the individual's tendency  
44 to attribute life outcomes to their own agency and abilities, as a key factor to promote pro-  
45 environmental behaviors. Lately, some scholars (Berger and Corbin, 1992; Nguyen et al., 2019)  
46 argued that PCE, namely the belief of being able to impact the environment through individual  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 consumption or purchase choices, has a moderating effect on the relationship between green  
2 intentions and sustainable actions. Hanss and Bohm (2010) proposed the *sustainable development*  
3 *self-efficacy* (SDSE) “to refer to people’s self-efficacy beliefs regarding sustainable development;  
4 that is, to the degree to which people believe that their individual behavior can contribute to  
5 sustainable development” (*ibidem*, p. 49). They discovered that this type of domain-specific self-  
6 efficacy is a significant predictor of sustainable consumption behavior, whereas general self-efficacy  
7 (GSE) is not. Moreover, the authors highlighted that self-efficacy concerning encouraging others (i.e.,  
8 “my actions to contribute to the preservation of natural resources will encourage others to do the  
9 same”) was found to be the stronger behavioral predictor. Addressing energy saving behaviours,  
10 Thøgersen and Grønhøj (2010) argued that self-efficacy factors influence significantly consumers’  
11 saving efforts. A qualitative study on office buildings (Lo et al., 2012) stated that, comparing different  
12 companies, self-efficacy is considered by management and employees as the main determinant of  
13 office energy-saving behavior in all of them. The importance of self-efficacy in promoting electricity  
14 saving and wider pro-environmental behaviors was also found in a study on the spillover effects of  
15 different communication frames (Steinhorst et al., 2015). Coherently, Yang et al. (2020) found that  
16 self-efficacy acts as a mediator between information intervention factors and energy-saving behavior  
17 intention, together with perceptual control.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 To our best knowledge, the relationship between gender, self-efficacy and sustainable/energy saving  
43 behaviors have been inadequately investigated so far. The present article, focusing on this issue in  
44 the Lombard and Italian context, is aimed at providing an explorative contribution to fill this gap.  
45 Considering the literature in general, perceived self-efficacy has been criticized as a typical Western  
46 construct (Klassen, 2004), but also recognized to vary in accord with the Hofstede’s (1980) cultural  
47 dimensions (Oettingen, 1995). Significant differences were found comparing individualistic and  
48 collectivistic cultures (Yan and Gaier, 1994; Eaton and Dembo, 1997; Klassen, 2004) and wide  
49 variations in scores between countries emerged (Scholtz et al., 2002). These latter authors also pointed  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

out a gender difference for higher degrees of self-efficacy in favour of men, with a national unsystematic effect. A more recent meta-analysis (Huang, 2012) highlighted again a small difference in favour of men in general academic self-efficacy, but also that the gender gap is mainly domain specific (i.e., females showed a higher language and arts self-efficacy than males). As in the case of the relationship between gender and sustainability (*see* previous paragraph), it could be assumed that the socialization and educational processes play a significant role.

### 2.3 Sustainable and energy saving behaviours in the Italian context.

According to recent reviews (Sarrica et al., 2018; ENEA, 2020), the Italian context is represented by an apparently contradictory picture. Indeed, Italian citizens show a high awareness on sustainability and energy issues, along with a weak tendency to change their related everyday behaviour (Inghilleri et al., 2020). Coherently, a European extensive survey on sustainable attitudes and behaviors (Poortinga et al., 2018) stated that Italian citizens, compared with other Europeans, show lower values on perceived individual responsibility, and moderate values on self-efficacy and proactivity. A similar outcome was found by Kühtz (2007) addressing the cynicism and resignation of Italians towards the practical application of the main concepts related to sustainable development. Moreover, the spread of sustainable behaviours in Italy, including some energy saving actions (usage patterns of electrical appliances and lighting), resulted to be lower than the EU average (European Commission, 2017). Accordingly, Thøgersen (2018) found that attitude towards energy saving was positively and significantly related to some energy-saving behaviour (light switching, washing machine use, heating/cooling habits, sustainable appliances purchasing) in 8 other European countries, but not in Italy. Referring to a culture-oriented approach, Inghilleri et al. (2020) argued that Italians tend to have a predominantly external *locus of control* (i.e., rejection of individual disincentive policies) and to be



1 aligned with cultural dimensions (individualism, masculinity) associated with a low intensity of pro-  
2 environmental behaviors (Husted, 2005). At the same time, some propaedeutic values for pro-  
3 environmental actions are also widespread in the population (long-term orientation, trust in collective  
4 action). The same authors highlighted the need to further investigate the different energy subcultures  
5 within the country, due to its internal socio-economic, geographical, and climatic heterogeneity.  
6

7  
8  
9  
10  
11 At present, no specific studies dedicated to gender differences and energy saving behaviors in the  
12 Italian context are available. This deficiency is also due to the fact that top-down approaches  
13 developed in engineering or economics fields have been privileged so far, taking into little  
14 consideration the psycho-social dimensions.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Addressing this topic, our research is articulated around the following research questions.

25  
26 Firstly, we aim to explore if in the Northern Italian region of Lombardy, in line with the cross-cultural  
27 findings addressed in the literature review (*see* 2.1), a significant gender gap in energy saving  
28 behaviors in favor of women is also present. Also, the research deepens the different types of energy  
29 saving behaviors in this context in relation to gender.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Secondly, gender differences in domain-specific (sustainability) self-efficacy are investigated, also  
37 addressing the relationship between self-efficacy and energy saving behaviors in the Lombardy  
38 scenario. Both are aimed to produce context-sensitive policy suggestions.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

### 48 **3. Methodology**

#### 49 **3.1 Case study**

50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58 The Lombardy region has a crucial socio-economic role in the Italian scenario, as it has about 17%  
59 of the country's inhabitants (over 10 million), it produces 22% of the Italian GDP and consumes 21,5  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 % of the national energy (SRM, 2019). It is the industrial and tertiary core of a homogeneous area  
2 (Northern Italy) with about 30 million inhabitants. It is densely populated (420 residents per km<sup>2</sup>;  
3 ISTAT, 2021), significantly polluted (see below) and was frequently described as a *megalopolis*  
4 (Turri, 2000; Bonomi and Abruzzese, 2004), being part of the so-called *blue banana*, the main  
5 development backbone of Western Europe. In line with the national trends described in paragraph  
6 2.3, it is characterized by a marked contradiction with regard to environmental sustainability. On one  
7 hand, it was recently stated that Lombardy is a leader in Italy in the number of companies that invest  
8 in green technologies and in economic investment towards environmental sustainability, as well as in  
9 the virtuous collection of domestic waste (Fondazione Symbola, 2020). On the other hand, the  
10 Lombard cities are among the most polluted in Europe (European Environment Agency, 2020) and  
11 the use of renewable energy sources is lower than the Italian average, while the production of CO<sub>2</sub> is  
12 higher, as is soil and waters contamination (Regione Lombardia, 2020). According to this alarming  
13 scenario, the Regional Strategy for Sustainable Development set as one of its main objectives for  
14 2030 “*a significant and rapid reduction of energy consumption from fossil sources in the residential*  
15 *and tertiary sector, in synergy with air quality policies and towards the transition to more sustainable*  
16 *cities*” (Regione Lombardia, 2020, p. 68). As for Italy as a whole, also Lombardy has a great  
17 unexplored potential in deepening residential energy saving behaviors, as domestic consumption  
18 constitutes the 18% of total regional consumption and is more subject to forms of individual and  
19 collective persuasion. In light of the above, Lombardy can be considered a promising case study for  
20 identifying and experimenting innovative policies at a local and national level.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 3.2 Participants

54  
55  
56  
57  
58 The sample consists of 155 participants, residing in Lombardy, northern Italy. They are almost  
59 equally divided by gender (men 48.4%, women 51.6%) and age (35.5% age group 18-37, 36.1% 38-  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

57, 28.4% over 58, 7,8 % over 78). 66.1% of them live in an apartment, while 32.2% in an independent dwelling. Subjects were recruited applying a snowball sampling technique, starting from the voluntary participation of 27 university students (Università degli Studi di Milano). The first participants, residing in all the Lombard provinces, were trained to disseminate the questionnaire to 3 families each. At the end of the research process, 59 families were involved in total. Consistent with this procedure, the sample shows a higher presence of young students (21,2%) and High school graduates (or higher degree, 75%) than the national and regional average. Conversely, the sample is in line with the regional average in terms of gender (51% of Lombards are women) and older ages (28.7% of Lombard citizens are over 60, 7% over 80).

### 3.3 Measures and procedure

A paper questionnaire was administered (winter 2019-2020) to answer the aforementioned research questions, investigating energy saving behaviours in the Italian context in relation to gender and perceived self-efficacy. Other attitude and household measures were also included in the survey but are not included in the analysis of the current paper.

Domestic energy saving behaviours were measured by a 7-item frequency scale (“*How often do you happen to...*”) and rated by the participants on a 7-points Likert Scale (*never-always*) (adapted from Michalos et al., 2009). Addressed behaviours are among those most commonly associated with domestic energy consumption and waste (i.e., “*To reduce\turn off the heating system on less cold winter days*”; see table 1). More in detail, they encompass three macro-areas: heating/cooling systems and thermal comfort (3 items), lighting and electrical devices (2 items), main domestic cleaning appliances (1 item, comprehending washing machine and dishwasher) Furthermore, an item on the use of stairs instead of the lift has been added, as this type of behavior has both collective (savings for the condominium) and health impact. Domain-specific self-efficacy was assessed via a three items scale (see Table 2) inspired by the *Sustainable Development Self-Efficacy Questionnaire* (SDSE;

1 Hanss and Bohm, 2010) and rated by the participants on a 7-points Likert Scale (*strongly disagree-*  
2 *strongly agree*). The scale showed a monofactorial structure, thus proving its saturation on the  
3  
4 predicted single factor, and a moderate reliability (Cronbach's Alpha= 0.729; Ponterotto and  
5  
6 Ruckdeschel, 2007). Data on socio-demographic variables and on the importance attributed to energy  
7  
8 saving were also collected. This latter was addressed using a single item ("*How important is energy*  
9 *saving is to you?*") and rated on a 7-points Likert Scale (*not at all-very much*). Data was processed  
10  
11 through the statistical software IBM SPSS Statistics (version 25).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

#### 19 **4. Results**

20  
21  
22  
23 To explore if a significant gender gap in energy saving behaviors in favor of women is present in our  
24  
25 case study (first research question), in line with the discussed international literature, an Analysis of  
26  
27 Variance (ANOVA; Fisher, 1925) on the self-reported frequency of the assessed domestic energy  
28  
29 saving behaviors between genders was performed. The ANOVA test is widely used in social research  
30  
31 to determine whether the differences in score between two groups are random (not statistically  
32  
33 significant) or due to the independent variable being addressed, in our case the gender difference.  
34  
35  
36

37 Results show (Table 3) that a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) emerges in favor of women on two  
38  
39 behaviors ("*Wear a t-shirt indoors during winter*" and "*Fully load washing machine/dishwasher*  
40 *before starting it*"). No significant differences emerge in favor of men. More in general, even if  
41  
42 statistical significance is not reached on five behaviors, it could be noticed that women score higher  
43  
44 (or lower, in case of reverse items) than men on sustainable behaviors concerning lighting and  
45  
46 electricity ("*Fully loading machines/dishwashers...*", "*Turn off the house lights when not strictly*  
47 *necessary*", "*Turn off electronic devices completely (instead of leaving them on stand-by)*"). The  
48  
49 opposite effect is observed with regard to domestic habits concerning heating and cooling systems,  
50  
51 as men show more sustainability-oriented behaviors.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 To answer the second research question, focused on investigating the role of perceived self-efficacy  
2 in gender differences regarding energy saving, the relationship between gender, perceived self-  
3 efficacy and domestic energy saving behaviors was deepened as follows.  
4

5  
6  
7 Firstly, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on importance attributed to energy saving and on domain-  
8 specific self-efficacy between genders was conducted to test whether there is a significant relationship  
9 between gender differences and these two variables.  
10  
11

12  
13  
14 Results show the absence of a significant difference between the two genders concerning the  
15 importance attributed to energy saving. On the contrary, this difference is significant ( $p < .05$ ) with  
16 regard to the general scores on the domain-specific self-efficacy scale, in favour of women ( $m. 5.57$   
17 vs. 5.16). Moreover, average scores on single items show that the widest gap between men and women  
18 lies in the different belief that they can represent a model and an example for the others' behavior  
19 (“*My actions to preserve sustainability will encourage others to do the same*”, Table 4). A correlation  
20 matrix (Table 5) was also calculated to further address how self-efficacy could influence energy  
21 saving behaviors within the genders. The correlation matrix allows the calculation of the statistical  
22 significance and the strength of the relationship between the addressed variables. Different patterns  
23 were highlighted, since in men's self-efficacy is found to be significantly and positively correlated  
24 ( $p < .01$ ) only with turning off lights when not necessary ( $r. 0.30$ ), whereas in women it is related to  
25 three behavioral dimensions (voluntary use of stairs,  $r. 0.39$ ; washing/dishwashing with full load,  $r.$   
26 0.30; turning off electrical appliances instead of leaving them in stand-by,  $r. 0.50$ ).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

## 49 **5. Discussion**

50  
51  
52  
53 Our case study analysis partially disconfirmed what was highlighted by other studies regarding the  
54 cross-culturality of gender effects on energy saving behaviors (*see 2.1*). Data showed that only a few  
55 of the addressed behaviors are significantly more widespread among women. On the other hand, even  
56 in the case of Lombardy, energy saving behaviors with a higher frequency among men have not been  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 detected, in line with the results from previous research (Zelezny et al., 2000). These results can be  
2 better interpreted referring to the specific energy saving behaviors considered. If previous research  
3 highlighted significant differences between domestic and public behavior on sustainability issues  
4 (Hunter et al., 2004), in our analysis the gender differences mainly emerged based on the type of  
5 addressed behaviors. It could be argued that, at least in the addressed (Italian) culture, the gender gap  
6 is present (and in some cases significant) only for some types of behavior, especially those concerning  
7 the individual habits in using heating/cooling systems and electrical appliances. These findings are  
8 consistent with what other authors found about greater indoor thermal discomfort in women,  
9 especially with respect to cooling (Karjalainen, 2012). This higher discomfort could lead women to  
10 adopt less frequently a poorly sustainable habit like wearing a t-shirt at home in winter, but also could  
11 potentially explain the men's greater attention in controlling the home temperature, although this  
12 latter data was not found to be statistically significant. Women's greater attention to the consumption  
13 of electrical appliances may instead be referred, in line with Shrestha et al. (2020), to their more  
14 intense involvement in routine household management activities (i.e., cooking, washing), and more  
15 generally to a greater amount of time spent on domestic premises compared to men in the Italian and  
16 Lombard context. In this regard, the most recent review on the subject (Gimenez-Nadal and Molina,  
17 2020) found that the Italian situation is still characterized by a strong gender gap to the detriment of  
18 women as regards the daily hours of paid and unpaid (domestic) work (the highest in Europe behind  
19 Turkey). Addressing attitudes, results showed a significant gender gap in favor of women on domain-  
20 specific self-efficacy, despite the lack of difference with men with regards to the importance attributed  
21 to energy saving. Women showed significantly higher scores on the perceived possibility of  
22 representing a model for others and encouraging them in energy saving behaviors. Furthermore, their  
23 behavioral patterns are more strongly associated with perceived self-efficacy, particularly regarding  
24 electricity consumption, than men. Those findings are consistent with previous studies (*see* 2.1) which  
25 found a greater tendency in women towards sustainable attitudes, mainly due to gender-biased  
26 socialization processes promoting a greater orientation towards altruism, care and ecocentrism in

1 females. Moreover, it can be hypothesized that, given the greater amount of daily time devoted to  
2 domestic unpaid work compared to men, women are (at least in the Italian scenario) the main  
3 reference in the family context as regards the dimension of sustainability applied to the home (Waitt  
4 et al., 2012) and for this reason they are invested with the role of model and example for other family  
5 members on these issues. The relationship between domain-specific self-efficacy and the social roles  
6 of the family members should be further explored in future research.  
7

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14 Our results have some limitations that are worth mentioning when reasoning on policies  
15 implementation. The limitation constituted by the sample size and its geographical distribution should  
16 be overcome, enlarging the sample in order to provide sounder conclusions that can be extended to  
17 the entire national territory and allow us to make comparisons between different Italian areas.  
18  
19 Moreover, our results should be tested via non-self-reported behavioral measures, i.e. through direct  
20 behavioral observations or monitoring energy consumptions, to avoid the unverifiable effects of self-  
21 representation biases. Also, future research may expand the repertoire of domestic energy saving  
22 behaviors considered, in order to detail, with increasing precision, the emergent gender gap in  
23 sustainable behaviors.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

## 39 **6. Conclusions and Policy implications**

40  
41  
42 Our analysis, focused on the Lombardy Region case study, in Italy, confirmed a crucial role for gender  
43 and self-efficacy in energy saving behaviors, also highlighting the need for a culture-sensitive  
44 perspective. As far as gender is concerned, the results of the Lombard sample are only partially in  
45 agreement with the existing literature that shows higher sustainable attitudes and more frequent  
46 sustainable behaviors in the female population. More specifically, they show that the gender effect is  
47 not uniformly distributed but affected by the type of addressed energy saving behaviors, according to  
48 the local culture. Moreover, the research shows that gender differences in attitudes are not due to a  
49 higher female sensitivity to sustainability in general, but to a higher individual agency which most  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 strongly affects daily practices. A significant discriminating element between the two groups is  
2 indeed the higher domain-specific self-efficacy of women. Men are equally convinced of the  
3 importance of sustainability issues, whereas they are more skeptical about the actual impact that  
4 individual behaviors can exert on the society at large.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 The relevance of gender and efficacy in promoting sustainable attitudes and behaviors is a valid  
11 source of information for defining policy guidelines and intervention strategies. Yet, such knowledge  
12 is not to be interpreted as a prediction of an intrinsic and permanent ability of women to be more  
13 prone to sustainability. It is instead a tool to leverage our understanding of the precursors of  
14 sustainable behaviors to favor their spread in various contexts. In most cases initiatives for  
15 sustainability are conceived as though the general population were composed of homogenous average  
16 individuals, paying little attention to differentiated strategies aimed at specific targets with certain  
17 characteristics, and gender is no different in this respect (Meinzen-Dick et al., 2014). We suggest that  
18 gender is a relevant variable to be considered, among those neglected in defining such targets. For  
19 example, Cheng et al. (2011) summarize some factors that can be considered when using framing and  
20 threat in defining the communication strategy, highlighting that social loss framing tends to be more  
21 effective on female populations. In a similar fashion, women appear to be more sensitive to guilt  
22 effects in advertising that motivates shoppers to bring their own grocery bags (Muralidharan and  
23 Sheehan, 2018). Moreover, according to Arachchi and Managi (2021), to favor sustainable decision-  
24 making concerning energy consumption it is important to promote the integration of two styles of  
25 thought, one more focused on the cause-effect logic and the other on a holistic approach. As men tend  
26 to rely more on the former and women on the latter (*ibidem*), designing of persuasive messages should  
27 be adapted accordingly; in addition, this emphasizes the importance of encouraging shared decisions  
28 among family and community members, facilitating the exchange of perspectives. Promoting a  
29 gender perspective is a key factor when designing sustainability policies, however it cannot be  
30 satisfactorily fostered by the mere active engagement of women. On the contrary, it implies  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 considering gender roles at different levels, to ensure that such engagement is impactful and not  
2 simply a formal act. In this perspective, we must take into account women's and men's motivations,  
3  
4 but also their material conditions and the daily routines where their energy decisions are made. At the  
5  
6 individual level this can be done considering the necessity of reinforcing not awareness and  
7  
8 commitment per se, but other factors that might trigger the already existing environmental  
9  
10 consciousness. Regarding the reduction of domestic energy consumption for example, men might be  
11  
12 facilitated through a more concrete explanation, by other members of the family, of the sustainable  
13  
14 behaviors they perform (Thøgersen and Grønhøj, 2010). Women might be supported in building more  
15  
16 competences about devices to increase the positive impact of their sustainable attitudes and behaviors  
17  
18 (Salvia et al., 2020; Sunikka-Blank et al., 2018; Tjørring, and Gausset, 2019). At the family level it  
19  
20 is important to consider the social roles and the specific activities connected with them as cultural  
21  
22 outcomes. Indeed, a key challenge is to improve the compliance rate of families, and not only  
23  
24 individuals, in sustainable choices, also considering the cultural origins of the gender gap and the  
25  
26 prospect of reducing it. According to our research, it might also be useful to design differentiated  
27  
28 policies or interventions for various issues (e.g., electrical appliances, heating system, thermal  
29  
30 insulation), keeping into consideration alternative proposals depending on the gender of the persons  
31  
32 mainly responsible for them. More gender-oriented intervention strategies would allow to tackle  
33  
34 different practical situations, avoiding or minimizing the effect of potentially conflicting elements.  
35  
36 The community level is key in promoting grassroots innovations in the transition toward more  
37  
38 sustainable energy consumption (Van Der Schoor et al., 2016), and at this level gender perspective  
39  
40 brings a new set of challenges. The accessibility of groups, the possibility to gain decision-making  
41  
42 power, the material conditions for maintaining active membership over time (e.g., being in charge of  
43  
44 the domestic duties, being able to travel to meet other members, having sufficient financial resources)  
45  
46 are some of the gender-sensitive aspects we must consider. For example, opportunities to participate  
47  
48 in citizens power plant initiatives are not equal, as men are over-represented: participants themselves  
49  
50 attribute this to larger economic availability and higher interest in technology (Schreuer, 2016). Also  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 the “do-it-yourself” (DIY) groups dedicated to domestic thermal improvements tend to exclude  
2 women, hence overcoming the traditional masculine culture of these groups is a main challenge  
3  
4 (Sunikka-Blank et al., 2018). Paradoxically, community initiatives tend to exclude women despite  
5  
6 their higher efficacy in sustainability, which is a loss also for the community at large. All those  
7  
8 reflections on gender issues at individual, family and community level must be considered in light of  
9  
10 the broader culture, as those contexts where gender gap is more robust will call for stronger  
11  
12 interventions. In such perspective, all those initiatives reducing inequalities among women and men  
13  
14 can indirectly support sustainability. This calls for a more critical approach to energy saving  
15  
16 behaviors, whose promotion “should include consideration of the intersection of lifestyle practices  
17  
18 with gendered social identities and the importance of including marginalized voices in solutions  
19  
20 implemented to address unsustainable practices” (Bloodhart and Swim, 2020, p.110). An attempt in  
21  
22 this vein is addressed by the communication policies recently developed by the Energy Efficiency  
23  
24 Department of ENEA. In the framework of the national campaign “Italy in Class A” a specific  
25  
26 initiative called “Women in Class A” has been launched. It relies on female testimonials whose  
27  
28 virtuous successful experiences in the field of sustainability has become the symbolic reference for  
29  
30 illustrating the path toward sustainability. It represents female figures as leaders in the field of  
31  
32 sustainability, which is a first step to creating alternative models to the traditional masculine  
33  
34 association with leadership in business and science (Swim et al., 2018). A deeper analysis of the  
35  
36 impact of similar communication strategies in various cultural contexts is crucial to design more  
37  
38 effective initiatives in the future.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

## 52 **Aknowledgements**

53  
54  
55  
56

57 This work is part of a broader scientific and strategic partnership between Università degli Studi di  
58  
59 Milano and ENEA. It was funded by ENEA as part of the “Italy in Class A” campaign, promoted by  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 the Italian Ministry of Economic Development and carried out by ENEA according to the national  
2 transposition of the EED.  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

## 9 **References**

10  
11  
12 Abrahamse, W., and Steg, L. (2011). Factors related to household energy use and intention to reduce  
13 it: The role of psychological and socio-demographic variables. *Human Ecology Review*, 18(1), 30-  
14 40. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24707684>  
15

16  
17 Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision*  
18 *Processes*, 50, 179-211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)  
19

20  
21 Arachchi, J. I., and Managi, S. (2021). Preferences for energy sustainability: Different effects of  
22 gender on knowledge and importance. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 141, 110767.  
23

24  
25 Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological*  
26 *review*, 84(2), 191. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>  
27

28  
29 Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

30  
31 Berger, I. E., and Corbin, R. M. (1992). Perceived consumer effectiveness and faith in others as  
32 moderators of environmentally responsible behaviors. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 11(2),  
33 79-89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074391569201100208>  
34

35  
36 Blocker, T. J., and Eckberg, D. L. (1997). Gender and environmentalism: Results from the 1993  
37 general social survey. *Social Science Quarterly*, 78(4), 841-858.  
38

39  
40 Bloodhart, B., and Swim, J. K. (2020). Sustainability and consumption: What's gender got to do with  
41 it? *Journal of Social Issues*, 76(1), 101-113.  
42

43  
44 Bonomi, A., and Albruzzese, A. (Eds) (2004). *La Città Infinita*, Milan: Bruno Mondadori Editore.

45  
46 Cheng, T., Woon, D. K., and Lynes, J. K. (2011). The use of message framing in the promotion of  
47 environmentally sustainable behaviors. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, 17(2), 48-62.  
48

49  
50 Clausen J. A. (1968). A historical and comparative view of socialization theory and research. In: J.  
51 A. Clausen J. A. (Ed.), *Socialization and society* (pp. 18-72). Boston: Little, Brown & Company.  
52

53  
54 Diamond, I., and Orenstein, G. (1990). *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism*. San  
55 Francisco: Sierra Club.

56  
57 Du, J., and Pan, W. (2021). Examining energy saving behaviors in student dormitories using an  
58 expanded theory of planned behavior. *Habitat International*, 107, 102308.  
59 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2020.102308>  
60

61  
62 Eagly, A. H. (2009). The his and hers of prosocial behavior: an examination of the social psychology  
63  
64  
65

of gender. *American Psychologist*, 64(8), 644. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.64.8.644>

Eaton, M. J., and Dembo, M. H. (1997). Differences in the motivational beliefs of Asian American and non-Asian students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(3), 433.

Eisler, A. D., Eisler, H., and Yoshida, M. (2003). Perception of human Ecology: Cross-cultural and gender comparisons. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 23(1), 89-101. [http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/10.1016/S0272-4944\(02\)00083-X](http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/10.1016/S0272-4944(02)00083-X).

European Environment Agency (2020). *Air quality in Europe-2020 Report*. <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/air-quality-in-europe-2020-report>.

ENEA (2020). *Rapporto Annuale Efficienza Energetica* (Vol. 9). Rome: ENEA.

European Commission (2017). *Special Eurobarometer 468. Attitudes of European citizens toward the environment*. [https://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/S2156\\_88\\_1\\_468\\_ENG](https://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/S2156_88_1_468_ENG).

Faiella, I., Lavecchia, L., Miniaci, R., and Valbonesi, P. (2020). *La povertà energetica in Italia. Secondo Rapporto dell'Osservatorio Italiano sulla Povertà Energetica*. [http://oipeosservatorio.it/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/rapporto2020\\_v2.pdf](http://oipeosservatorio.it/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/rapporto2020_v2.pdf).

Fishbein, M., and Cappella, J. N. (2006). The role of theory in developing effective health communications. *Journal of Communication*, 56(suppl\_1), S1-S17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00280.x>

Fisher R. A. (1925). *Statistical methods for research workers*. Edinburgh/London: Oliver and Boyd.

Fondazione Symbola (2020). *GreenItaly 2020. Un'economia a misura d'uomo per affrontare il futuro*. <https://www.symbola.net/approfondimento/rapporto-greenitaly-2020/>

Gifford, R., and Nilsson, A. (2014). Personal and social factors that influence pro- environmental concern and behaviour: A review. *International Journal of Psychology*, 49(3), 141-157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12034>

Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., and Molina, J. A. (2020). The gender gap in time allocation in Europe. *IZA Discussion Papers*, 13461.

Hanss, D. and Böhm, G. (2010). Can I make a difference? The role of general and domain-specific self-efficacy in sustainable consumption decisions. *Umweltpsychologie*, 14, 46–74.

Hines, J. M., Hungerford, H. R., and Tomera, A. N. (1987). Analysis and synthesis of research on responsible environmental behavior: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 18(2), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.1987.9943482>

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2001) *Culture's Consequences* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Huang, C. (2012). Discriminant and incremental validity of self-concept and academic self-efficacy: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology*, 32(6), 777-805.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2012.732386>.

Hunter, L. M., Hatch, A., and Johnson, A. (2004). Cross-national gender variation in environmental behaviors. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(3), 677-694. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0038-4941.2004.00239.x>.

Husted, B. W. (2005). Culture and ecology: A cross-national study of the determinants of environmental sustainability. *MIR: Management International Review*, 349-371. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40836056>.

Inghilleri, P., Boffi, M., Pola, L., and Rainisio, N. (2020). *I comportamenti energetici in ambito domestico. Dimensioni culturali, sociali e individuali*. Rome: ENEA.

ISTAT (2018). *Censimento Popolazione Abitazioni*. <http://dati-censimentopopolazione.istat.it/Index>.

ISTAT (2021). *Rapporto annuale 2021. La situazione del paese*. [https://www.istat.it/storage/rapporto-annuale/2021/Rapporto\\_Annuale\\_2021.pdf](https://www.istat.it/storage/rapporto-annuale/2021/Rapporto_Annuale_2021.pdf)

Karjalainen, S. (2012). Thermal comfort and gender: a literature review. *Indoor Air*, 22(2), 96-109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0668.2011.00747.x>.

Klassen, R. M. (2004). Optimism and realism: A review of self-efficacy from a cross-cultural perspective. *International Journal of Psychology*, 39(3), 205-230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590344000330>.

Kühtz, S. (2007). Adoption of sustainable development schemes and behaviours in Italy: Barriers and solutions- what can educators do? *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 8(2), 155-169. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14676370710726625>.

Lee, E., Park, N. K., and Han, J. H. (2013). Gender difference in environmental attitude and behaviors in adoption of energy-efficient lighting at home. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 6(9), 36-50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v6n9p36>.

Lo, S. H., Peters, G. J. Y., and Kok, G. (2012). Energy-related behaviors in office buildings: a qualitative study on individual and organisational determinants. *Applied Psychology*, 61(2), 227-249. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00969.x>

Luchs, M. G., and Mooradian, T. A. (2012). Sex, personality, and sustainable consumer behaviour: Elucidating the gender effect. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 35(1), 127-144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-011-9179-0>

McCrae, R. R., and Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 52(1), 81. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81>

McCrae, R. R., and Costa, P. T. (1999). A five-factor theory of personality. In L. A. Pervin and O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed.; pp. 139–153). New York: Guilford.

Meinzen-Dick, R., Kovarik, C., and Quisumbing, A. R. (2014). Gender and sustainability. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 39, 29-55.

Michalos, A. C., Creech, H., McDonald, C., and Kahlke, P. M. H. (2009). *Measuring knowledge, attitudes and behaviors towards sustainable development: Two exploratory studies*. Winnipeg CA:

International Institute for Sustainable Development.

1  
2 Ministry of Economic Development (2017). Strategia energetica nazionale.  
3 <https://www.mise.gov.it/images/stories/documenti/Testo-integrale-SEN-2017.pdf>  
4

5 Ministry of Economic Development (2020). *La situazione energetica nazionale nel 2019*.  
6 [https://dgsaie.mise.gov.it/pub/sen/relazioni/relazione\\_annuale\\_situazione\\_energetica\\_nazionale\\_dat](https://dgsaie.mise.gov.it/pub/sen/relazioni/relazione_annuale_situazione_energetica_nazionale_dat)  
7 [i\\_2019.pdf](https://dgsaie.mise.gov.it/pub/sen/relazioni/relazione_annuale_situazione_energetica_nazionale_dat).  
8  
9

10 Morawski, J. G., and St. Martin, J. (2011). The evolving vocabulary of the social sciences: The case  
11 of “socialization”. *History of Psychology*, 14(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021984>.  
12

13 Muralidharan, S., and Sheehan, K. (2018). The role of guilt in influencing sustainable pro-  
14 environmental behaviors among shoppers: Differences in response by gender to messaging about  
15 England's plastic-bag levy. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 58(3), 349-362.  
16  
17

18 Nguyen, H. V., Nguyen, C. H., and Hoang, T. T. B. (2019). Green consumption: Closing the  
19 intention- behavior gap. *Sustainable Development*, 27(1), 118-129. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.1875>  
20  
21

22 Oettingen, G. (1995). Cross-cultural perspectives on self-efficacy. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy*  
23 *in changing societies*, 149-176. New York: Cambridge University Press.  
24

25 Pol, E. (2007). Blueprints for a History of Environmental Psychology (II): From Architectural  
26 Psychology to the challenge of sustainability. *Medio Ambiente y Comportamiento Humano*, 8(1), 1-  
27 28.  
28

29 Ponterotto, J. G., & Ruckdeschel, D. E. (2007). An overview of coefficient alpha and a reliability  
30 matrix for estimating adequacy of internal consistency coefficients with psychological research  
31 measures. *Perceptual and motor skills*, 105(3), 997-1014.  
32  
33

34 Poortinga, W., Fisher, S., Bohm, G., Steg, L., Whitmarsh, L., and Ogunbode, C. (2018). *European*  
35 *attitudes to climate change and energy*. Topline results from Round 8 of the European Social Survey.  
36

37 Rainisio, N., Boffi, M., and Riva, E. (2015). Positive change in environment: Aesthetics,  
38 environmental flowability and well-being. In: P. Inghilleri, G. Riva and E. Riva (Eds.), *Enabling*  
39 *Positive Change. Flow and complexity in daily experience* (pp. 91–104). Warsaw, Berlin: De Gruyter.  
40 [DOI: 10.2478/9783110410242.6](https://doi.org/10.2478/9783110410242.6).  
41  
42

43 Regione Lombardia (2021). *Strategia Regionale per lo sviluppo sostenibile*.  
44 <https://www.svilupposostenibile.regione.lombardia.it/it/strategia-regionale/la-strategia>  
45

46 Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of  
47 reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80(1),1.  
48 <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0092976>  
49  
50

51 Sadri, G., and Robertson, I. T. (1993). Self- efficacy and work- related behaviour: a review and  
52 meta- analysis. *Applied Psychology*, 42(2), 139-152.  
53 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1993.tb00728.x>  
54  
55

56 Salvia, G., Morello, E., Rotondo, F., Sangalli, A., Causone, F., Erba, S., and Pagliano, L. (2020).  
57 Performance Gap and Occupant Behavior in Building Retrofit: Focus on Dynamics of Change and  
58 Continuity in the Practice of Indoor Heating. *Sustainability*, 12(14), 5820.  
59 <https://doi:10.3390/su12145820>  
60  
61

- 1  
2  
3 Sarrica, M., Biddau, F., Brondi, S., Cottone, P., and Mazzara, B. M. (2018). A multi-scale  
4 examination of public discourse on energy sustainability in Italy: Empirical evidence and policy  
5 implications. *Energy Policy*, *114*, 444-454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2017.12.021>  
6  
7 Schreuer, A. (2016). The establishment of citizen power plants in Austria: A process of  
8 empowerment? *Energy Research & Social Science*, *13*, 126-135.  
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.12.003>  
10  
11 Scholtz, U., Gutierrez-Dona, B., Sud, S., and Schwarzer, R. (2002). Is general self-efficacy a universal  
12 construct? Psychometric findings from 25 countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*,  
13 *18*(3), 242-251. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.18.3.242>  
14  
15 Schultz, P. W. (2001). The structure of environmental concern: Concern for self, other people, and  
16 the biosphere. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *21*(4), 327-339.  
17 <https://doi.org/10.1006/jevp.2001.0227>  
18  
19 Schultz, P. W. (2002). *Environmental attitudes and behaviors across cultures. Online readings in*  
20 *Psychology and Culture*, *8*(1), 2307-0919. <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1070>  
21  
22 Scott, D., and Willits, F. K. (1994). Environmental attitudes and behavior: A Pennsylvania survey.  
23 *Environment and Behavior*, *26*, 239-260. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001391659402600206>  
24  
25 Shrestha, B., Bajracharya, S. B., Keitsch, M. M., and Tiwari, S. R. (2020). Gender differences in  
26 household energy decision- making and impacts in energy saving to achieve sustainability: A case  
27 of Kathmandu. *Sustainable Development*, *28*(5), 1049-1062.  
28 <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2055>  
29  
30 SRM - Associazione Studi e ricerche per il Mezzogiorno (2019). *Med & Italian Energy Report*.  
31 Naples: Giannini Editore.  
32  
33 Stajkovic, A. D., and Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-  
34 analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*(2), 240. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.240>  
35  
36 Steinhorst, J., Klöckner, C. A., and Matthies, E. (2015). Saving electricity—For the money or the  
37 environment? Risks of limiting pro-environmental spillover when using monetary framing. *Journal*  
38 *of Environmental Psychology*, *43*, 125-135.  
39 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.05.012>  
40  
41 Stern, P. C. (1992). What psychology knows about energy conservation. *American*  
42 *Psychologist*, *47*(10), 1224. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.47.10.1224>  
43  
44 Sunikka-Blank, M., Galvin, R., and Behar, C. (2018). Harnessing social class, taste and gender for  
45 more effective policies. *Building Research & Information*, *46*(1), 114-126.  
46 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2017.1356129>  
47  
48 Swim, J. K., Vescio, T. K., Dahl, J. L., and Zawadzki, S. J. (2018). Gendered discourse about climate  
49 change policies. *Global Environmental Change*, *48*, 216–225.  
50 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2017.12.005>  
51  
52 Thøgersen, J. (2018). Frugal or green? Basic drivers of energy saving in European households.  
53 *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *197*, 1521-1530. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.06.282>  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1 Thøgersen, J., and Grønhøj, A. (2010). Electricity saving in households—A social cognitive  
2 approach. *Energy Policy*, 38(12), 7732-7743. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.08.025>.
- 3 Tjørring, L., and Gausset, Q. (2019). Drivers for retrofit: a sociocultural approach to houses and  
4 inhabitants. *Building Research & Information*, 47(4), 394-403.  
5 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2018.1423722>.
- 6  
7  
8 Turri, E. (2000). *La megalopoli padana*. Venice: Marsilio.
- 9  
10 Van Der Schoor, T., Van Lente, H., Scholtens, B., and Peine, A. (2016). Challenging obduracy: How  
11 local communities transform the energy system. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 13, 94-105.  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.12.009>
- 13  
14 Vicente-Molina, M. A., Fernández-Sainz, A., and Izagirre-Olaizola, J. (2018). Does gender make a  
15 difference in pro-environmental behavior? The case of the Basque Country University students.  
16 *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 176, 89-98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.079>
- 17  
18  
19 Xiao, C., and Hong, D. (2010). Gender differences in environmental behaviors in China. *Population*  
20 *and Environment*, 32(1), 88-104. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11111-010-0115-z>
- 21  
22  
23 Yan, W., and Gaier, E. L. (1994). Causal attributions for college success and failure: An Asian-  
24 American comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25(1), 146-158.  
25 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022194251009>
- 26  
27  
28 Yang, S., Zhang, Y., and Zhao, D. (2016). Who exhibits more energy-saving behavior in direct and  
29 indirect ways in china? The role of psychological factors and socio-demographics. *Energy Policy*, 93,  
30 196-205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2016.02.018>
- 31  
32  
33 Yang, R., Yue, C., Li, J., Zhu, J., Chen, H., and Wei, J. (2020). The influence of information  
34 intervention cognition on college students' energy-saving behavior intentions. *International Journal*  
35 *of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(5), 1659. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17051659>
- 36  
37  
38 Waitt, G., Caputi, P., Gibson, C., Farbotko, C., Head, L., Gill, N., and Stanes, E. (2012). Sustainable  
39 household capability: which households are doing the work of environmental  
40 sustainability? *Australian Geographer*, 43(1), 51-74.
- 41  
42  
43 Winter, D. D. N., and Koger, S. M. (2014). *The psychology of environmental problems: Psychology*  
44 *for sustainability*. London: Psychology Press.
- 45  
46  
47 Zelezny, L. C., Chua, P. P., and Aldrich, C. (2000). New ways of thinking about environmentalism:  
48 Elaborating on gender differences in environmentalism. *Journal of Social issues*, 56(3), 443-457.  
49 <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00177>
- 50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



## Tables

**Table 1**

	Items
	<i>How often do you happen to...</i>
1	Reduce\turn off the heating system on less cold winter days
2	Use the air conditioner during summer*
3	Intentionally use the stairs instead of the elevator
4	Fully load washing machine/dishwasher before starting it
5	Wear a t-shirt indoors during winter*
6	Turn off the house lights when not strictly necessary
7	Turn off electronic devices completely (instead of leaving them on stand-by)

Table 1: Domestic energy saving behaviours frequency scale. \*=reverse item

**Table 2**

	Items
1	My domestic consumption and my lifestyle affect environmental sustainability
2	By reducing my consumption, I can contribute to the preservation of environmental sustainability
3	My actions to preserve sustainability will encourage others to do the same

Table 2: Domain-specific (sustainability) efficacy scale

**Table 3**

	Items	MEN (m.)	WOMEN (m.)
1	Reduce\turn off the heating system on less cold winter days	5.66	5.45
2	Use the air conditioner during summer	4.17	4.59
3	Intentionally use the stairs instead of the elevator	4.5	4.83
4	Fully load washing machine/dishwasher before starting it*	5.08	5.83
5	Wear a t-shirt indoors during winter*	3.08	2.36
6	Turn off the house lights when not strictly necessary	6.15	6.29
7	Turn off electronic devices completely (instead of leaving them on stand-by)	3.98	4.63

Table 3: Average scores on the selected domestic energy saving behaviors, by gender (\*p<.05)

**Table 4**

		<b>MEN (m.)</b>	<b>WOMEN (m.)</b>
<b>1</b>	My domestic consumption and my lifestyle affect environmental sustainability	5.36	5.68
<b>2</b>	By reducing my consumption, I can contribute to the preservation of environmental sustainability	5.60	5.95
<b>3</b>	My actions to preserve sustainability will encourage others to do the same	4.51	5.09

*Table 4: Average scores on domain-specific self-efficacy items, by gender***Table 5**

		<b>MEN (r.)</b>	<b>WOMEN (r.)</b>
<b>1</b>	Reduce\turn off the heating system on less cold winter days	0.19	0.15
<b>2</b>	Use the air conditioner during summer	0.03	0.10
<b>3</b>	Intentionally use the stairs instead of the elevator	0.32	0.39**
<b>4</b>	Fully load washing machine/dishwasher before starting it	0.08	0.30**
<b>5</b>	Wear a t-shirt indoors during winter	-0.07	0.03
<b>6</b>	Turn off the house lights when not strictly necessary	0.30**	0.12
<b>7</b>	Turn off electronic devices completely (instead of leaving them on stand-by)	0.27	0.50**

*Table 5: Domain-specific self-efficacy and energy saving behaviors (Correlation matrix, \*\*p<.01)*

## Highlights

- In Lombardy case study, a pervasive gender gap in energy saving behaviors is partially disconfirmed.
- Gender gap on energy saving behaviors is confirmed on specific behaviors and it is culture-sensitive.
- A gender gap is found in domain-specific perceived self-efficacy.