

1 Sustainable practices

Social theory and climate change

Elizabeth Shove and Nicola Spurling

Introduction

This book is informed by three propositions: one is that consumption is usefully understood as an outcome of practice: people consume objects, resources and services not for their own sake but in the course of accomplishing social practices (Warde 2005). The second is that mitigating and adapting to climate change is sure to require different patterns both of consumption and daily life. In short, the challenge is one of imagining and realising versions of normal life that fit within the envelope of sustainability and that are resilient, adaptable and fair. Since this implies a substantial, systemic transition in what people *do* – in how they move around, what they eat, and how they spend their time – the third proposition is that social theories of practice provide an important intellectual resource for understanding and perhaps establishing social, institutional and infrastructural conditions in which much less resource intensive ways of life might take hold.

According to the World Wildlife Fund, the resources needed to maintain Western European habits currently exceed the earth's capacity by a factor of three. This has not always been so. In the 1970s, on average, European levels of consumption remained within limits which our planet could sustain. How ordinary ways of life have become so resource intensive in such a short space of time is one of the puzzles that runs through this book. There are different ways of approaching this topic. In popular and policy discourse it is usual to explain such changes as outcomes of individual choice. From this perspective, moving towards a more sustainable society depends on helping people to make better choices, for example by understanding the environmental impact of what they do. Ecological and carbon footprint calculators¹ are designed with this in mind. These calculators sum up the consequences of an individual's diet, their mobility and the way they heat and light their home, presenting the results in simple graphs and figures. By adjusting responses to the calculator's questions, people can quickly see how much difference they could make to the size of their ecological footprint by using the car less, being vegetarian, increasing the number of people who share the same home or taking holidays close to home.

Tools like this draw attention to contemporary expectations of 'normal life' (e.g. car ownership, number of people per household, number of holidays per

year, etc.), demonstrating just how embedded and ordinary resource intensive lifestyles have become. Can individuals simply choose to reconfigure their lives in ways that meet the calculator's demands? What other aspects of daily life would have to change? What would it mean to abandon the car, cut domestic energy consumption by a half or a third, move into a smaller home and share that space with others? In what sense are substantially more sustainable ways of living plausible given present transport systems, buildings and social conventions? Responses are sure to vary from case to case but the general pattern is clear. Bringing individual carbon or ecological footprints back into the range of 'one planet' is likely to require a radical redefinition of what counts as normal social practice, and of the institutions and infrastructures on which these arrangements depend.

This might seem like a massive, perhaps insurmountable, challenge but if we look to recent history or take note of contemporary variation, it is obvious that there is no single template to which daily life conforms. The range of social practices that constitute seemingly essential aspects of contemporary living are contingent and constantly shifting. For example, diets and habits of personal hygiene (showering, bathing, etc.) are on average quite unlike those that pertained fifty years ago, and there have been correspondingly significant developments in the technologies, meanings and competences involved. Taking a slightly broader view the total range of practices that constitute social life has also changed: what is normal today has not always been so and, as such, there is no reason to suppose that currently familiar arrangements will stay the same for very long. It is reasonable to expect transitions in the array of practices that constitute social life and the resources they require. From an environmental point of view, the question is whether social practices might develop in directions that lead, en masse, to a spectacular reduction in collective ecological and carbon footprints. Can we imagine how such change might come about, and if so, what further costs and consequences might follow?

In designing a book that addresses these questions, we focus on understanding how contemporary patterns of consumption come to be as they are, and how they might change – a project to which the social sciences have much to contribute. In embarking on this task, we make a number of broad assumptions about what sustainability means and how sustainable practice might be defined. Reducing resource use to a level that can be maintained by future generations seems like a reasonable goal, and is one that is addressed in several chapters. However, contributors do not imagine the existence of a single universally agreed template of what constitutes a lower carbon or more sustainable society. Other possible ambitions include those of scaling back carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions (with a focus on mitigating climate change), minimising the rate at which finite fossil fuels are depleted, preserving biodiversity, and addressing global inequalities in consumption and well being.

Voß and colleagues argue for an approach that 'abandons the assumption of "one" adequate problem framing, "one" true prognosis of consequences, and "one" best way to go' ... as if this ... 'could be identified in an objective manner

from a neutral, supervisory outlook on the (social–ecological) system as a whole’ (Voß and Bornemann 2011). Most, but perhaps not all, contributors to this book share something of the same reflexive stance. In so far as interpretations and definitions of sustainable goals come into view they are, for the most part, taken to be provisional and historically specific.

Theories of consumption have shifted over the past decade as attention has turned from individual consumers to the cultural, material and economic structuring of consumption (Cohen and Murphy 2001; Gronow and Warde 2001; Shove 2003; Southerton *et al.* 2004; van Vliet *et al.* 2005; Spaargaren 2011). Along the way, this literature has questioned behavioural representations of individual choice, underlined the environmental implications of ordinary consumption and argued for a focus on the services (e.g. lighting, heating, laundering, etc.) that resources make possible. The related conclusion that services are implicated in the reproduction of everyday life represents an important step, but more is required to explain how they evolve. In concentrating on these questions – how do more and less sustainable practices become established, and how do they diffuse? – this book moves the agenda on, and moves it in a direction that exploits recent developments in social theory. It does so by placing ‘practices’ centre-stage.

The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory (Schatzki *et al.* 2001) signalled renewed interest in theories of practice. The strategy of taking social practices, ordered across space and time, as the focus of enquiry sets such approaches apart from individualist and structuralist modes of thinking (Giddens 1984) and has further consequences for how processes of social reproduction and transformation are conceptualised. For example, rather than seeing change in the resource intensity of daily life as an outcome of individual choice, or of seemingly external social and economic forces, it makes sense to ask about how social practices evolve, and what this means for the use of energy, water and other natural resources. There is no one theory of practice and no such thing as ‘a’ practice approach, but in developing different aspects of the ‘practice turn’, and exploring its implications for sustainability, contributors to this collection address a series of related questions: how are practices defined and how do they change? What are the material elements of which practices are composed? How do practices circulate and travel, and how do they relate to each other? How can we understand power within systems of practice, and how and by whom are matters of value, including interpretations of well being and sustainability, reproduced and contested? In responding to these questions, authors make use of different disciplinary traditions, drawing on sociology, geography, science studies, economics and philosophy, and introduce empirical research on cycling, heating, cooling and eating. In combination, the result is an exploratory venture in which new lines of enquiry are opened up, and different threads developed: it is around these that the five parts of the book are organised.

How are practices defined and how do they change?

The first two chapters deal with fundamental problems of definition and change. If practices are to figure as the basic unit of social enquiry, how are they to be recognised and known? Second, if social practices underpin consumption, how is it that new forms come into being and others disappear? In responding to the first question, Alan Warde's discussion 'What sort of a practice is eating?', draws attention to the importance of formalisation and coordination. Some practices are relatively simple to spot in that they are bound and delimited by shared, somewhat formalised, descriptions, prescriptions and definitions of proper performance. These are the easy cases in that there is likely to be a readily observable trail of relatively unambiguous indicators – documents, rules and guides – demonstrating that a practice is 'out there', existing across space and time, and figuring as a recognisable entity that people can join, defect from or resist.

In trying to make sense of other more troublesome examples, like eating, Warde turns from questions of bounding (where does one practice end and another begin?) to matters of linkage and intersection (how are practices coordinated?). In moving into this territory, and in writing about compound practices, he brings new topics to the fore: in particular, what are the threads of interdependence that hold constellations and complexes of practice provisionally in place and how and why do these threads tighten and slacken? Rather than fretting about whether eating is, or is not, a practice in some absolute sense, the message and the practical methodological advice is to identify and compare stronger and weaker forms of coordination between components like those of shopping, preparing and consuming. This is useful guidance for those interested in analysing the trajectories of compound practices over time. It is also useful in thinking about how practices emerge, persist and disappear, this being the focus of Theodore Schatzki's contribution entitled 'The edge of change'.

Having taken care to distinguish between ongoing happening on the one hand, and change on the other, Schatzki writes about how practices, and bundles of practice, shape and in a sense generate each other. In his account, relevant processes include those of coalescence (in which rules, norms, understandings and arrangements combine), hybridisation (in which practices merge) and bifurcation (in which they split apart). In all of this, the complex relation between stability (which itself requires ongoing reproduction) and more transformative forms of evolution is very much in view, as are differential, but parallel, rates and types of change. These opening chapters elaborate concepts and definitions of social practice and frame much of what comes next, including more detailed empirical studies of transition and persistence in the materials and resource intensities of what people do.

The materials of practice

The goal of 'dematerialising' daily life, for example, by a factor of ten,² has been around for a while. The basic idea is that of developing technologies and

techniques that allow people to do the same or more, but with less environmental impact. In exploring the uses of information and communication technologies (ICTs), Inge Røpke and Toke H. Christensen's chapter on 'Transitions in the wrong direction: digital technologies and daily life', and Sari Yli-Kauhaluoma *et al.*'s chapter on 'Mundane materials at work: paper in practice', work as a pair. Both follow the adoption of new technologies, showing how novel material elements do, and do not, transform existing practices. The examples and cases discussed illustrate the resource implications of some of the more abstract processes of linkage, hybridisation and bifurcation introduced by Warde and Schatzki. In addition, these two chapters work with the suggestion that social practices depend on the active integration of elements, including meanings, competences and materials (Reckwitz 2002; Shove *et al.* 2012). In this context, the common challenge is to show how ICTs become embedded and how this affects related patterns of energy and resource consumption.

Two rather different pictures emerge. The first is one in which ICTs are quickly integrated into practices as diverse as horse riding, bird watching and keeping in touch with friends and family. As described, widespread use of ICTs tends to soften time-space constraints, leading to an intensification of daily life. This is not the only possible outcome. Røpke and Christensen argue that in other social and economic circumstances, ICTs might transform practices in very different ways, and in ways that do reduce consumption. The present trend is, nonetheless, one in which more is packed into the day, and more energy is used as a result. By contrast, the second narrative, based on a small scale study of office life, emphasises the persistent importance of paper as a medium through which separate practices are coordinated and organised. Yli-Kauhaluoma *et al.* contend that detailed analysis of these cross-cutting functions helps explain why the paperless office remains a myth, and why ICTs have *not* led to the dematerialisation of working life. Røpke and Christensen describe processes of rapid appropriation, whereas Yli-Kauhaluoma *et al.* emphasise much slower forms of co-evolution. However, both demonstrate the subtlety of material innovation in practice.

Though not spelled out in quite these terms, both chapters question simple, essentially technological, goals of dematerialisation. They do so by reminding us that ICTs (and paper) have multiple roles, figuring as elements necessary for the conduct of specific practices, but also bridging between different practices, and mattering for when and where these are reproduced. This argues for a correspondingly subtle analysis of the relation between materiality (including resources and forms of consumption that are important for carbon emissions and ecological footprints) and a multiplicity of practices. Later chapters take this discussion further, but before turning to these more systemic analyses, the next two chapters concentrate on how people become practitioners and hence how practices spread.

Sharing and circulation

Social practices such as bathing, showering, driving and cycling vary in terms of how many people reproduce them, and where they are routinely enacted. In crude terms, we might say that some practices are bigger, more extensive, and more widely and frequently performed than others. To give two simple examples, at present in the UK, showering is more common than bathing, and driving is more common than cycling (in terms of time spent and kilometres travelled). Moving beyond the UK, what Urry (2004) refers to as the ‘system of automobility’ has become established across most countries of the world, so much so that driving has, in a sense, overtaken practices of cycling and walking. In theory, we might characterise the present state of any one practice at a particular point in time by mapping its geographic spread, the rate of recurrent performance, and the sheer number of ‘carriers’ or practitioners involved (Reckwitz, 2002). Should such maps exist, and should they be regularly revised, they might be used to track the movement and global circulation of more and less resource intensive practices (Shove 2009). Although there is no such atlas, understanding how practices spread remains important in thinking about where, and how, lower carbon ways of life might take hold.

Allison Hui’s empirical study of how ashtanga yoga and leisure walking have developed to become globally popular pursuits provides some clues. Hui suggests that the spread of a practice, its ‘circulation’, is related to the separate movements of people (carriers), and of materials and knowledge, these being ‘elements’ of practice, as defined by Reckwitz (2002) and by Shove *et al.* (2012). Hui’s central claim is that the circulation and persistence of requisite elements is a necessary condition for the diffusion of practices across space and time. A second related observation is that much travel is undertaken as a necessary part of doing certain practices. At first sight, neither yoga nor leisure walking require extensive resource consumption, but for some, being a practitioner prompts and justifies long and frequent journeys. As Hui explains, patterns of travel (and the destinations involved) are bound up with the historical development and circulation of the practices in question. For example, the history of leisure walking is such that the practice is closely associated with quite specific locations (hills, countryside etc.). Likewise, the manner in which yoga is organised and taught (by gurus and through first-hand experience) means that devoted practitioners are obliged to travel if they are to perfect their technique in the proper manner. In both cases, the history of the practice’s development and diffusion is of some significance for where and by whom it is enacted, and hence for the forms of mobility that are subsequently required.

Russell Hitchings, who is also interested in how practices circulate, takes a different approach, focusing on the forms of learning and sharing that occur through ‘communities of practice’ (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998). Lave and Wenger write about how novices become fully-fledged practitioners, and about how practices develop as cohorts of newcomers and old hands interact. Like others who discuss the careers of people and practices, these authors

emphasise the socially shared character of seemingly personal experience and expertise. In Chapter 6, Hinchings revisits two recent research projects with these ideas in mind. The first study, which focused on how office workers keep cool in summer, concluded that shared practices were an outcome of collective learning, much along the lines that Lave and Wenger describe. By contrast, the second project, which was about how older people keep warm in winter, revealed a wider range of rather more private arrangements. Comparison of these two cases leads Hinchings to conclude that existing social networks are crucial for how strategies and practices of comfort circulate and change. As it happens, the conventions of comfort that office workers share are increasingly dependent on air conditioning: in this case the community is one that fosters and reproduces energy intensive practices. By contrast, older people, who might benefit from sharing skills in low-energy methods of keeping warm, often kept their habits private; they were not part of any comparable community of practice.

This discussion highlights the ambivalence of ‘community’ as a site of ecological innovation. It suggests that some communities, like those to which office workers belong, constitute networks through which *more* resource intensive practices circulate, whereas others may preserve pockets of tradition and variety. This might be ‘good’ in social and environmental terms, but it might also be problematic. Either way, the project of bringing concepts of community and practice together draws attention to the dual significance of social networks as conduits through which practices travel, and as outcomes of past patterns of recruitment. This complicates accounts in which ‘communities’, usually defined in geographical terms, figure as crucibles of pro-environmental change.

Relations between practices

The next three chapters mark a change of gear. Rather than focusing on how practices develop and circulate, one at a time, they concentrate on relations between practices: on how systemic transformations come about, on the work involved in making new practices normal within such systems, and on the extensive ‘geometries’ of practice that characterise daily life in contemporary industrialised societies.

Matt Watson makes a start on this agenda by speculating about what it might take for cycling to displace driving on a societal scale. The methodological strategy of taking this seemingly fanciful idea seriously forces him to take stock of the changing relationship between systems of velo- and automobility over time. Rather than representing systemic transition as a single evolutionary process, as is usually the case (Geels 2002), the relation between co-existing systems takes centre-stage. In taking this approach, Watson shows how theories of social practice and of sociotechnical innovation might be combined.

His main argument is that innovations in practice depend on patterns of recruitment and defection (for example recruitment to driving, defection from cycling), and that sociotechnical transformations are, in the end, underpinned by such processes. Although competitive relations between practices are crucial, it

is clear that driving does not simply take the place of cycling. As Watson goes on to show, meanings of 'fast', 'convenient' and 'slow' modes of transport are outcomes of the changing *relation* between cycling and driving, and between the practices and infrastructures of which past and present systems of velo- and automobility are composed. From this it follows that opportunities for deliberate policy intervention (for example, to promote cycling) are themselves an emergent product of ongoing relations and dynamic processes within and between these co-existing systems. To some extent this is obvious: strategies that make sense when 40 per cent of local trips are by bike, are evidently not the same as those that might be adopted when this figure has fallen to one or two per cent. A less obvious conclusion, but one that comes from this discussion, is that policy making, past and present, does not stand outside the systems of practice that it seeks to influence, but is instead integral to them. In other words, policy interventions have effect when integrated into ongoing, already dynamic processes of recruitment and defection that are in turn shaped by forms of path dependence, lock in and feedback.

Concluding that systemic transitions have somewhat emergent lives of their own does not prevent us from recognising and assessing the normative character and practical significance of deliberate attempts to steer practices in one direction or another (a theme explored in Chapter 10). As represented here, the project of understanding how people become carriers of practice (and how practices compete with each other) provides a means of understanding how power is exercised and how inequalities are reproduced. This occurs at many levels and, as detailed in the next chapter, there is no escaping the politics of technology and no denying the commitments and judgements that are, of necessity, folded into the dynamics of social practice.

Julien McHardy's chapter is about the work involved in bringing electric cycling into being, and establishing it as a specific type of practice. In the European context, electric bikes are promising technologies (van Lente 1993; Brown, *et al.* 2000): though not yet 'normal', they promise to extend the range and scope of cycling and perhaps reduce reliance on the car. Electric bicycles are not viewed as the harbingers of a radically new regime of velomobility, but they do figure in future oriented discourses of sustainability.³ At the same time, the question remains, what *is* electric cycling and what might it become? In order to address this question, McHardy zooms in on the technicalities of testing and comparing competing models. As he explains, the process of testing electric bikes simultaneously anticipates and constructs electric cycling, defining the riding styles of imagined cohorts of future cyclists and ensuring that those who participate in the test faithfully reproduce this not-yet actual practice. The test process depends on managing and containing variety in order to define a somewhat stable form, this being a necessary step if performances are to be compared and if electric cycling is to be presented as a recognisable entity that exists across time and space. There is nothing special about this particular test procedure (many tests work this way), but there is something intriguing about how relations between actual and future cyclists and bicycles are negotiated in the

process. These relations, along with also imagined interactions between electric cycling and driving, are inscribed in test protocols that delimit the contours of electric cycling as a practice and that reveal/establish how this practice is/is not to be normalised and positioned within and alongside existing systems of urban and semi-urban mobility.

We do not know what will happen beyond the confines of the test, or how electric cycling will fare in the longer run. Whatever transpires, electric cycling will be shaped by the standardising work undertaken by the testers' protocols and methods and the impact these have on product design, and on the terms in which electric cycling is framed for future users. Though not the only possible configuration, the result is a package in which actual bikes and imagined riders are bundled together and constituted as an increasingly stable configuration known as 'electric cycling'.

Grégoire Wallenborn's more philosophical chapter takes McHardy's discussion of these human-non-human hybrids to heart. It is one thing to suggest that practices constitute the basic unit of social enquiry, but who, or what, then constitutes 'the practitioner'? Is electric cycling enacted by the rider alone, or by an always fluid combination of rider and bicycle? (sometimes one does the work, sometimes the other). This line of thinking opens the way for a more detailed analysis of what Wallenborn refers to as the 'extended body', this being the human body, plus everything else that is implied in the performance of a practice. Wallenborn distinguishes between five generic 'places' in which a body might be extended and concludes that the 'geometry' of a practice is defined by the specific intertwining of these 'topographies'. His five-fold scheme provides an analytic framework with which to represent the changing outlines both of practices, and of the extended bodies that enact them. It also provides a set of terms with which to contemplate future possible scenarios, including ones in which practices and bodies are systematically less extended, and in which qualities of life are instead defined with reference to the richness and variety of actual and potential 'assemblages'. Wallenborn's contribution takes us away from particular practices to forms of containment, circulation and flow that characterise systems and complexes of practice. In so doing, it brings questions about the relations between extension (including delegation to other people and things), resource intensity and well being into the frame.

The last two chapters in the collection take these topics as their central concern. Andrew Sayer's contribution outlines a number of challenges facing those who are interested in concepts of sustainable practice. These have to do with the role and status of values, with how capitalist systems of profit making fit into the picture, and with how concepts of well being and social practice might connect. In responding to some of these challenges, Gordon Walker explores the potential for combining Sen's work on capability and justice with the literature on social practice. In working through these ideas, both authors discuss the limits of social theories of practice as currently formulated, and both consider ways in which some of these might be overcome.

Sustainability, inequality and power

Serious consideration of political economy and power, and questions of morality and justice have not figured prominently within the ‘practice turn’. However, any systemic transition towards sustainability will take place in the context of present patterns of inequality and power. In addition, significant change of the scale required is itself sure to generate ‘winners’ and ‘losers’ (Shove and Walker 2010). There is no doubt that these are issues with which a discussion of sustainable *practice* needs to engage, but how are these to be approached and framed? For example, are values and judgements best understood as being integral to practice and as outcomes of practical experience as in MacIntyre’s view (1985), or as commitments that stand somewhere outside the realm of practice? This ongoing discussion draws attention to the necessarily political and contested character of efforts to steer or modify the trajectories of social practice, many of which are central to the functioning of capitalist societies. It is in this context that Sayer discusses the place of individuals’ reasons and values. He is particularly concerned that the representation of people as the (mere) carriers of practice risks positioning them as passive hosts, rather than as evaluative, judgemental and creative beings. Though at one extreme this might be the case, carriers also figure as essential sources of variation, transformation, conflict, contest and change. The question is therefore not whether people-as-the-carriers-of-practice have values or make moral judgements (they clearly do), but rather, how these are to be conceptualised.

In the second part of his chapter, Sayer asks whether theories of practice can address questions of economic and corporate power. It is fair to say that some of the recent literature is preoccupied with the details of consumer behaviour and with the immediacies of doing – for example, doing heating, doing waste management or whatever (Gram-Hanssen 2010; Hargreaves 2011). In writing of this kind, questions about the provision and supply of necessary elements of practice – including sources and forms of energy and what Wallenborn describes as the globally ‘extended bodies’ involved – disappear from view. As Sayer points out, it is easy to limit an analysis of ‘practice’ to a close study of situated performance, whether of cooking and heating, or of financial management. And it is true that when concepts of practice are cut short in this way, it is difficult to see how they might help in understanding evidently relevant trends in business, profit making and politics.

It is in this context that Sayer makes a case for bringing political economy back into a discussion of practice. He does not go into detail about what this might involve, but if the positions developed by other contributors to this collection are anything to go by, responses are likely to vary rather widely. For example, some might argue that problems of macro-economic transformation are not problems that theories of practice can usefully address. Others might distinguish between practices, on the one hand, and social and economic contexts/forces on the other, perhaps going on to detail the relation between the two. Alternatively, there may be no need to bring political economic concerns ‘back’

on the grounds that they have never been absent. From this point of view, processes of accumulation and conflict and patterns of inequality are outcomes of, and are central to, the lives of practices. As such, they are crucial in understanding how practices circulate and become dominant, and how complex systems of practice develop and endure. These various interpretations reflect underlying differences in how practices are conceptualised. There is no one theory of practice, but as demonstrated in other parts of this book, some versions are capable of explicating unsustainability and injustice at this macro scale.

This potential needs to be developed and, in the final chapter, Gordon Walker gives a sense of what this might involve. Sayer and Wallenborn both conclude by suggesting that a more sustainable future depends on identifying and promoting 'frugal' practices that enhance and contribute to well being. Walker homes in on the issue of what constitutes a good and worthwhile life, doing so in a manner that allows him to explore connections between social theories of justice (in particular, Sen's capabilities framework) and of practice. In working these ideas through in greater detail, Walker makes use of the distinction between practice-as-entity (that is, as something that is recognised and that persists across space and time), and practice-as-performance (moments in which practices-as-entities are enacted), revisiting Sen's notions of functioning and capability with reference to these ideas. As with other chapters, the results of this exploratory exercise are promising and generative. Representing social practices as the doings through which good and worthwhile lives are achieved, seems to provide a means of approaching the normative and ethical questions that surround deliberate efforts to promote sustainability.

These final chapters point to an emerging debate about the limits and potential of practice theory. This revolves around two positions. The first suggests that issues of political economy and power have been bypassed because theories of practice are ill-equipped to deal with them. The second suggests that concepts of practice can be developed in this direction, as Walker's chapter demonstrates.

Sustainable practice

Some of the first efforts to represent and analyse sustainable *practice* were developed in response and reaction to dominant paradigms emphasising attitude, behaviour and consumer choice (Shove 2010). The chapters in this book show how much more there is to do, and how much potential remains. As we have begun to see, theories of practice (broadly defined) are capable of feeding into questions of *sustainability* from a number of different angles: contributing to understandings of justice, transition, innovation and political economy, as well as consumption. This is relatively new territory, but the chapters in this book provide terms and concepts that are useful in thinking about how certain practices dominate and how complexes and systems of practice become embedded and established at a societal scale. Further work is required to describe and characterise forms of accumulation (for example, of money, competence, infrastructure, etc.), and of distribution and access that follow from past patterns of

practice and shape future possibilities. This depends on understanding (not overlooking) the lives of people who carry, contest, negotiate and manage multiple practices at once, and on understanding how values and meanings of well being are embedded in processes of recruitment, defection and ongoing transformation. In dealing with aspects of this agenda, the chapters included in this book give a sense of what a more comprehensive account of *sustainable practice* might entail. This is unfinished business, but in putting this collection together we have made a start.

Notes

- 1 Available online at: www.ecologicalfootprint.com/.
- 2 Available online at: www.factor10-institute.org/.
- 3 Available online at: www.sustainable-mobility.org/.

References

- Brown, N., Rappert, B. and Webster, A. (eds) (2000) *Contested Futures: A Sociology of Prospective Techno-Science*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Cohen, M. and Murphy, J. (eds) (2001) *Exploring Sustainable Consumption*, Amsterdam: Pergamon Press.
- Geels, F. W. (2002) 'Understanding the dynamics of technological transitions: a co-evolutionary and socio-technical analysis', Enschede: Twente University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gram-Hanssen, K. (2010) 'Standby consumption in households analysed with a practice theory approach', *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 14(1): 150–165.
- Gronow, J. and Warde, A. (2001) *Ordinary Consumption*, New York: Routledge.
- Hargreaves, T. (2011) 'Practice-ing behaviour change: Applying social practice theory to pro-environmental behaviour change', *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 11(1): 79–99.
- Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: legitimate peripheral participation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (1985) *After Virtue*, London: Duckworth.
- Reckwitz, A. (2002) 'Toward a theory of social practices: a development in culturalist theorizing', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2): 243–263.
- Schatzki, T., Knorr Cetina, K. and von Savigny, E. (eds) (2001) *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, London: Routledge.
- Shove, E. (2003) *Comfort, Cleanliness and Convenience: the Social Organization of Normality*, Oxford: Berg.
- Shove, E. (2009) 'Everyday practice and the production and consumption of time', in E. Shove, F. Trentmann and R. Wilk (eds) *Time, Consumption and Everyday Life: Practice, Materiality and Culture*, Oxford: Berg.
- Shove, E. (2010) 'Beyond the ABC: climate change policy and theories of social change', *Environment and Planning A*, 42(6): 1273–1285.
- Shove, E. and Walker, G. (2010) 'Governing transitions in the sustainability of everyday life', *Research Policy* 39, (4): 471–476.
- Shove, E., Pantzar, M and Watson, M. (2012) *The Dynamics of Social Practice: Everyday Life and How it Changes*, London: Sage.
- Southerton, D., Chappells, H. and van Vliet, V. (2004) *Sustainable Consumption: the Implications of Changing Infrastructures of Provision*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Spaargaren, G. (2011) 'Theories of practices: agency, technology, and culture: Exploring the relevance of practice theories for the governance of sustainable consumption practices in the new world-order', *Global Environmental Change*, 21(3): 813–822.
- Urry, J. (2004). 'The "System" of Automobility', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 21(4–5): 25–39.
- van Lente, H. (1993) 'Promising technology. The dynamics of expectations in technological developments', University of Twente, PhD.
- van Vliet, B., Chappells, H. and Shove, E. (2005) *Infrastructures of Consumption: Environmental Innovation in the Utility Industries*, London: Earthscan.
- Voß, J. and Bornemann, B. (2011) 'The politics of reflexive governance: challenges for designing adaptive management and transition management', *Ecology and Society* 16(2): 9.
- Warde, A. (2005) 'Consumption and theories of practice', *Journal of Consumer Culture* 5(2): 131–153.
- Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

