LSE Public Policy Review

Transformative Behavioural Change: Can Radical Shifts in Human Action Prevent Catastrophic Global Crises?

RESEARCH

DARIO KRPAN

LSE Press

ABSTRACT

Humanity faces existential threats from climate change, rising inequalities, and disruptive technologies. Addressing these challenges before they reach the point of crisis that will force us to adapt reactively under conditions of severe disruption requires transformative behavioural change. This change involves radical shifts in values, identities and actions that fundamentally alter how individuals live and relate to others. In this article, I first define the concept of transformative behavioural change, differentiate it from incremental change, explore what drives it, and illustrate it with historical and contemporary examples. I then examine how such transformations can interact with systemic change, highlighting the potential of committed minorities and social tipping points to catalyse broader societal shifts. I also consider the role of public policy in enabling transformation by redesigning infrastructures, incentives, and cultural narratives. To make these ideas more concrete, I envision three scenarios: a degrowth society oriented towards sufficiency and equity, a psychologically self-sufficient society in which fulfilment derives from inner development, and a technologically enabled economy where digital tools amplify change. These scenarios underscore the human capacity to imagine and pursue different futures, known as the transformative utopian impulse. I conclude that whilst the prospects for transformative behavioural change at scale remain uncertain, incrementalism is inadequate, and such change may be the only pathway to avoid catastrophic consequences stemming from the most pressing issues the world is facing.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:
Dario Krpan
Department of Psychological and Behavioural Science, London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street, London, WC2A 2AE, United Kingdom
d.krpan@lse.ac.uk

KEYWORDS:
transformative behavioural change; systemic transformation; degrowth; post-growth; public policy; utopian impulse

JEL CLASSIFICATION CODES:
D9; E2; E7; P4; Q5

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:
Krpan D. Transformative Behavioural Change: Can Radical Shifts in Human Action Prevent Catastrophic Global Crises? *LSE Public Policy Review*. 2026; 4(3): 8, pp. 1–11. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31389/lseppr.171

DOI: 10.31389/lseppr.171

1. INTRODUCTION

Humanity today faces challenges of an unprecedented scale, including climate change, rising inequality, and disruptive technological transformations (1–3). Having resisted reform for decades, incremental changes in people's actions may no longer be enough to avoid catastrophic consequences. Instead, society may need to radically alter its course, making profound changes in consumption patterns, lifestyles, economic priorities, and collective values (4–6). In this context, the question is whether we, as humans, can achieve this degree of transformation voluntarily, before major crises in ecological and social systems force it upon us, or if humanity is destined to adapt only when forced by the consequences of its own status quo.

The current article examines this question through the lens of transformative behavioural change, which refers to difficult-to-achieve shifts in human actions that involve a transformation of one's way of being and living (5). These changes are radical and often require individuals to alter core aspects of their identity, habits, and broader way of life. For example, someone accustomed to a lifestyle of abundance that is characterised by consumption of luxury goods, frequent flights, and meat-heavy diets might transition to a lifestyle that involves adopting minimalism and plant-based food choices, rejecting unnecessary consumption, embracing low-impact forms of travel, and becoming more spiritual. Whilst individuals can and do achieve such transformations (5), the pressing question is whether they can occur at a scale and speed sufficient to address society's most urgent global problems.

To explore this potential here, I first provide an overview of what transformative behavioural change entails and how it differs from other forms of change. Second, I examine its possible connection to broader systemic transformations, since widespread individual shifts may be a precondition for structural change at societal, political, and economic levels. Third, I consider the role of public policy, exploring whether governments can design interventions to initiate and sustain transformative change. I also envision different scenarios in which transformative behavioural change could reshape society to prevent catastrophic consequences stemming from the major contemporary challenges. Finally, I reflect on the overall viability of transformative behavioural change as a pathway to resolving these existential challenges.

2. WHAT IS TRANSFORMATIVE BEHAVIOURAL CHANGE?

Transformative behavioural change can best be defined through an example. Let us say that there is an individual who has long lived with a materialist outlook, focusing on career advancement, financial success, and social status. After a profound experience – which may have been induced by a life crisis, meditation, forming a new social relationship, or another event – this person begins to adopt an entirely different orientation to life. They start practising daily rituals, dedicate more time to community and service, reduce attachment to possessions, and place compassion and inner growth at the centre of their decisions. What makes this change transformative is that it fundamentally reshapes the individual on many levels, from how they think and act to how they engage with their physical environment and other human beings (5, 7). Importantly, transformative behavioural changes can occur in multiple, non-exclusive domains, such as sustainability, spirituality, health, education, work, and many others (5, 6, 8, 9). Whilst transformative behavioural changes do not need to be in response to critical global issues (5), when they are (e.g., when individuals radically reduce their carbon footprints by giving up frequent air travel, shifting to plant-based diets, and embracing low-impact housing and mobility), they move beyond individual importance and have the potential to acquire global significance (6, 10).

Transformative behavioural changes are distinct from incremental changes, which involve small, modest modifications in people's actions, such as switching to energy-efficient lightbulbs or choosing a plant-based meal a few times per week (5). Transformative change entails a radical reorientation of lifestyle that often requires abandoning established routines and reshaping one's identity. For example, whilst reducing car use by taking public transport once a week would count as an incremental adjustment, selling one's car altogether and committing to cycling or walking as the primary mode of transport, alongside adopting other major sustainability practices (e.g., downsizing one's home, adopting a vegan diet, engaging only in leisure activities that have low carbon emissions) would represent a transformative shift. Therefore, transformative change is qualitatively different from incremental change, as it

DOI: 10.31389/lseppr.171

involves adopting more demanding behaviours and practices compared to the current status quo in pursuit of redefined values, priorities, and way of life (4, 5).

Examples of transformative behavioural change can be found throughout history and contemporary society. Religious and spiritual traditions provide some of the most vivid illustrations of transformative behavioural change. In the Christian tradition, Saul's dramatic conversion on the road to Damascus saw him abandon his role as a persecutor of Christians to become Paul, one of the religion's most committed apostles (11). St. Augustine, similarly, left behind a youth marked by indulgence to dedicate himself to theological reflection and the pursuit of virtue (12), as did St. Francis of Assisi, who renounced his inheritance and military ambitions to embrace a life of poverty and service (13). Beyond Christianity, Siddhartha Gautama relinquished wealth and privilege to begin the ascetic path that led to his awakening as the Buddha (14), whilst Malcolm X moved from a life of crime to become a central figure in the struggle for racial justice after embracing Islam (15). Historical movements such as abolitionism and the civil rights movement were fuelled by individuals who reimagined their personal lives and commitments around radically new values (16–18), laying the groundwork for wider social transformation.

In modern times, transformative change is particularly evident in the climate movement, where some individuals transition from high-consumption, carbon-intensive lifestyles to practices such as living car-free, adopting plant-based diets, or embracing communal and degrowth-oriented models of living (6, 7, 19). Examples of such models include ecovillages, housing cooperatives, and intentional communities organised around shared resources, reduced consumption, collective decision-making, and more localised forms of production and consumption. These practices are not isolated lifestyle adjustments; they reflect a broader effort to align everyday life with an imagined alternative social order. This orientation is captured by the concept of the transformative utopian impulse (4), which refers to people's propensity to envision and pursue far-reaching societal transformation, whether in relation to planetary health, social justice, equality, or other major challenges, thus linking personal behavioural change to collective action.

Although examples of transformative behavioural change are well documented, systematic knowledge about what motivates and drives such change is still lacking (5). Psychological and behavioural science has only recently begun to examine this question, and current insights remain fragmented across related constructs rather than integrated into a single explanatory framework (5). Current evidence suggests that profound life events often act as catalysts. These may include crises such as an illness, bereavement, or trauma, which can trigger processes of post-traumatic growth in which individuals reconstruct their worldviews and priorities (20, 21). In other cases, self-transcendent experiences such as deep meditation, peak aesthetic or spiritual states, or feelings of awe and connectedness to other people, nature, or a higher power have been linked to sudden reductions in self-focus and heightened concern for others (22, 23). Transformative change can also be inspired by close personal relationships or meeting new individuals (5, 24). Moreover, some accounts describe 'quantum changes', in which individuals undergo abrupt reorientations in identity and behaviour, often arising in therapeutic settings or through powerful personal experiences (9, 25, 26), such as epiphanies following a personal crisis, intense experiences of clarity that lead individuals to radically reassess their lives, and so on.

Taken together, these examples suggest that transformative behavioural change is frequently motivated by extraordinary experiences that destabilise existing beliefs and identities, creating openings for new commitments and ways of living (5, 20, 27). The question is whether transformative behavioural change is possible only when such events and experiences 'occur' to people, or if individuals can actively modify their surroundings and experiences to deliberately inspire transformative change.

3. TRANSFORMATIVE BEHAVIOURAL CHANGE AND SYSTEMIC CHANGE

When it comes to addressing the world's most pressing challenges, there are two broad perspectives. One focuses on how individuals can modify their own behaviour to mitigate problems such as climate change, biodiversity loss, or over-consumption (10). The other argues that individuals should not be blamed for these crises, since responsibility lies primarily with systems (e.g., economic, political) that structure choices and constrain behaviour (28–30),

DOI: 10.31389/lseppr.171

and only by tackling these systems can global problems be addressed. However, the idea of 'the system' can be misleading if treated as an abstract entity. Systems are composed of individuals, ranging from the few who hold disproportionate amounts of power and resources to the overwhelming majority who fall within the average or below average range of influence (31). We also know that systems are unlikely to change spontaneously, since complex systems tend to maintain stability until they are perturbed by strong internal or external forces (32–34). For example, in nature, molecules do not typically reorganise into entirely new forms without external energy inputs, and the climate does not suddenly shift into a new state except under major forcing events. In this respect, a key question relevant to addressing the world's most pressing issues is whether human systems are capable of more deliberate and rapid transformation than other natural systems, which would allow us to address such issues before the point of irreversible damage.

Studying transformative behavioural change is particularly relevant in this context because it addresses whether human systems can be reshaped proactively, rather than only reactively in response to crises. Contemporary capitalist systems, for example, could be radically altered if those who drive them (capital owners, high-net-worth individuals) undertook transformative behavioural change by voluntarily reorienting their lives and using their influence to steer organisations, institutions, politicians, and other key actors towards change. For example, since capital owners and high-net-worth individuals bear a disproportionate share of responsibility for the climate crisis (35, 36), this would require them to drastically change their lifestyles by abandoning luxury consumption, avoiding environmentally harmful travel, and redistributing their wealth more broadly across society. Capital owners would also need to push their organisations towards post-growth principles (37). These include adhering to the non-distribution constraint, which ensures that any surplus or profit is reinvested for social benefit rather than private gain; adopting ownership structures that prioritise stewardship or collective benefit over shareholder primacy; instituting governance arrangements that give workers and stakeholders a meaningful voice in decision-making; orienting strategy around social and ecological wellbeing rather than growth for its own sake; and limiting the size and geographical scope of organisations so that they remain appropriately scaled and locally rooted (37).

Capitalist systems could also be radically altered if everyday individuals collectively ceased engaging in the consumption practices on which capitalism depends. A brief glimpse of this possibility occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic, when enforced lockdowns abruptly curtailed consumption, mobility, and production. For a short time, global capitalism experienced severe disruption, demonstrating how quickly systemic stability can be undermined when core behavioural patterns are suspended (38). However, this change was externally imposed and temporary, raising the question of whether voluntary, bottom-up behavioural transformations could produce similar systemic effects.

A central issue, therefore, is how many people would need to adopt transformative behavioural changes and how quickly such changes would need to occur to produce systemic transformation before crises such as climate change intensify further. If a substantial proportion of everyday individuals abruptly abandoned consumerist practices, and/or if economic elites fundamentally restructured their lifestyles and organisational practices, capitalism would not be able to persist. However, the probability of widespread simultaneous change of this kind is very low. Nevertheless, this degree of mass participation may not be necessary if systemic transformation can be sparked by small groups of economic elites and everyday citizens whose actions cascade through society.

History provides examples of major social transformations that began with small groups adopting radically different behaviours before spreading more widely through society. Early Christianity, for instance, began with only a handful of apostles who radically altered their lives in response to the teachings of Jesus. Despite persecution, their commitment spread over centuries, ultimately transforming the Roman Empire and establishing Christianity as a dominant global religion (39). Similar dynamics are evident in other social movements, from abolitionism to the civil rights movement (16–18), where radical behavioural change among a minority gradually shifted norms and institutions. These examples suggest that system-level change does not always require immediate majority participation. Instead, it can emerge through the cumulative effects of committed minorities, network effects, and cultural tipping points (40).

DOI: 10.31389/lseppr.171

The challenge today is that the climate crisis does not afford centuries for transformation. Avoiding catastrophic outcomes requires fundamental changes within years, not generations (2). This urgency raises a crucial question: are there mechanisms that could accelerate the spread of transformative behavioural change to reshape systems fast enough? Potential pathways include leveraging social contagion and norm change, where the visible adoption of radical behaviours by committed minorities (e.g., flight refusal, plant-based diets, degrowth practices, post-growth business approaches) influences broader populations (41). Another is policy design that aligns systemic incentives with individual transformation, such as restructuring markets to make low-carbon choices the default and high-carbon practices less viable (6, 42). Since many people in contemporary society exhibit a relatively high transformative utopian impulse (i.e., the propensity to envision and act towards radically better futures), as Basso and Krpan (4) showed, it could be argued that conditions are fertile for transformative behavioural change to spread across society.

Research on social tipping points suggests that systemic transformation could, in some cases, occur rapidly (43, 44). For example, threshold models of collective behaviour (45) indicate that when a critical minority adopts a new behaviour, it can cascade through social networks and rapidly become the norm. Empirical support for this possibility comes from studies showing that, in a controlled social coordination task, a committed minority comprising roughly 25% of a group could shift the behaviour of the majority (40). For example, in some of these experiments, participants first settled on using the same name for an image, creating a shared group norm. Researchers then introduced a committed minority who consistently used a different name; when this minority reached roughly 25% of the group, the alternative name spread to the majority (40). However, this threshold should not be treated as universal, since the experiments focused on a specific form of social coordination and such tipping points are likely to vary across domains, behaviours and circumstances. Nevertheless, the findings are useful because they show that, under some conditions, committed minorities can alter wider group behaviour. Applied to sustainability, this suggests that transformative behavioural change among a relatively small but committed minority could create momentum for broader systemic change, provided that their actions are visible and socially influential. Such insights highlight the importance of understanding not only how individuals transform their own behaviour, but also how these changes interact with social dynamics to reach critical thresholds that can reconfigure whole systems. Therefore, whilst widespread participation is ultimately necessary, targeted acceleration of transformative change through minority influence may be one of the most realistic pathways to achieving systemic transformation within the narrow timeframe available to address the climate crisis.

A complementary perspective that further clarifies how individual and systemic transformation intersect in everyday life is the social practice theory (46–50). Rather than locating change primarily in individual attitudes or in abstract systems, this body of work conceptualises social practices, understood as routinised configurations of materials, meanings, and competences, as the basic unit of social reproduction and transformation. From this perspective, behaviours such as driving, flying, or consuming meat are not simply individual choices but outcomes of historically embedded practices sustained by infrastructures, cultural meanings, and tacit skills. Transformation, therefore, does not typically occur because individuals decide to 'behave better', but because the elements that hold practices together are reconfigured. This helps explain why transformative behavioural change is often experienced as being drawn into new ways of living rather than chosen in isolation, and why redesigning infrastructures and meanings is central to enabling transformation at scale.

A psychosocial perspective can further deepen understanding by highlighting the emotionally defensive dimensions of resistance to transformation (28, 29, 51–53). Everyday routines provide forms of ontological security that protect individuals and societies from existential anxiety. The climate and ecological crises threaten this security, often provoking socially organised denial, disavowal, and discourses of delay rather than engagement. These responses are not merely individual but are culturally and institutionally patterned, allowing societies to maintain a sense of normality whilst postponing transformation. From this perspective, transformative behavioural change involves not only altering practices or incentives, but developing collective capacities to tolerate uncertainty, loss, and conflict. Social movements, communities, and institutions that can contain such anxieties may therefore play a crucial enabling role in supporting transformation rather than paralysis.

DOI: 10.31389/lseppr.171

4. TRANSFORMATIVE BEHAVIOURAL CHANGE AND PUBLIC POLICY

Whether and how transformative behavioural change can be incorporated into public policy remains an open question. On the one hand, such a change is highly demanding, as it requires individuals to fundamentally alter their ways of living rather than make incremental adjustments. On the other hand, public policy is typically developed and implemented by the very systems that transformative change seeks to challenge. Governments often prioritise stability, economic growth, and political feasibility, which makes radical interventions difficult to enact (54–56). Moreover, policies are constrained by vested interests, lobbying power, and the inertia of existing institutions, all of which tend to preserve the status quo (54, 57). These factors raise doubts about whether transformative behavioural change can be meaningfully integrated into policy agendas.

Nevertheless, there may be important opportunities. Indeed, history shows that governments can and do intervene radically in times of crises. For example, wartime economies or the COVID-19 pandemic revealed that states are capable of rapidly reshaping markets, mandating lifestyle changes, and mobilising resources at unprecedented scales when survival is at stake (38). The challenge is to recognise the climate and ecological crises as similarly urgent and existential, thereby legitimising interventions that might otherwise seem politically unthinkable. Recent research (58, 59) actually shows that people's support for radical economic approaches, such as degrowth, as well as for associated policies, is high. Therefore, public opinion is not a legitimate obstacle to introducing policies that could aid transformative behavioural change, but could even be engaged in pursuit of such policies.

In addition to legitimising radical interventions, public policy can also leverage the dynamics of social tipping points. By amplifying the visibility of transformative initiatives, such as car-free cities, frequent flyer levies, or cooperative housing models, policies can accelerate their diffusion into mainstream culture. Incentive structures, such as taxation on high-carbon goods combined with subsidies for sustainable alternatives, can further align personal transformation with systemic objectives. Importantly, such measures do not force transformative change on all individuals simultaneously but create fertile ground for committed minorities to influence wider populations. Policy can act as a catalyst that bridges individual transformation and systemic change.

Finally, transformative behavioural change has a normative dimension that is crucial for policy debates. In other words, it raises questions about the values and goals that should guide society. For example, it challenges the assumption that human well-being is best served by material growth and consumerism, instead promoting visions of sufficiency, equity, and flourishing within planetary boundaries (4, 42, 60, 61). Whilst difficult to implement, such a paradigm shift may be vital. Without transformative behavioural change at scale, humanity is unlikely to escape its most pressing existential threats, from climate collapse to potential negative impacts of AI and other technological disruptions on jobs and employment. The question, therefore, is not whether public policy should engage with transformative change, but how it can best do so, acknowledging both the limits of existing systems and the urgent need for radical transformation.

5. ENVISIONING SCENARIOS OF TRANSFORMATIVE BEHAVIOURAL CHANGE TO PREVENT CATASTROPHIC CONSEQUENCES

The concept of the transformative utopian impulse that is closely linked to transformative behavioural change highlights the importance of imagination in social transformation, recognising that before systems change, individuals and communities must first be able to imagine alternatives (4). Envisioning possible futures where transformative behavioural change takes hold can help us identify opportunities and pathways for averting catastrophic consequences, even if such futures may currently seem improbable and difficult to implement. After all, many practices that are now seen as unremarkable were once utopian ideas, from the universal right to vote and equal rights for women and minorities all the way to the abolition of slavery and the establishment of universal education.

DOI: 10.31389/lseppr.171

Recent work in participatory and speculative futures research suggests that imagination itself can be cultivated as a social practice rather than treated solely as an abstract individual capacity (62–66). From this perspective, imagination becomes a collective process that can be actively pursued and supported through social and institutional arrangements. Participatory speculative approaches invite people to collaboratively explore counterfactual or alternative futures through methods such as storytelling, design-based inquiry, and scenario-building, enabling participants to engage with transformation experientially rather than only at the level of description (64, 65, 67, 68). Such approaches have been used to support governance innovation, policy experimentation, and democratic engagement by allowing individuals and groups to rehearse different ways of organising social life. For example, citizens' climate assemblies can bring together diverse members of the public to deliberate on low-carbon futures and develop recommendations for climate policy, whilst participatory scenario workshops can help communities explore possible local transitions and identify potential pathways for action. In this sense, the transformative utopian impulse can be understood not only as an individual disposition, but as something that can be seeded, sustained, and studied through collective processes that expand the perceived horizon of possibility.

One potential scenario of transformative behavioural change to prevent the catastrophic consequences of climate change and rising wealth inequalities is a degrowth society. Such a society would be grounded in a planned and democratic reduction of unnecessary production and consumption in high-income countries, whilst ensuring universal access to essential goods and services (42, 69–72). In such a society, the economy is reoriented away from consumerism and GDP growth towards sufficiency, equity, and ecological integrity. For individuals, this would require transformative behavioural change in the form of adopting less resource-intensive lifestyles, such as plant-based diets, reduced consumption, and shared ownership, embedded within broader systemic reforms. Policies such as reducing working time, redistributing wealth and resources, strengthening universal public services, and guaranteeing green jobs would enable people to thrive whilst using fewer resources (42, 73). This pathway requires both individuals and institutions to fundamentally reconfigure their relationship with material wealth and to embrace new forms of wellbeing within planetary boundaries.

Another potential scenario envisions a society in which individuals have high levels of psychological self-sufficiency, which ensures harmonious societies without conflict and with little need for carbon-intensive activities. I use the term psychological self-sufficiency to describe people's ability to lead a fulfilling and satisfying life whilst requiring little in terms of material, social, or sensory input from the external environment and from others, building on my work on external input (74). In such a society, people's main goal and source of satisfaction would be working on their own ideas and visions, without externally materialising or realising them. For example, a person may spend years developing a novel, composing music, or exploring a scientific idea, finding fulfilment in the creative process itself rather than in external recognition or material success. Others may dedicate themselves to meditation, philosophical reflection, or artistic practice, deriving meaning from inner development rather than from consumption or accumulation. People would still help each other and contribute to the common good, but without being dependent on each other for their mental health and psychological wellbeing. In other words, they would interact and communicate with others whilst not needing them to be happy or to maintain any other optimal psychological state they value (if different from happiness). Such a society would, by default, avoid many of the problems we face today. Wealth inequality would be low, since people would not be motivated to amass excessive material resources, seek power, or pursue luxury lifestyles. Environmental impact would also be low because people's main pursuits would not be tied to high-carbon activities. In such a society, psychological self-sufficiency means that fulfilment and satisfaction come primarily from within rather than from external sources, allowing people to coexist without generating the kinds of systemic problems (e.g., inequality and climate change) that humans have largely created for each other.

Finally, one can envision a technologically enabled sufficiency economy. Whilst many commentators see technology as a substitute for behavioural change (75), in this scenario, technology amplifies transformative change. Digital tools facilitate resource sharing at scale, from energy cooperatives to mobility services. Individuals fundamentally change their relationship with technology: rather than using it for endless consumption, they adopt it to

DOI: 10.31389/lseppr.171

optimise ecological efficiency and democratic participation. Crucially, this scenario relies not only on technological advances but on radical changes in human behaviour and values, steering innovation towards sufficiency rather than accumulation.

These scenarios are deliberately radical, but they serve a critical function: they expand the horizon of possibility. The transformative utopian impulse is not about predicting which future will unfold, but about demonstrating that different futures are possible (4). By imagining concrete pathways where transformative behavioural change reshapes society, we open space for collective agency, political creativity, and cultural experimentation (62, 63). The choice before us is whether to allow catastrophic consequences to dictate our transformation, or to use our unique human capacity for foresight and imagination to deliberately choose and shape a sustainable and equitable future.

6. CONCLUSION

The central question explored in this article is whether humanity is capable of transformative behavioural change at the scale and speed necessary to address its most pressing existential challenges. Unlike incremental changes in people's actions, transformative behavioural change entails radical reorientation of one's way of living, encompassing shifts in values, identity and daily practices. Such change is demanding, but history and contemporary examples demonstrate that individuals and small groups have undertaken transformations of this kind, sometimes sparking wider systemic change.

A key issue is the relationship between individual transformation and systemic transformation. Whilst systemic change is often presented as distinct from or opposed to individual responsibility, the two are deeply interconnected. Systems are composed of individuals, including both elites with disproportionate power and ordinary people whose collective practices sustain economic and political orders. Transformative change among either group, if sufficiently widespread or influential, has the potential to destabilise and redirect systemic trajectories. Insights from research on social tipping points and minority influence suggest that even relatively small groups can catalyse cascades of change when their actions shift social norms and practices.

Public policy plays an ambivalent but crucial role. Policies are produced within the very systems that transformative change seeks to alter and are therefore constrained by institutional inertia and vested interests. However, history shows that governments are capable of rapid and radical intervention in moments of crisis, and the climate and ecological emergencies, as well as the rapidly increasing wealth inequalities, demand recognition as crises of this order. Policy interventions can create enabling environments for individual transformation by redesigning and re-envisioning infrastructures, incentives, and cultural narratives, thereby aligning personal change with systemic objectives.

Looking ahead, the transformative utopian impulse reminds us that envisioning radically better futures is not an indulgence but a necessity. Imagining societies that transcend consumerism, embrace sufficiency, and prioritise equity and planetary health opens conceptual space for action. Scenarios ranging from degrowth economies to psychologically self-sufficient societies and technology-enabled sufficiency economies highlight that different futures are possible if transformative behavioural change becomes widespread enough to reshape and reorganise social systems.

Whether humanity can achieve such transformation before catastrophic consequences unfold remains uncertain. What is clear, however, is that incrementalism will not suffice. The climate crisis, ecological degradation, and rising inequalities demand a fundamental rethinking of how we live. Transformative behavioural change offers both a challenge and an opportunity: a challenge because it requires unprecedented shifts in identity and practice, and an opportunity because it may be the only pathway capable of averting existential risks. The urgency of the present moment calls for nothing less than the deliberate pursuit of such transformation.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The author has no competing interests to declare.

AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS

Dario Krpan orcid.org/0000-0002-3420-4672
Department of Psychological and Behavioural Science, London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street, London, WC2A 2AE, United Kingdom

REFERENCES

1. **Chancel L, Piketty T, Saez E, Zucman G.** *World inequality report 2022*. Harvard University Press; 2022.
2. **Lee H, Romero J.** *Climate change 2023: synthesis report* [Internet]. Geneva, Switzerland: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC); 2023. pp. 35–115. DOI: https://doi.org/10.59327/IPCC/AR6-9789291691647
3. **Xiao A, Xu Z, Skare M, Qin Y, Wang X.** Bridging the digital divide: the impact of technological innovation on income inequality and human interactions. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun*. 2024;11(1):809. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03307-8
4. **Basso F, Krpan D.** Measuring the transformative utopian impulse for planetary health in the age of the Anthropocene: a multi-study scale development and validation. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2022;6(3):e230–e242. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(22)00004-3
5. **Krpan D.** Agenda for psychological and behavioural science of transformative behavioural change. *Behav Public Policy*. 2024;1–26. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2024.30
6. **Whitmarsh L, Hampton S.** Are radical changes to lifestyles necessary for mitigating climate change? *Dialogues on Climate Change*. 2024;29768659241293215. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/29768659241293215
7. **Buch-Hansen H, Nesterova I.** Less and more: conceptualising degrowth transformations. *Ecol Econ*. 2023;205:107731. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2022.107731
8. **Henderson GM.** Transformative learning as a condition for transformational change in organizations. *Hum Resour Dev Rev*. 2002;1(2):186–214. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/15384302001002004
9. **Miller WR, C'de Baca J.** *Quantum change: when epiphanies and sudden insights transform ordinary lives*. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press; 2001. xii, 212 p.
10. **Nielsen KS, Clayton S, Stern PC, Dietz T, Capstick S, Whitmarsh L.** How psychology can help limit climate change. *Am Psychol*. 2021;76(1):130–144. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000624
11. **Wright T.** *Paul: A biography*. London, UK: SPCK Publishing; 2018.
12. **Augustine S.** *Confessions* [Internet]. London, UK: Penguin; 2003 [cited 2025 Oct 9]. Available from: https://www.penguin.co.uk/books/34771/confessions-by-augustine-saint/9780141396897
13. **Chesterton GK.** *Saint Francis of Assisi*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers; 2008.
14. **Thomas EJ.** *The life of Buddha*. London, UK: Routledge; 1996.
15. **Malcolm X, Haley A.** *The autobiography of Malcolm X* [Internet]. London, UK: Penguin; 2001 [cited 2025 Oct 9]. Available from: https://www.penguin.co.uk/books/57282/the-autobiography-of-malcolm-x-by-malcolm-x-with-the-assistance-of-alex-haley-introduction-by-paul-gilroy/9780141185439
16. **Hague W.** *William Wilberforce: the life of the great anti-slave trade campaigner*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt; 2007.
17. **Hochschild A.** *Bury the chains: prophets and rebels in the fight to free an empire's slaves*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt; 2005.
18. **Morris AD.** *The origins of the civil rights movement*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster; 1986.
19. **Ivanova D, Barrett J, Wiedenhofer D, Macura B, Callaghan M, Creutzig F.** Quantifying the potential for climate change mitigation of consumption options. *Environ Res Lett*. 2020;15(9):093001. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab8589
20. **Jayawickreme E, Blackie LER.** Post–traumatic growth as positive personality change: evidence, controversies and future directions. *Eur J Pers*. 2014;28(4):312–331. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/per.1963
21. **Tedeschi RG, Calhoun LG.** Posttraumatic growth: conceptual foundations and empirical evidence. *Psychol Inq*. 2004;15(1):1–18. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1501_01
22. **Hunt HT.** Experiences of radical personal transformation in mysticism, religious conversion, and psychosis: a review of the varieties, processes, and consequences of the numinous. *J Mind Behav*. 2000;21(4):353–397.
23. **Yaden DB, Haidt J, Hood RW, Vago DR, Newberg AB.** The varieties of self-transcendent experience. *Rev Gen Psychol*. 2017;21(2):143–160. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000102
24. **Bauer JJ, McAdams DP.** Personal growth in adults' stories of life transitions. *Journal of Personality*. 2004;72(3):573–602. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00273.x
25. **Bien TH.** Quantum change and psychotherapy. *J Clin Psychol*. 2004;60(5):493–501. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20003
26. **Miller WR.** The phenomenon of quantum change. *J Clin Psychol*. 2004;60(5):453–460. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20000

27. **Luhmann M, Fassbender I, Alcock M, Haehner P.** A dimensional taxonomy of perceived characteristics of major life events. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2021;121(3):633–668. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000291
28. **Adams M.** *Ecological crisis, sustainability and the psychosocial subject: beyond behaviour change*. London, UK: Springer; 2016. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-35160-9
29. **Adams M.** Critical psychologies and climate change. *Curr Opin Psychol*. 2021;42:13–18. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.01.007
30. **Chater N, Loewenstein G.** The i-frame and the s-frame: how focusing on individual-level solutions has led behavioral public policy astray. *Behav Brain Sci*. 2023;46:e147. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X22002023
31. **Maniates MF.** Individualization: plant a tree, buy a bike, save the world? *Glob Environ Politics*. 2001;1(3):31–52. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/152638001316881395
32. **Gunderson L, Holling C.** *Panarchy: understanding transformations in human and natural systems*. Island Press; 2002. xxiv +507 pp.
33. **Holling CS.** Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst*. 1973;4:1–23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245
34. **Prigogine I, Stengers I.** *Order out of chaos: man's new dialogue with nature*. London, UK: Verso Books; 2018.
35. **Chancel L.** Global carbon inequality over 1990–2019. *Nat Sustain*. 2022;5(11):931–938. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-022-00955-z
36. **Schöngart S, Nicholls Z, Hoffmann R, Pelz S, Schleussner CF.** High-income groups disproportionately contribute to climate extremes worldwide. *Nat Clim Change*. 2025;15(6):627–633. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-025-02325-x
37. **Hinton J.** Five key dimensions of post-growth business: Putting the pieces together. *Futures*. 2021;131:102761. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102761
38. **Tooze A.** *Shutdown: How Covid shook the world's economy*. London, UK: Penguin; 2021.
39. **Stark R.** *The rise of Christianity: a sociologist reconsiders history* [Internet]. New Jersey, US: Princeton; 1996 [cited 2025 Oct 7]. Available from: https://press.princeton.edu/books/hardcover/9780691027494/the-rise-of-christianity
40. **Centola D, Becker J, Brackbill D, Baronchelli A.** Experimental evidence for tipping points in social convention. *Science*. 2018;360(6393):1116–1119. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aas8827
41. **Nyborg K, Anderies JM, Dannenberg A, Lindahl T, Schill C, Schlüter M,** et al. Social norms as solutions. *Science*. 2016;354(6308):42–43. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf8317
42. **Kallis G, Hickel J, O'Neill DW, Jackson T, Victor PA, Raworth K,** et al. Post-growth: the science of wellbeing within planetary boundaries. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2025;9(1):e62–78. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(24)00310-3
43. **Moser SC, Dilling L.** Toward the social tipping point: creating a climate for change. In: Moser SC, Dilling L, editors. *Creating a Climate for Change: Communicating Climate Change and Facilitating Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2007. pp. 491–516. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511535871.035
44. **Otto IM, Donges JF, Cremades R, Bhowmik A, Hewitt RJ, Lucht W,** et al. Social tipping dynamics for stabilizing Earth's climate by 2050. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2020;117(5):2354–2365. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1900577117
45. **Granovetter M.** Threshold models of collective behavior. *Am J Sociol*. 1978;83(6):1420–1443. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1086/226707
46. **Shove E.** Beyond the ABC: climate change policy and theories of social change. *Environ Plan A*. 2010;42(6):1273–1285. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1068/a42282
47. **Shove E, Pantzar M, Watson M.** *The dynamics of social practice: everyday life and how it changes* [Internet]. London, UK: Sage; 2025 [cited 2026 Jan 5]. Available from: https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/the-dynamics-of-social-practice/book235021
48. **Hargreaves T.** Practice-ing behaviour change: applying social practice theory to pro-environmental behaviour change. *J Consum Cult*. 2011;11(1):79–99. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540510390500
49. **Geels FW.** Regime resistance against low-carbon transitions: introducing politics and power into the multi-level perspective. *Theory Cult Soc*. 2014;31(5):21–40. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276414531627
50. **Murphy R.** What is undermining climate change mitigation? How fossil-fuelled practices challenge low-carbon transitions. *Energy Res Soc Sci*. 2024;108:103390. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.103390
51. **Giddens A.** *Modernity and self-identity: self and society in the late modern age* [Internet]. Stanford University Press; 1991 [cited 2026 Jan 5]. Available from: https://www.sup.org/books/sociology/modernity-and-self-identity

52. **Norgaard K.** *Living in denial: climate change, emotions, and everyday life*. Boston, MA: MIT Press; 2011. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262015448.001.0001
53. **Cohen S.** *States of denial: knowing about atrocities and suffering*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press; 2001.
54. **McConnell A, 't Hart P.** Inaction and public policy: understanding why policymakers 'do nothing'. *Policy Sci*. 2019;52(4):645–661. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-019-09362-2
55. **Pierson P.** Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics. *Am Political Sci Rev*. 2000;94(2):251–267. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/2586011
56. **Schmelzer M.** 'Without growth, everything is nothing': on the origins of growthism. In: Eastwood L, Heron K, editors. *De Gruyter handbook of degrowth*. De Gruyter; 2024. pp. 25–40. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110778359-004
57. **Baumgartner FR, Berry JM, Hojnacki M, Leech BL, Kimball DC.** *Lobbying and policy change: who wins, who loses, and why*. Chicago, Illinois, USA: University of Chicago Press; 2009. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226039466.001.0001
58. **Andre P, Boneva T, Chopra F, Falk A.** Globally representative evidence on the actual and perceived support for climate action. *Nat Clim Change*. 2024;14(3):253–259. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-024-01925-3
59. **Krpan D, Basso F, Hickel J, Kallis G.** Assessing public support for degrowth: survey-based experimental and predictive studies. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2025;9(11). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanplh.2025.101326
60. **Raworth K.** A Doughnut for the Anthropocene: humanity's compass in the 21st century. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2017;1(2):e48–e49. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(17)30028-1
61. **Savini F.** Post-growth, degrowth, the doughnut, and circular economy: a short guide for policymakers. *JCCPE*. 2024;2(2):113–123. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3138/jccpe-2023-0004
62. **Kallis G, March H.** Imaginaries of hope: the utopianism of degrowth. *Ann Am Assoc Geogr*. 2015;105(2):360–368. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2014.973803
63. **Adams M.** Communicating vegan utopias: the counterfactual construction of human-animal futures. *Environ Commun*. 2022;16(1):125–138. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2021.1969977
64. **Light A.** Collaborative speculation: anticipation, inclusion and designing counterfactual futures for appropriation. *Futures*. 2021;134. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102855
65. **Dunne A, Raby F.** *Speculative everything* [Internet]. Boston, MA: MIT Press; 2013 [cited 2026 Jan 5]. Available from: https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262019842/speculative-everything/
66. **Poli R.** *Introduction to anticipation studies*. 1st edn. Vol. 1. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2017. 1 p. (Anticipation Science). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63023-6
67. **Cornish F, Breton N, Moreno-Tabarez U, Delgado J, Rua M, de-Graft Aikins A,** et al. Participatory action research. *Nat Rev Methods Primers*. 2023;3(1):34. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/s43586-023-00214-1
68. **Chopra S, Clarke RE, Clear AK, Heitlinger S, Dilaver O, Vasiliou C.** Negotiating sustainable futures in communities through participatory speculative design and experiments in living. In: *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* [Internet]. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2022. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3501929
69. **Demaria F, Schneider F, Sekulova F, Martinez-Alier J.** What is degrowth? From an activist slogan to a social movement. *Environ Values*. 2013;22(2):191–215. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3197/096327113X13581561725194
70. **Hickel J, Kallis G, Jackson T, O'Neill DW, Schor JB, Steinberger JK,** et al. Degrowth can work — here's how science can help. *Nature*. 2022;612(7940):400–403. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-04412-x
71. **Kallis G, Kostakis V, Lange S, Muraca B, Paulson S, Schmelzer M.** Research on degrowth. *Annu Rev Environ Resour*. 2018;43(1):291–316. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-102017-025941
72. **Krpan D, Basso F, O'Dell D, Hickel JE, Kallis G.** A call for psychological and behavioural science on degrowth. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2025;9:1513–1518. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-025-02211-8
73. **Fitzpatrick N, Parrique T, Cosme I.** Exploring degrowth policy proposals: a systematic mapping with thematic synthesis. *J Clean Prod*. 2022;365:132764. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.132764
74. **Krpan D.** Exploring the need for external input through the prism of social, material and sensation seeking input. *R Soc Open Sci*. 2022;9(5):211373. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.211373
75. **Cahoy DR.** *The Techno-Optimist Case for Addressing Sustainability and its Grounding in Capitalist (Market) Incentives* [SSRN Scholarly Paper] [Internet]. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network; 2023 [cited 2025 Oct 10]. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4317805

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:
Krpan D. Transformative Behavioural Change: Can Radical Shifts in Human Action Prevent Catastrophic Global Crises? *LSE Public Policy Review*. 2026; 4(3): 8, pp. 1–11. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31389/lseppr.171

Submitted: 22 January 2026
Accepted: 14 July 2026
Published: 05 November 2026

COPYRIGHT:
© 2026 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. See https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

LSE Public Policy Review is a peer-reviewed open access journal published by LSE Press.