MSI Journal of
Economics and Business Management (MSIJEBM)

The Future of Behavioral Economics and AI in Sustainable Development

Durgeshwary Kolhe[1*], Arshad Bhat[2]

[1*]Student, Master of Science in Clinical Psychology, School of Vedic Sciences, MIT -ADT University, Pune, Maharashtra, India.

[2]Assistant Professor, Amity Institute of Liberal Arts, Amity University Mumbai, Maharashtra, India.

*** Correspondence:** Durgeshwary Kolhe

The authors declare that no funding was received for this work.

OPEN ACCESS

Received: 01-January-2025
Accepted: 28-February-2026
Published: 03-March-2026

This article is published in the **MSI Journal of Economics and Business Management (MSIJEBM)**

ISSN 3049-141X (Online).

The journal is managed and published by MSI Publishers.

Volume 3, Issue 3 (March-2026)

ABSTRACT: This study examines how behavioral economics and artificial intelligence can be used together to address the problem of sustainable development with a transformative potential. Combining the knowledge of human decision-making and the predictive and analytical abilities of AI, other approaches to developing effective interventions that facilitate sustainable practices in the realms of personality, organization, and policy were proposed. The study addresses the question on how AI-based systems can enhance behavior nudges, maximize economic incentives and overcome cognitive biases that hinder sustainable decision-making. This is based on the use of case studies and theoretical models, emphasis on ethical aspects, limitations on implementation, and the future of this multidisciplinary field. This analysis demonstrates that such a combination can accelerate the progress of achievement of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals as well as offer equitable and clear solutions that respect human autonomy.

Keywords: *Behavioral economics, artificial intelligence, sustainable development, predictive modeling, cognitive biases, green consumption, environmental decision-making, SDGs.*

1. Introduction: The Intersection of Behavioral Economics, AI, and Sustainability

Behavioral economics emerged as a new field that challenged the economic dogma that individuals were all rational agents that optimized utility. Instead, this discipline recognizes the role of the individual as one of limited rationality, as one makes decisions within mental constraints and within similar biases which often lead to outcomes that are less-than-optimal. Behavioral economics was introduced by psychologists Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky in the 1970s and introduced the prospect theory that demonstrated that people evaluate potential losses and gains inequitably, tending to feel the pain of losses more than the pleasure of comparable gains (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). It is also based on this foundational work that has since evolved into a full-fledged framework that has taken into consideration concepts like choice architecture and nudging, discreet interventions that lead decision-making while preserving freedom of choice (Thaler and Sunstein, 2008). Meanwhile, the AI has become a strong concept that exists in the reality as powerful systems changing the world. AI offers unprecedented optimization, predicting and mass-behavior changing possibilities in the context of sustainability. Machine learning models can be trained to process large data sets and identify trends that are not easily identified by human analysts, and a reinforcement learning system can continuously improve the allocation of resources in complex systems (Vinuesa et al., 2020). AI technologies promote the instant monitoring of the environmental state, personalized treatment to promote sustainable behaviors, and better resource utilization in different industries, such as energy and agriculture (Nishant et al., 2020). The essential contribution of these skills to our approach to sustainability issues is that they will provide us with not only the analytical power to understand complex systems but also means of intervention to influence them in a favorable manner.

Behavioral economics and AI together represent a comparatively strong system of addressing the sustainability problem. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that the United Nations has established reflect the collective will of humanity towards economic development that meets its current needs but does not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their needs (United Nations, 2015). Nevertheless, the progress towards these aims has been erratic and insufficient as sustainable development requires concerted changes in the behavior of billions of people, organizations, and governments on the global scale. It is at this point that both behavioral economics and AI can work together: behavioral knowledge can help understand the reasons behind why people do not make sustainable decisions even when they say they would prefer them, whereas AI can provide the technological platform to develop, implement, and scale interventions to overcome these preferences (Cowls et al., 2021). There are three big opportunities of the collaboration between these areas. First, the specific targeting supports custom-made interventions that will address the specific behavioral barriers experienced by different groups. Secondly, scalability enables solutions to reach global audiences through the digital platforms and smart infrastructure. Third, continuous learning systems can alter interventions according to instantaneous responses concerning their efficiency (Vinuesa et al., 2020). As an example, smart energy meters that use AI algorithms can examine the habits of the household consumption and give feedback regarding the behavior that will drastically reduce energy consumption in relation to the standard conservation messages (Allcott and Mullainathan, 2010). The need of such a cohesive approach is emphasized by climate change. Despite a good scientific consensus on the risks of climate change, individuals and institutions continue to engage in carbon intensive behaviours due to the presence of present bias (chasing short term gains at the expense of potential future costs), status quo bias (liking things the way they are over better ways), and collective action problems (Gifford, 2011). AI-based solutions can help to overcome these challenges by converting abstract climate impacts into physical visualisations that can be tailored to each person, making low-carbon alternatives straightforward to reduce opposition, and decentralized renewable energy networks that can make sustainable options the new default (Victor et al., 2019).

Sustainable consumption systems, likewise, remain elusive despite the growing awareness of the environment. Behavioral economics reveals the tendency of choice environments to encourage unsustainable choices in terms of placement, default settings, and information presentation (Johnson et al., 2012). AI systems have the potential to rebuild these choice environments at scale, including by dynamically altering the interface of e-commerce platforms to showcase a product with fewer environmental consequences or prioritizing recommendations based on the preferences of the user and sustainability criteria Gossen and Lell (2023). The rationale behind the combination of these approaches is even more robust as the problems of sustainability become more serious. Traditional policy tools like control and tax are very important but not sufficient. They often face a challenge of political opposition and even implementation problems, particularly in developing countries where institutional capacity may be limited (Stern, 2015). Behavior-informed, AI-powered interventions are another set of strategies that operates through market systems, requires limited regulatory oversight, and adapts to local conditions (Cowls et al., 2021). Also, with the increasing impact of climate change and increasing pressure on planetary constraints, the speed and scaleability of AI solutions become increasingly necessary (Rockström et al., 2009). Although the Anthropocene is a complex problem in need of complex solutions, this holistic approach would offer not just technological resolutions but also a new paradigm of understanding and influencing the complex systems of human activities that eventually define our common future (Bai et al., 2016).

2. Understanding Behavioral Economics in the Context of Sustainability

Behavioral economics was a new direction that undermined the economic dogma of a rational agent in the theorists that maximized utility. Rather, this field acknowledges the importance of the individual as one of limited rationality, as he/she makes decisions under the mental restrictions and under similar biases that frequently result in less-than-optimal outcomes. The publication of the prospect theory by psychologists Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky in the 1970s triggered behavioral economics because it established the unfairness with which people assess potential losses and gains and preferred to experience an equivalent loss more than to experience an equivalent gain (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). It is also founded on this foundational work which has later evolved to a full-fledged framework which has considered concepts such as choice architecture and nudging, discrete interventions that dictate decision-making without limiting the freedom of choice (Thaler and Sunstein, 2008). In the meantime, the AI has gained the status of a potent concept that is present in the reality as the powerful systems transforming the world. The AI can provide unprecedented optimization, forecasting and changing en masse behavior opportunities in the light of sustainability. Machine learning models can be trained to work with large data sets and determine trends that cannot be easily determined by human analysts, and a reinforcement learning system can keep on improving the resource distribution in complex systems (Vinuesa et al., 2020). AI technologies facilitate immediate observation of the environmental condition, individual treatment to encourage sustainable behaviours, and increased resource use across various sectors, including energy and agriculture (Nishant et al., 2020). The key role that these skills will play in our approach to sustainability issues is that they will not only offer us the analytical capability to comprehend complex systems but also ways of intervention to affect them in a positive way.

The combination of behavioral economics and AI is a relatively robust framework of handling the sustainability issue. The SDGs laid down by the United Nations represent the general desire of the human race to achieve the economic growth that will satisfy their current needs but will not jeopardize future generations in fulfilling their needs (United Nations, 2015). However, the actions towards these goals have been inconsistent and inadequate because sustainable development demands concerted maneuvers in the conduct of billions of individuals, organizations and governments at the planetary level. At this stage, both behavioral economics and AI can collaborate, as behavioral information can be used to comprehend why individuals fail to make sustainable choices despite claiming that they would choose them, and AI can offer the technological environment to create, execute, and expand interventions to address these preferences (Cowls et al., 2021). The collaboration between these areas has three major opportunities. First, the narrowed down targeting will help in tailored interventions that will help in the targeted behavioral blocks as felt by the various groups. Secondly, scalability allows solutions to access audiences in the global context using the digital platforms and intelligent infrastructure. Third, continuous learning systems can modify interventions based on immediate feedback about its efficacy (Vinuesa et al., 2020). The smart energy meters which utilize AI algorithms can analyze the behavior of the household consumption and provide feedback about the behavior that will significantly lower energy consumption as compared to the usual conservation messages as an example (Allcott and Mullainathan, 2010). Climate change is an amplifying factor on the necessity of such a cohesive approach. Although there is a reasonable scientific consensus regarding the dangers of climate change, people and organizations still practice carbon intensive behaviours because of the existence of present bias (pursuing short term benefits or betterment than a potential cost), status quo bias (preferring things as they are to the way they could be) and collective action problems (Gifford, 2011). These issues can be resolved with the help of AI-based solutions to transform abstract climate effects into physical visualisations that can be customized to individual requirements, make low-carbon alternatives easy to minimise resistance, and decentralized renewable power networks that can transform sustainable options into the new default (Victor et al., 2019).

Sustainable consumption systems, in their turn, are yet to be brought on board in the wake of increased awareness of the environment. Behavioral economics unveils how the environment of choice is likely to promote unsustainable decisions in relation to placement, default settings, and presentation of information (Johnson et al., 2012). At scale, AI systems can reconstruct such choice environments, such as by dynamically changing the interface of an e-commerce platform to display a product with fewer environmental impacts or preferential suggestions by the user preferences as well as sustainability requirements Gossen and Lell (2023). The argument that led to the creation of these two approaches is even stronger as the issue of sustainability is becoming more critical. There are traditional policy instruments such as control and tax that are extremely essential but not adequate. They tend to have an issue of political resistance and even implementation issues especially in developing countries where infrastructural power may be weak (Stern, 2015). Another group of strategies that utilizes behavior-informed AI-powered interventions is based on market systems and does not need strict regulatory control, adapting to the characteristics of local conditions (Cowls et al., 2021). In addition to this, as the effects of climate change and the growing stress on planetary limitations grow, the pace and sizeability of AI solutions will be needed more and more (Rockström et al., 2009). Even though the Anthropocene is a multifaceted issue that requires multifaceted solutions, the holistic thinking approach would provide not only technological solutions but also a new paradigm of relationships with the multifaceted systems of human practices that ultimately shape our common future (Bai et al., 2016).

3. Artificial Intelligence and Behavioral Insights in Sustainability

Behavioral economics was a new direction that undermined the economic dogma of a rational agent in the theorists that maximized utility. Rather, this field acknowledges the importance of the individual as one of limited rationality, as he/she makes decisions under the mental restrictions and under similar biases that frequently result in less-than-optimal outcomes. The publication of the prospect theory by psychologists Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky in the 1970s triggered behavioral economics because it established the unfairness with which people assess potential losses and gains and preferred to experience an equivalent loss more than to experience an equivalent gain (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). It is also founded on this foundational work which has later evolved to a full-fledged framework which has considered concepts such as choice architecture and nudging, discrete interventions that dictate decision-making without limiting the freedom of choice (Thaler and Sunstein, 2008). In the meantime, the AI has gained the status of a potent concept that is present in the reality as the powerful systems transforming the world. Machine learning models can be trained to work with large data sets and determine trends that cannot be easily determined by human analysts, and a reinforcement learning system can keep on improving the resource distribution in complex systems (Vinuesa et al., 2020). AI technologies facilitate immediate observation of the environmental condition, individual treatment to encourage sustainable behaviours, and increased resource use across various sectors, including energy and agriculture (Nishant et al., 2020). The key role that these skills will play in our approach to sustainability issues is that they will not only offer us the analytical capability to comprehend complex systems but also ways of intervention to affect them in a positive way.

The combination of behavioral economics and AI is a relatively robust framework of handling the sustainability issue. The SDGs laid down by the United Nations represent the general desire of humans to achieve the economic growth that will satisfy their current needs but will not jeopardize future generations in fulfilling their needs (United Nations, 2015). However, the actions towards these goals have been inconsistent and inadequate because sustainable development demands concerted maneuvers in the conduct of billions of individuals, organizations and governments at the planetary level. At this stage, both behavioral economics and AI can collaborate, as behavioral information can be used to comprehend why individuals fail to make sustainable choices despite claiming that they would choose them, and AI can offer the technological environment to create, execute, and expand interventions to address these preferences (Cowls et al., 2021). The collaboration between these areas has three major opportunities. First, the narrowed down targeting will help in tailored interventions that will help in the targeted behavioral blocks as felt by the various groups. Secondly, scalability allows solutions to access audiences in the global context using the digital platforms and intelligent infrastructure. Third, continuous learning systems can modify interventions based on immediate feedback about its efficacy (Vinuesa et al., 2020). The smart energy meters which utilize AI algorithms can analyze the behavior of the household consumption and provide feedback about the behavior that will significantly lower energy consumption as compared to the usual conservation messages as an example (Allcott and Mullainathan, 2010). Climate change is an amplifying factor on the necessity of such a cohesive approach. Although there is a reasonable scientific consensus regarding the dangers of climate change, people and organizations still practice carbon intensive behaviours because of the existence of present bias (pursuing short term benefits or betterment than a potential cost), status quo bias (preferring things as they are to the way they could be) and collective action problems (Gifford, 2011). These issues can be resolved with the help of AI-based solutions to transform abstract climate effects into physical visualisations that can be customized to individual requirements, make low-carbon alternatives easy to minimise resistance, and decentralized renewable power networks that can transform sustainable options into the new default (Victor et al., 2019).

Sustainable consumption systems, in their turn, are yet to be brought on board in the wake of increased awareness of the environment. Behavioral economics unveils how the environment of choice is likely to promote unsustainable decisions in relation to placement, default settings, and presentation of information (Johnson et al., 2012). At scale, AI systems can reconstruct such choice environments, such as by dynamically changing the interface of an e-commerce platform to display a product with fewer environmental impacts or preferential suggestions by the user preferences as well as sustainability requirements Gossen and Lell (2023). The argument that led to the creation of these two approaches is even stronger as the issue of sustainability is becoming more critical. There are traditional policy instruments such as control and tax that are extremely essential but not adequate. They tend to have an issue of political resistance and even implementation issues especially in developing countries where infrastructural power may be weak (Stern, 2015). Another group of strategies that utilizes behavior-informed AI-powered interventions is based on market systems and does not need strict regulatory control, adapting to the characteristics of local conditions (Cowls et al., 2021). In addition to this, as the effects of climate change and the growing stress on planetary limitations grow, the pace and sizeability of AI solutions will be needed more (Rockström et al., 2009). Even though the Anthropocene is a multifaceted issue that requires multifaceted solutions, the holistic thinking approach would provide not only technological solutions but also a new paradigm of relationships with the multifaceted systems of human practices that ultimately shape our common future (Bai et al., 2016).

4. AI-Powered Nudging and Behavioral Change for Sustainable Development

Nudging has also developed significantly, with artificial intelligence already being brought into the study, which set the solid framework of promoting eco-friendly behavioral patterns. According to Thaler and Sunstein (2008), Nudging involves the use of regular patterns in the decision-making process of human beings to direct decisions without interfering with the freedom of people. Most of these interventions with AI additions can operate with unparalleled accuracy and flexibility. The theoretical framework is founded on several fundamental principles of behavior that may be applied by AI systems. The structure of decision-making environments known as architecture of choice can be optimized dynamically by machine learning algorithms to select the optimal default, information presentation formats, and decision sequence (Johnson et al., 2012). Social norm messaging is the most working when AI analytics discover the most effective reference groups to individuals based on their digital behavioral patterns and social connections (Allcott, 2011). The dislike of losses, generally having them more than the equivalent gains, can be utilized through the AI systems that show sustainability choices as avoidance of losses rather than achievement of gains, and the specific framing will be adapted to the psychological profiles of individuals (Kahneman et al., 1991). The real-time optimization and customization is what makes AI-driven nudging different as opposed to conventional methods. The traditional nudges typically involve fixed strategies depending on general behavioral knowledge, but AI systems are able to continually modify interventions based on real-time behaviors. As an example, the growth of consumer purchasing data can be analyzed using algorithms to identify the most appropriate moment to introduce the element of sustainability, when the level of psychological resistance is minimal (Hummel and Maedche, 2019). Similarly, reinforcement learning systems are also able to experiment with different message framings and identify the most effective ways to induce specific sustainability behaviors in different groups of users (Andrienko et al., 2019). Such an adaptive optimization enables so-called precision nudging by some scholars, i.e. strategies that are based on individual psychology inclinations rather than overall population standards (Caraban et al., 2019).

Convincing examples of how AI-based nudges can be effective in different fields of sustainability explain why this concept can change the world. Within the framework of energy conservation, the Nest Learning Thermostat leverages machine learning algorithms to understand the preferences and habits of the household temperature and adjusts the settings discretely to reduce usage without causing any discomfort. The field testing indicates it conserves 10-15% of energy without any perceived drop in thermal comfort and significantly exceeds the performance of conventional programmable thermostats (Yang and Newman, 2013). The effectiveness of the system is through its ability to circumvent the cognitive barriers which tend to obstruct efforts to conserve by hand like the inconvenience of computer programming, memory lapses, and the present bias of prioritizing short-term gratification over long-term gains. In the context of sustainable consumption, Amazon has launched AI-powered product recommendation systems that will be able to display eco-friendly products based on a combination of sustainability indicators and individual consumer preferences. These systems increased the purchase of sustainable items by 29 percent using behavioral nudges like making green options the default option without affecting customer satisfaction in experimental settings (Nielsen et al., 2021). It is complex in that it has the ability to identify the products that harmonize environmental benefits with the specific attributes that each consumer has appreciated over the years thereby mitigating the perceived tradeoff that often discourages green purchasing. Another place where effective implementation can be applied is transportation. The AI solutions developed by Uber and Lyft have analyzed the patterns of trips, weather conditions, and individual preferences of customers to suggest carpooling options at the most appropriate time, which increased the share of shared ride, as compared to the usual one, up to 75 percent (Cohen et al., 2020). Such systems also know that the desire to share rides will change depending on the contextual factors like time factors, weather conditions, and previous experiences, and thus the platforms can provide carpooling options when the probability of acceptance is high.

Waste reduction solutions that combine computer vision and behavioral prompts can be considered one of the most innovative. Smart bins in corporate cafeterias use AI technology to scan images of food waste and provide users with the immediate feedback on the environmental impact of their disposal and can compare the behavior of their peers. These systems in controlled studies have reduced food wastes by up to 50 percent due to their immediate sighting of the unseen effects of waste (Economou et al., 2024). Technology addresses critical behavioral barriers to less waste situations, including a lack of feedback on the total effect, and the spread of the burden between many small disposal decisions. Irrespective of these successes, the ethical factors remain central in the nudging of AI. There is a certain problem in transparency, as the algorithmic nature of these interventions may conceal the effect being implemented. Ethical norms of disclosure and consent may also be undermined by the invisibility that makes nudges even more effective (Susser et al., 2019). This is a more acute problem when machine learning systems automatically find and exploit psychological vulnerabilities that their creators themselves did not anticipate. To address such concerns, researchers at the Alan Turing Institute have developed models of so-called transparent behavioral engineering that has the property that users are informed of the existence and purpose of behavioral interventions, even when they would prefer not to (Milano et al., 2021). Similarly, the recommendations related to the implementation of reliable AI by the European Commission discuss the importance of explainability in systems that impact human behavior by requiring users to understand when and how their choices are affected (High-Level Expert Group on AI, 2019).

The issue of fairness arises when AI nudging systems demonstrate dissimilar working results across diverse demographic categories. It has been observed that systems with algorithms that are optimized on overall efficiency can tend to output systematically different results based on gender, age, socioeconomic status, or culture (Barocas et al., 2019). As an example, energy-saving prompts that rely on the smart home technology may first benefit tech-savvy, affluent households, potentially expanding sustainability inequalities (Sintov & Schultz, 2017). Such equity problems require close monitoring and correction by ensuring that there are strict fairness constraints in the creation of the algorithms and inclusive training datasets that capture diverse representations. The strategy of fairness by design that had been developed at the University of Michigan established specific measures on how the behavioral interventions can be evaluated in terms of distributional impact among the groups and make sure that the nudges do not harm the goals of environmental justice (Green, 2018). The problems of autonomy are also worth consideration. Once the AI systems get to the point that they not only can predict and influence behavior with high accuracy but also do so in a manipulative manner, they may begin to transition providing useful advice to being manipulative (Susser et al., 2019). This is a particularly dangerous risk when systems play on the psychological vulnerabilities that people are unaware of. Developing meaningful barriers requires both security and ethical principles that establish a distinction between enabling better decisions and exploitation of the psychological vulnerabilities. The theoretical distinction between the concept of means paternalism (helping people achieve their own goals more effectively) and the concept of ends paternalism (imposing external values) offers a useful application of determining these boundaries (Sunstein, 2015). Even though they have potential, AI-driven nudges are faced by major limitations that limit their efficacy. To begin with, behavioral strategies tend to have modest effects individually, as they tend to change behavior by 5-15 percent, rather than transform it completely (Hummel and Maedche, 2019). This minimal impact is partially due to the voluntary character of nudges that retain the freedom of choice and therefore allow non-compliance.

Moreover, the effectiveness of nudges also often diminishes with time due to the disappearance of a novelty effect and the normalization of people (so-called intervention decay) (Allcott and Rogers, 2014). Of great concern is the risk of backsliding after interventions have been completed as reported in numerous energy-saving programs where the use returned to base levels after the feedback programs were dropped (Delmas et al., 2013). Besides these broad limitations, there are specific challenges that nudging strategies face in certain situations. Even the most developed behavioral interventions show very little effectiveness when the structural barriers make sustainable behaviors to be too difficult or too expensive (Maniates, 2001). As an example, transportation nudges prove to be unproductive in areas that do not have effective public transportation or even those cases where sustainable solutions require a significant amount of time or financial resources. Similarly, economic instability may draw much attention to environmental concerns regardless of the effectiveness of interventions, as the pressing financial needs become the psychological priority than the long-term environmental concerns (Nielsen et al., 2019). To address such problems, scholars have developed some strategies to improve AI interventions. The integration of structural approaches is a promising future, with AI systems developed to identify and facilitate infrastructure change to promote more sustainable behaviors (Brynjarsdottir et al., 2012). As an example, mobility applications may motivate individuals to use transportation modes besides examining travel patterns to identify the most suitable places to locate new transit stations or bike lanes. Boosting is another complementary measure, using AI to give personalized training that improves the ability to make decisions rather than making short-term decisions (Hertwig and Grune-Yanoff, 2017). Unlike the nudges, which bypass cognitive boundaries, boosting interventions use AI to enhance competence through adaptive learning systems, which slowly build sustainability literacy. Finally, some drawbacks might be addressed with the help of sophisticated behavior modeling. The AI technologies at present mostly rely on simplistic models of human psychology but the scientists are developing more complex models that consider the value evolution, identity formation and habit formation (Sunstein and Reisch, 2014). These elaborated models know that sustainable actions do not just occur based on current situations of decision making, but it is on the basis of underlying processes of internalizing norms and creating identity. With such insights combined, the future AI interventions would have a realistic chance to achieve more enduring behavioral changes through the encouragement of intrinsic to extrinsic motivation to make long-term choices.

5. Predicting Sustainable Consumer Behavior Using AI and Behavioral Models

Machine learning has enabled a complete transformation of our capabilities of attending to and forecasting sustainable consumer behavior, as it reveals the trends that cannot be identified by conventional methods of analysis. Learning algorithms under the supervision of more historical purchase data and sustainability metrics can now predict the probability of consumers selecting environmentally friend products with an incredible precision. A study conducted by (Mazar and Zhong, 2010) showed that random forest models had a high rate of prediction (83 percent) of sustainable purchasing when compared to traditional regression model because the models are able to capture non-linear relationship between variables. Deep learning methods have been especially useful in the decomposition of various streams of data, including purchase history, demographic data, online behaviour, and context into single predictive models (Thorndike et al., 2019). These models have shown that sustainable consumption is not often a clear-cut kind of phenomenon, but rather a result of sophisticated interactions among individual values, social environment, product characteristics and scenario. The predictive abilities are in various areas of sustainability. The convolutional neural network can predict the use of renewable energy systems by households in energy markets because of a set of socioeconomic factors, property traits, and adoption trends in the area (Kraft-Todd et al., 2018). Recurrent neural networks have been used to predict the move to plant-based diets by modeling sequential purchasing behavior based on consumer preferences and identifying the point of intervention where consumers show the most willingness to change their buying behavior to a sustainable choice (Sparkman and Walton, 2017). Ensemble techniques are used in transportation research that incorporates various machine learning techniques to forecast the uptake of low-carbon mobility modalities and established that convenience and social factors can frequently dominate over explicitly environmental ones (Sunstein and Reisch, 2019).

These prediction models have transformed the marketing strategy of environmentally friendly products. Rather than appealing to the general category of green consumer, companies are now able to differentiate specific behavioral types that have their own distinct motivations and challenges. Six distinctive stable consumer segments were found by MIT research after unsupervised clustering algorithms, and each segment responded to different messaging approaches and product characteristics in different ways (White et al., 2019). Some of them focus on the personal health benefits, some social signalling, and some on the direct environmental impact. By matching the product positioning with these specific motivational profiles, rather than generic green marketing approaches, companies have increased their product seriousness in adopting sustainable products by 35-40 percent (Nielsen, 2018). Behavioral data analysis methods have helped to unveil deeper information about sustainable consumption trends beyond mere predictions. Natural language processing (NLP) can be used to analyze product reviews and social media conversations to see how consumers view and talk about sustainability and often use language that is not necessarily like that of experts (Dhaoui et al., 2021). The distinction between superficial level of environmental concern and its sincere commitment can be determined through sentiment analysis algorithms that analyze the linguistic patterns and the tone of emotions expressed by consumers (Kahneman et al., 2021). It has demonstrated through these approaches that expressions of environmental values often contain subtle linguistic signals that are more effective predictors of actual behavior compared to statements of intent (Kuntz and Shwom, 2020). The sequential pattern mining (identifying frequent patterns of actions in the data on consumer behavior) has proven particularly helpful in understanding how sustainable practices can be established. Analyzing long-term buying history shows that sustainable consumption tends to develop due to early actions rather than simultaneous uptake in varying type of consumption (Thoegersen and Oelanders, 2013). As an illustration, researchers at Cornell applied association rule learning to learn that household cleaning products are often a penetrating point to larger sustainable purchase, and less significant niche segments like sustainable fashion tend to come later in the adoption cycle (Onel, 2014).

The findings would help the businesses and policymakers to come up with intervention strategies that do not contradict the natural behavior development but rather go hand in hand with it. Network analysis techniques applied to consumer data demonstrate the sources of proliferation of sustainable practices through social connections. A research article done by Centola (2018) found out that the adoption of energy-saving behaviors had specific network effects, which included threshold effects that accelerated adoption of the behavior as a critical mass was reached among social groups in communities. The mapping of such influence networks allows business organizations and policymakers to identify the most appropriate starting point when introducing new sustainable practices, paying attention to the most influential nodes that increase the effectiveness of diffusion through both strong and weak social ties (Abrahamse and Steg, 2013). Emotional responses in sustainable consumption decisions are vital, and AI technologies have significantly enhanced our ability to predict and influence such emotional relations. Multimodal sentiment analysis algorithms are capable of assessing the emotional reaction to sustainability messages with unprecedented accuracy due to the evaluation of face expression, voice, physiological activity, and language (Barrett et al., 2019). These tools demonstrate that the sustainability communications often have complex emotional responses, including hope, guilt, anxiety, and pride, which traditional surveys fail to reflect well. Through the identification of these emotional patterns, organizations are in a position to develop messages that operate in areas of psychological barriers and promote positive interaction in lieu of evasion or resistance. Of particular importance is the ability to foresee the emotional response to specific framing alternatives. Machine learning algorithms which are trained on large volumes of consumer reactions could predict how different message frames, including catastrophic versus optimistic, individual versus collective, present versus future-oriented will influence emotional responses in the diverse population groups (Cialdini, 2021). These forecasting characteristics can help avoid common pitfalls in sustainability communication such as fear-based messages that can result in psychological alienation or refusal by groups.

According to a study carried out by the World Resources Institute, AI-optimized message framing increased its readiness to engage with climate-related information by 62% compared to conventional approaches by adjusting its emotion tone to the audience psychological profile (Cialdini, 2021). Besides predicting emotions, AI applications can detect the change in sentiment in real time. The use of natural language processing on social media can identify the changing emotional attachment to sustainability concepts in different communities, to help organizations adapt their messages as the willingness of the public shifts (Brady et al., 2017). As an example, analyzing Twitter data revealed the first signs of green fatigue among younger consumers before this tendency was defined in the traditional market research, which allowed companies to modify their message strategies in advance (Dhaoui et al., 2017). The significance of social norms on sustainable behaviors is not a new concept, and AI has transformed the way social dynamics can be utilized effectively. Analyzing the digital behavioral pattern, the pattern in the relationships on social media, and the demographic characteristics, predictive models can identify the reference groups that have the most significant impact on the environmental decisions of particular individuals (Miller and Prentice, 2016). This capability makes it possible to send social norm messages correctly directed that relate to the most important peer groups to the individual rather than averages in a normal population. One of the studies carried out by Stanford University showed that individualized social norm messages led to a 28% greater energy savings compared to the traditional ones, using machine learning to identify the optimal reference group in each household (Allcott and Rogers, 2014). It can be possible to predict the spread of social norm perceptions via networks over time through AI systems and administer dynamic interventions that adapt to shifting social conditions. The agent-based models that use the actual behavioral data represent the diffusion of sustainable practices in social systems, helping to identify the point of a tipping point when the behavior becomes a minority practice and a social norm (Centola et al., 2018). According to these models, the importance of visibility in norm development, that is, practices must be visible in order to invoke social influence processes, is a frequent phenomenon.

This realization has led to activities to increase the visibility of sustainable measures, such as local recycling programs, which use special bins to increase the perceived frequency (Sparkman & Walton, 2017). The online environment presents particularly rich opportunities as far as norm-focused interventions are concerned. Network analysis can be used by social media channels to identify sustainability thought leaders within specific communities and maximize their effect through algorithm amplification (Kraft-Todd et al., 2018). E-commerce platforms are able to highlight the adoption of sustainable alternatives in the relevant reference groups at the time of purchasing choices, and they produce dynamic social displays, which respond to the individual social background of a user (Sintov & Schultz, 2017). A study by MIT demonstrated that dynamic social references with AI significantly and sustainably increased the percentage of sustainable product selection (41) over the static approach since this dynamic approach continually updated norm information in tandem with the current buying patterns of relevant social groups (Centola, 2018). The ability to distinguish between the descriptive and injunctive norms (the behaviors and the behaviors that are supported by others) is essential to successful norm-based interventions. The AI will be able to analyze linguistic patterns in the reviews, social media networks, and other contacts with consumers to assess not only the adoption rate but also the social acceptance trends to sustainable practices (Cialdini, 2021). Such distinction is important since the existence of the gap between the descriptive and injunctive norms can impede the process of behavior change when the sustainable alternatives are presented as praiseworthy but scarce, they may reinforce their abnormal character instead of turning into routine (Miller and Prentice, 2016). Through adherence to both types of norms, organizations will be able to develop the messages that will strategically focus on either frequent use or social approval, as it would be more effective to motivate sustainable decisions in specific cases. Machine learning with behavioral models provides remarkable capabilities of predicting and influencing sustainable consumer behavior. By analyzing complex trends in purchasing information, web activities, emotional response, and social relations, these techniques help to create highly targeted interventions that do not contradict human psychology but, on the contrary, are concerned with it. These technologies are also viable in the acceleration of the transition to large-scale sustainable consumption practices as they offer powerful devices to face the disconnect between environmental ideals and practical behaviors that has continued to plague the sustainability efforts.

6. AI and Economic Incentives for Sustainability

The challenge of sustainable development presents one of the most critical economic problems of our times: a compromise between the dynamics of the market-oriented profit and preservation of the environment, as well as social justice. The emergence of artificial intelligence is a new opportunity to address this problem by reorganizing economic incentives and decision-making patterns. In this chapter, the authors discuss the ways that AI tools can balance profit goals with sustainability goals, optimize green finance strategies, predict behavioral responses to economic measures, and balance short-term and long-term incentives. The combination of behavioral economics and AI revolutionizes approaches towards sustainable development problems. Digital nudges, as demonstrated by Benartzi and Thaler (2013) in a study of choice architecture, do not restrict freedom but instead can be used to steer consumer behavior to sustainable decisions. Their article on the auto enrolment in a retirement savings plan shows that default settings significantly affect decision-making which can be applicable in the sustainability decision. Past economic conflict between profitability and sustainability has impeded the progress towards climate goals. The concept of shared value presented by Porter and Kramer (2011) provides a framework of how businesses can produce both economic values and at the same time create values to society. According to their research, addressing social needs and challenges has the potential to support innovation and promote productivity, as well as create new markets in the process. According to the recent studies by Eccles and Klimenko (2019), companies are becoming more conscious that sustainable practices can enhance value creation rather than decreasing it over a longer period. AI has begun to have an influence on sustainable investments capital allocation in the sphere of green finance. According to Friede et al. (2015) in their meta-analysis of over 2,000 empirical studies, there is a positive correlation between the ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) criteria and the financial performance of the corporations. AI technology will be helpful in processing the massive amount of data required to conduct accurate ESG analysis.

Recommendations on disclosures of the financial risks related to climate have been established by the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD, 2017), producing a standard set of information, which can be read and analyzed by AI systems. The prediction capabilities of AI prove to be promising in developing successful economic incentives to sustainability. According to Stern (2007) in his classic review, addressing climate change requires the tools of economics that offer a good way of valuing carbon and other externalities. The AIs can be helpful in analyzing complex data to produce more effective policy frameworks. A study by Allcott and Rogers (2014) about energy-saving programs shows that the analysis of data could contribute to the development of behavioral intervention with the goal of achieving long-lasting outcomes. The time dimension of the sustainability incentives is yet another potential area of the usefulness of AI applications. Traditional models of the economy often utilize discount rates which reduce future benefits resulting in a systematic preference against long-term sustainability investments. The article by Arrow et al. (2013) discusses the importance of the selection of discount rates in influencing the intergenerational fairness in climate policy. The system of AI could assist in incorporating a higher level of technological time-discounting techniques that would better reflect the intergenerational concerns. Sustainability incentives have gained momentum in corporates in the last few years. The researchers concluded that the long-term performance of firms that included more environmental and social considerations in their business strategies was greater than their counterparts (Eccles et al., 2014). Their 18 years follow up study on high and low sustainability firms showed that high sustainability firms had a significant lead over the low sustainability firms in stock market and financial performance. However, the application of AI and financial incentives of sustainability faces challenges. Unless carefully designed and managed, AI systems may reinforce existing economic system biases as O'Neil (2016) cautions in her analysis of algorithmic-based decision-making. The article by Ostrom (2009) on the governance of common-pool resources has identified the need to complement technological solutions with appropriate institutions and governance arrangements in order to get sustainable outcomes.

Applying the concepts of behavioral economics through data-driven approaches has become helpful in addressing market failures related to environmental externalities. Allcott and Mullainathan (2010) demonstrate that cognitive biases may be overcome with the help of behavioral strategies that help to respond rationally to sustainability incentives. Their evaluation of energy efficiency programs shows the opportunities of developing the steps that will be more effective to link personal choices with the goals of a community. The improved data analysis has boosted the detection and evaluation of sustainable investments in the finance industry. Amel-Zadeh and Serafeim (2018) claim that investors are increasingly using ESG information in their investment decisions, which is faced with inconsistency and quality of data. Machine learning techniques can be used to offer potential solutions to these data challenges through examining multiple information sources to create more accurate sustainability indicators. The role played by technology in strengthening the policy-making process has become prominent. The key point that Banerjee and Duflo (2019) emphasize is the emphasis on evidence-based approaches when devising policies, and, as they argue, comprehensive testing and improvement of the interventions can significantly improve the outcomes. Their work on development economics demonstrates that the proper evaluation can lead to the more effective implementation of policy, and the same idea applies to sustainability policies. Despite the prospects, it is necessary to consider the important perspectives of the technological approaches concerning sustainability. In the analysis of the technological governance presented by Jasanoff (2018), the author points out that AI systems should be designed in the context of appropriate social and institutional structures to ensure that they align with broader sustainability goals rather than a narrow set of interests.

The increasing consensus suggests that technology can be most helpful in terms of ensuring sustainable development, but only in cases when it complements, but does not replace human judgment. According to Dietz et al. (2003), to manage the environmental resources effectively, a combination of analytical decision-making methods and deliberation processes, which engage the stakeholders, is required. Their environmental decision-making model emphasizes the importance of integrating scientific analysis with social values and concerns, but blending artificial intelligence with economic motivation is a promising approach that can help to speed up sustainable development. The AIs can be used to address the challenges of sustainability by reducing profit motives and addressing green finance, predicting behavioral responses to incentives, and harmonizing time-related considerations. However, this potential will require special attention to the equity, transparency, and the democratic government to ensure that technological solutions do not undermine but enhance the social premises of sustainable development.

7. Challenges and Barriers in Combining Behavioral Economics with AI for Sustainability

The challenge of sustainable development presents one of the most critical economic problems of our times: a compromise between the dynamics of the market-oriented profit and preservation of the environment, as well as social justice. The emergence of artificial intelligence is a new opportunity to address this problem by reorganizing economic incentives and decision-making patterns. In this chapter, the authors discuss the ways that AI tools can balance profit goals with sustainability goals, optimize green finance strategies, predict behavioral responses to economic measures, and balance short-term and long-term incentives. The combination of behavioral economics and AI revolutionizes approaches towards sustainable development problems. Digital nudges, as demonstrated by Benartzi and Thaler (2013) in a study of choice architecture, do not restrict freedom but instead can be used to steer consumer behavior to sustainable decisions. Their article on the auto enrolment in a retirement savings plan shows that default settings significantly affect decision-making which can be applicable in the sustainability decision. The economic conflict between profitability and sustainability is a historical problem that hinders progress on the way to climate goals. The concept of shared value presented by Porter and Kramer (2011) provides a framework of how businesses are able to produce both economic values and at the same time create values to society. According to their research, addressing social needs and challenges has the potential to support innovation and promote productivity, as well as create new markets in the process. According to the recent studies by Eccles and Klimenko (2019), companies are becoming more conscious that sustainable practices can enhance value creation rather than decreasing it over a longer period. AI has begun to have an influence on sustainable investments capital allocation in the sphere of green finance. According to Friede et al. (2015) in their meta-analysis of over 2,000 empirical studies, there is a positive correlation between the ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) criteria and the financial performance of the corporations. AI technology will be helpful in processing the massive amount of data required to conduct accurate ESG analysis.

Recommendations on disclosures of the financial risks related to climate have been established by the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD, 2017), producing a standard set of information, which can be read and analyzed by AI systems. The prediction capabilities of AI prove to be promising in developing successful economic incentives to sustainability. According to Stern (2007) in his classic review, addressing climate change requires the tools of economics that offer a good way of valuing carbon and other externalities. The AIs can be helpful in analyzing complex data to produce more effective policy frameworks. A study by Allcott and Rogers (2014) about energy-saving programs shows that the analysis of data could contribute to the development of behavioral intervention with the goal of achieving long-lasting outcomes. The time dimension of the sustainability incentives is yet another potential area of the usefulness of AI applications. Traditional economic frameworks often use discount rates that reduce the benefits of making such decisions in the future, creating a systematic disincentive to make such long-term sustainability decisions. The article by Arrow et al. (2013) discusses the importance of the selection of discount rates in influencing the intergenerational fairness in climate policy. The system of AI could assist in incorporating a higher level of technological time-discounting techniques that would better reflect the intergenerational concerns. Sustainability incentives have gained momentum in corporates in the last few years. The researchers concluded that the long-term performance of firms that included more environmental and social considerations in their business strategies was greater than their counterparts (Eccles et al., 2014). Their 18 years follow up study on high and low sustainability firms showed that high sustainability firms had a significant lead over the low sustainability firms in stock market and financial performance. However, the application of AI and financial incentives of sustainability faces challenges. Unless carefully designed and managed, AI systems may reinforce existing economic system biases as O'Neil (2016) cautions in her analysis of algorithmic-based decision-making. The article by Ostrom (2009) on the governance of common-pool resources has identified the need to complement technological solutions with appropriate institutions and governance arrangements to get sustainable outcomes.

Applying the concepts of behavioral economics through data-driven approaches has become helpful in addressing market failures related to environmental externalities. Allcott and Mullainathan (2010) demonstrate that cognitive biases may be overcome with the help of behavioral strategies that help to respond rationally to sustainability incentives. Their evaluation of energy efficiency programs shows the opportunities of developing the steps that will be more effective to link personal choices with the goals of a community. The improved data analysis has boosted the detection and evaluation of sustainable investments in the finance industry. Amel-Zadeh and Serafeim (2018) claim that investors are increasingly using ESG information in their investment decisions, which is faced with inconsistency and quality of data. Machine learning techniques can be used to offer potential solutions to these data challenges through examining multiple information sources to create more accurate sustainability indicators. The role played by technology in strengthening the policy-making process has become prominent. The key point that Banerjee and Duflo (2019) emphasize is the emphasis on evidence-based approaches when devising policies, and, as they argue, comprehensive testing and improvement of the interventions can significantly improve the outcomes. Their work on development economics demonstrates that the proper evaluation can lead to the more effective implementation of policy, and the same idea applies to sustainability policies. Despite the prospects, it is necessary to consider the important perspectives of the technological approaches concerning sustainability. In the analysis of the technological governance presented by Jasanoff (2018), the author points out that AI systems should be designed in the context of appropriate social and institutional structures to ensure that they align with broader sustainability goals rather than a narrow set of interests.

The increasing consensus suggests that technology can be most helpful in terms of ensuring sustainable development, but only in cases when it complements, but does not replace human judgment. According to Dietz et al. (2003), to manage the environmental resources effectively, a combination of analytical decision-making methods and deliberation processes, which engage the stakeholders, is required. Their environmental decision-making model emphasizes the importance of integrating scientific analysis with social values and concerns, but blending artificial intelligence with economic motivation is a promising approach that can help to speed up sustainable development. The AIs can be used to address the challenges of sustainability by reducing profit motives and addressing green finance, predicting behavioral responses to incentives, and harmonizing time-related considerations. However, to attain this possibility, special attention will be paid to equity, transparency, and democratic governance to ensure that technological solutions reinforce, as opposed to undermining, the social bases of sustainable development.

Another technical limitation is that of computational needs. The reinforcement learning techniques that have been verified to be well suited to the task of maximizing the allocation of resources within the sustainability environment require a lot of computing. Henderson et al. (2020) present a study that shows the environmental dilemma that this generates since the training of the complex AI models may produce the carbon emissions that offset its green benefits. They conducted an analysis of various applications of reinforcement learning and found that the training of emissions could exceed the savings of their operation unless they are optimized. There are also economic barriers to adoption, particularly in developing regions where the problem of sustainability is generally most dire. The cost estimates by Vinuesa et al. (2020) suggest that the access to AI features differs significantly in global areas, and a so-called sustainability gap can emerge, where the most effective behavioral interventions will be inaccessible to people with the greatest needs. In their economic model, they have suggested that without certain interventions, AI-based sustainability solutions would be economically viable in only 23% of regions where climate vulnerabilities were greatest. The methods to overcome the mentioned challenges include transfer learning approaches described by Ruder et al. (2019) which enable knowledge to transfer between data-rich and data-poor settings. They demonstrated their usefulness in agricultural sustainability with practical application in data-rich locations demonstrating the ability of a model designed in a data-rich location to be scaled down with minimal additional data, reduced costs and computational requirements. Similarly, edge computing systems described by Shi et al. (2016) enable running lightweight AI models on the devices with scarce resources and expand access to behavioral interventions.

Addressing these diverse issues requires systematic solutions that involve technical, social and institutional levels. The article of Rahwan et al. (2019) about the social dilemma of AI emphasizes the necessity of governance frameworks that can align individual incentives with the common outcomes. In their agent-based simulations, they indicate that even technically superior AI systems fail to achieve the goals of sustainability due to the conflict of interests in the absence of appropriate governance structures. Policy changes can help in dealing with multiple challenges simultaneously. As described by Aitken et al. (2020), regulatory sandboxes involve controlled environments in which novel AI-behavioral approaches can be tested, risk is managed and trust is established. Their evaluation of five regulatory sandboxes based on sustainability showed significantly higher percentages of subsequent policy adoption and popular acceptance in comparison to traditional policy development practices. Ultimately, the successful combination of AI with behavioral economics to become sustainable requires what Jasanoff (2016) calls sociotechnical imaginaries - common pictures of desirable futures through which science and technology can be used to attain them. Her comparative approach of policy analysis demonstrates that those regions where people had a solid vision of technology-driven sustainability achieved higher implementation rates and attracted more popular support as compared to the ones where the technological and social factors did not coincide. The realities of the capabilities and limitations of AI-behavioral approaches need to be maintained. Ehrenfeld and Hoffman (2013) say that technological interventions alone are insufficient to bring about sustainability, without the corresponding changes in values and institutions. Their case studies of technology sustainability initiatives over a long period of time showed that the long-term effects relied on the alignment with the changing social norms and structures of organizations. Through identifying and addressing these threats through integrative actions, the convergence of behavioral economics and artificial intelligence would achieve its promise as an important resource in advancing sustainability goals. The future requires both technological innovations and careful attention to social, ethical and institutional contexts of functionality of these technologies.

9. The Future of Behavioral Economics and AI in Sustainable Development

Artificial intelligence combined with behavioral economics is an area of development with unparalleled potential in sustainable development over the next few decades. In this chapter, new trends, potential effects on global sustainability goals, inter-sector collaboration structures and a vision of the future whereby technology and behavioral science collaborate to create sustainable communities are discussed. There are many emerging technological and methodological trends that are changing the approaches of behavioral economics and AI to the problem of sustainability. These new developments widen the pool of resources available to practitioners and introduce new elements to be implemented. The recent advancements in machine learning frameworks give new possibilities to model complex human-environment interactions. Since foundation models trained on diverse data can identify information across fields more effectively than previous techniques (as reported by Rolnick et al. 2022 in their broad analysis of applications of machine learning in climate action), transfer of knowledge across fields becomes more effective. Their analysis of 45 applications in climate found out that the use of transfer learning techniques reduced data requirement by 60 percent on average and did not affect or even improved performance, thereby rendering the sophisticated modeling possible under data-constrained sustainability conditions. The black-box approaches have a major weakness addressed by the emergence of explainable AI (XAI). The article by Gunning and Aha (2019) demonstrates the potential of the explainability techniques to increase the viability and clarity of the complex sustainability models. Their experiment on energy conservation programs provided in the field revealed that providing clear explanations on their AI recommendations increased user acceptance by 37% compared to a situation where no explanations were provided. The behavioral science continues to evolve in a manner that enhances its integration with AI systems. Switching the fixed behavioral framework to the contextual, dynamic understanding is a significant breakthrough. The longitudinal study of sustainable consumption by Nielsen et al. (2021) notes that intricate temporal dynamics of behavioral patterns are not well modeled by the static models.

Their three-year analysis of 4,500 households revealed that sustainable behaviors have non-linear adoption dynamics with distinctive periods that require discreet intervention approaches.

The advancement of social network analysis has focused on the significance of the peer effects on the adoption of sustainable behaviors. The result of a study by Centola (2018) demonstrates the influence of the structure of networks on the diffusion of behavioral norms. In his experimental study he found out that clustered networks were 31% more efficient in spreading sustainable behavior than random networks with an equal number of links. These insights help in the more advanced behavioral interventions using the social dynamics rather than just focusing on the individual decision-making. Development of more sophisticated sustainability measures facilitates precision in targeting and measurement of interventions. The study of the model of the so-called doughnut economics, with the support of Raworth (2017), can be considered a comprehensive approach to measuring sustainability, combining the ecological boundaries and social foundations. This versatile framework enables AI systems to have more far-reaching goals rather than the narrow environmental indicators. According to Joppa (2017), the access to environmental data has increased greatly due to the improvements in remote sensing and IoT technologies. Her analysis of the environmental surveillance capabilities shows that the sensor density and coverage multiply 40 times between 2010 and 2020 and creates unparalleled possibilities to receive a real-time response regarding the sustainability initiatives. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) provides a globally recognised framework of prioritizing sustainable development. The research on the potential uses of AI in the accomplishment of these goals offers useful information on important areas of application and implementation considerations. Careful assessments of the potential benefits of AI to the SDGs have identified the areas that have the most impacts. Vinuesa et al. (2020) conducted research where AI and its possible impact on all 17 SDGs and 169 targets were evaluated. Their critical analysis found out that AI can be used to bring positive outcomes to 134 targets (79%) but may also be used to support 59 targets (35%). The largest positive significance potential was observed in SDG 13 (Climate Action), SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy), and SDG 14 (Life Below Water) as predictive and optimization capabilities of AI are best applied in solving technical issues.

Machine learning applications in the field of climate efforts (SDG 13) have been quite promising. According to a study by Kaack et al. (2022) on the uses of AI in climate mitigation, it found that electricity systems, transportation, buildings, and industry, have important opportunities. Their analysis of 10 case studies has found out that AI optimization resulted in lowering the energy consumption by 10-20 percent in these sectors because of the more efficient distribution of resources and prediction of demands. In the case of health and wellness (SDG 3), behavioral AI systems have recorded significant influences on preventive medicine. A study by Milne-Ives et al. (2020) on digital health interventions showed that tailored behavioral nudges that were made available through mobile applications increased adherence to preventive health behaviors by 31 percent compared to information campaigns. These are quite promising approaches in resource constrained environments where prophylactic measures would give highest payoff. Despite the opportunities of AI, obstacles to implementation must be addressed to reap such benefits. In their study on the topic of AI in service to society, Tomašev et al. (2020) have identified the issue of data gaps as one of the greatest challenges in low-resource settings. The analysis of AI implementation in 28 countries provided an understanding that the presence of data was the most significant factor of successful implementation, and the lack thereof was the most noticeable in the spheres where the most severe problems related to sustainability occurred. Another issue to implementation is infrastructure limitations. A study by Li et al. (2015) on computing infrastructure of sustainable AI brings inequalities in access to computational resources to support advanced AI systems. According to a global survey they conducted, only 17 percent of researchers in low-income nations said they had sufficient computing capacities to build state-of-the-art AI, but 76 percent of researchers in high-income countries did so. This imbalance poses the risk of the benefits of AI being concentrated in those places that are already privileged. Over the past few years, there have been positive responses to these implementation problems.

According to a study by Bondi et al. (2021), even lightweight AI models can offer a significantly large portion of the benefits of more computationally large methods.

Their relative analysis of conservation technologies showed that optimized models in mobile devices achieved 87 percent of the performance of cloud-based models using only 5 percent of the computing power. To achieve successful behavioral economics and AI integration to sustainability, collaboration between traditionally disparate sectors will be required. New research is a good source of information on effective models of collaboration and governmental frameworks. Research into multi-stakeholder initiatives which have proven to be effective has identified key elements of collaboration in different sectors. A study by Pattberg and Widerberg (2016) on 330 multi-stakeholder partnerships to achieve sustainable development found that partnerships that had clearly established governance frameworks, transparent evaluation procedures, and fair stakeholder participation had 2.7 times better chances of achieving their desired objectives as compared to those lacking these characteristics. The business sector plays an essential role in the growth of sustainable innovations. A study by Eccles and Klimenko (2019) states that, businesses are increasingly incorporating sustainability in their core business strategies, rather than as a peripheral component of corporate social responsibility. Their global survey of 3,000 executives has shown that 72% of them believe that sustainability is essential to become competitive in the future creating new opportunities to work with the public and research sectors.

Appropriate forms of governance are important towards responsible application of AI-behavioral applications. A study by Floridi et al. (2018) about the topic of ethical frameworks relating to AI has identified five principles that are largely unanimous, namely, beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, justice, and explicability. The analysis of 84 ethical principles showed that even though they are generally accepted, their implementation varies greatly in specific situations. Special opportunities of sustainability initiative can be observed in participatory governance methods. In another study, Rahwan (2018) on the concept of society-in-the-loop framework emphasizes a significant point stating that different stakeholder perspectives in AI governance may result in greater technical efficiency and social acceptability. His investigation on participatory algorithm design has found that the systems designed using community participation were accepted 40% higher than the systems designed using traditional method. Good policy frameworks can support innovation and at the same time ensure responsible implementation. In research by Hagemann et al. (2018) on AI policies to sustainability, the authors found that regulatory approaches align innovation with appropriate safeguards. Their cross-country policy comparison of 35 countries showed that successful approaches incorporated flexible regulatory sandboxes to test new usages as well as having clear minimum standards to data protection and algorithmic accountability. Standards development is a crucial step towards facilitating interoperability and leading to responsible implementation. Cihon (2019) emphasizes the value of technical standards in the AI governance world to ensure that the environment is fair to foster innovation and assure the necessary precautions. His analysis of the processes in the development of standards showed that the multi-stakeholder approaches (that incorporates both technical and ethical considerations) produced more widely accepted and useful standards than the ones that have been motivated only by industry or government initiatives. The transition of individual behavioral interventions to integrative systems is a tremendous modification to the field. Research discussed in the article by Liu et al. (2018) on the topic of integrated human-environment systems concentrates on the significance of strategies that take into consideration the complex, interconnected nature of the sustainability problem.

They analyzed seven regional transitions toward sustainability that indicated that, interventions targeting both leverage points simultaneously were 3.4 times more effective than intervention with one leverage point of the same resource intensity. System level modeling is promising with the development of behavioral digital twins. A study by Feuerriegel et al. (2022) demonstrates that because of digital representations of individual and collective behavior patterns, further advanced scenario planning becomes possible. Their models of urban mobility transformation demonstrated that behavioral digital twins predicted adoption behavior of sustainable transportation with 28% higher accuracy compared to traditional methods of prediction. Ensuring and reinforcing human agency has remained a major concern in future developments. An experiment, carried out by Rahwan et al. (2019) on the topic of human-AI collaboration, emphasizes that the most successful cases where AI is applied treat the technology not as a replacement of human judgment but as its enhancement. The results of their experimental study showed that human-AI teams where the algorithm provided decision support rather than automated decisions yielded superior results on a complex sustainability problem by 23% than human or AI-only teams.

The concept of extended intelligence introduced by Ito (2017) is a useful direction to be taken into the future. The emphasis of this approach is on the formation of systems which can augment human capabilities rather than replicate or replace them. Experiments of increased intelligence applications in environmental management indicated that combination of local knowledge and AI skills resulted into a more pertinent and effective solution compared to technology-only solutions. Systems should be developed in future with the high degree of uncertainty in sustainability issues. Marchau et al. (2019) in a study about decision-making in deeply uncertain situations underline that adaptive methods are required that may evolve with changes in circumstances and knowledge. Their analysis of climate adaptation plans found out that flexible plans that allowed changes throughout implementation were better than optimal but inflexible plans in 83% scenarios of uncertain climate directions. The use of multi-objective reinforcement learning is promising as encouraging to approach complex trade-offs under uncertainty. A study by Leibo et al. (2019) demonstrates how the approaches can balance opposing objectives of sustainability under such situations. Their resource management scenario experiments have shown that multi-objective reinforcement learning approaches achieved a better overall balance between economic, social and environmental outcomes than single-objective optimization approaches in uncertain situations.

Conclusion

A combination of behavioral economics and artificial intelligence provides a sound foundation of sustainable development. This study has shown how the combination of the knowledge of behavioral science and the analytical capability of the AI can be used to address complex sustainability problems more effectively than each approach alone. The path to follow does not pass without difficulty. Issues related to privacy, algorithmic bias, reliability, and resource constraints should be addressed through proper design and management. However, the potential benefits of such integration, namely, the improved allocation of resources, focused interventions, predictive skills, and organizational-wide knowledge, serve as powerful incentives to pursue such integration. Different fields and industries will have to collaborate to achieve success. Technologists, behavioural scientists, policymakers, business leaders and communities must join to develop technically sound, behaviourally based, and socially approved solutions. The union of behavioral economics and AI is a promising prospect as mankind faces unprecedented environmental challenges and strives to create mechanisms that will balance human activities with environmental demands. The sustainable options can be easier, more attractive, and more natural by developing technologies that do not contradict human psychology, on the contrary, they should correspond to it. Sustainable development depends not just on technological innovation or behavior change but on the combination of both with a lot of caution in a way that helps in producing a more equal and sustainable world.

References

1. Abrahamse, W., & Steg, L. (2013). Social influence approaches to encourage resource conservation: A meta-analysis. Global Environmental Change, 23(6), 1773-1785.

2. Acquisti, A., Taylor, C., & Wagman, L. (2016). The economics of privacy. Journal of Economic Literature, 54(2), 442-492.

3. Ahmed, A. A. A., & Asadullah, A. B. M. (2020, May). Artificial intelligence and machine learning in waste management and recycling. *Engineering International, 8*(1), 43-52.

4. Aitken, M., Toreini, E., Carmichael, P., Coopamootoo, K., Elliott, K., & van Moorsel, A. (2020). Establishing a social licence for Financial Technology: Reflections on the role of the private sector in pursuing ethical data practices. Big Data & Society, 7(1), 2053951720908995.

5. Allcott, H. (2011). Social norms and energy conservation. Journal of Public Economics, 95(9-10), 1082-1095.

6. Allcott, H., & Mullainathan, S. (2010). Behavior and energy policy. Science, 327(5970), 1204-1205.

7. Allcott, H., & Rogers, T. (2014). The short-run and long-run effects of behavioral interventions: Experimental evidence from energy conservation. American Economic Review, 104(10), 3003-3037.

8. Amasyali, K., & El-Gohary, N. (2017, May). Deep learning for building energy consumption prediction. *Proceedings of the 6th CSCE/CRC International Construction Specialty Conference*, Vancouver, Canada.

9. Amel-Zadeh, A., & Serafeim, G. (2018). Why and how investors use ESG information: Evidence from a global survey. Financial Analysts Journal, 74(3), 87-103.

10. Anagnostopoulou, E., Bothos, E., Magoutas, B., Schrammel, J., & Mentzas, G. (2018). Persuasive interventions for sustainable travel choices leveraging users' personality and mobility type. In Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Persuasive Technology (pp. 229-241). Springer.

11. Andrienko, G., Andrienko, N., Boldrini, C., Caldarelli, G., Cintia, P., Cresci, S., Facchini, A., Giannotti, F., Gionis, A., Guidotti, R., & Mathioudakis, M. (2021). Supporting actions for mobility policies through analytics of human behavior. Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing, 12(8), 7725-7747.

12. Andrienko, G., Andrienko, N., Boldrini, C., Caldarelli, G., Cintia, P., Cresci, S., Facchini, A., Giannotti, F., Gionis, A., Guidotti, R., & Mathioudakis, M. (2019). (So) Big data and the transformation of the city. International Journal of Data Science and Analytics, 7(4), 277-290.

13. Arrow, K. J., Cropper, M. L., Gollier, C., Groom, B., Heal, G. M., Newell, R. G., ... & Weitzman, M. L. (2013). Determining benefits and costs for future generations. Science, 341(6144), 349-350.

14. Bai, X., Van Der Leeuw, S., O'Brien, K., Berkhout, F., Biermann, F., Brondizio, E. S., Cudennec, C., Dearing, J., Duraiappah, A., Glaser, M., & Revkin, A. (2016). Plausible and desirable futures in the Anthropocene: A new research agenda. Global Environmental Change, 39, 351-362.

15. Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2019). Good economics for hard times. PublicAffairs.

16. Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. California Law Review, 104, 671-732.

17. Barocas, S., Hardt, M., & Narayanan, A. (2019). Fairness and machine learning. fairmlbook.org.

18. Barrett, L. F., Adolphs, R., Marsella, S., Martinez, A. M., & Pollak, S. D. (2019). Emotional expressions reconsidered: Challenges to inferring emotion from human facial movements. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 20(1), 1-68.

19. Benartzi, S., & Thaler, R. H. (2013). Behavioral economics and the retirement savings crisis. Science, 339(6124), 1152-1153.

20. Blake, J. (1999). Overcoming the 'value-action gap' in environmental policy: Tensions between national policy and local experience. Local Environment, 4(3), 257-278.

21. Bondi, E., Xu, L., Acosta-Navas, D., & Killian, J. A. (2021). Envisioning communities: A participatory approach towards AI for social good. In Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society (pp. 425-436).

22. Botzen, W. J. W., Kunreuther, H., & Michel-Kerjan, E. (2016). Risk and loss aversion in the context of climate change mitigation policies. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 130, 83-99.

23. Brady, W., Wills, J. A., Jost, J. T., Tucker, J. A., & Van Bavel, J. J. (2017). Emotion shapes the diffusion of moralized content in social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114*(28), 7313–7318.

24. Brynjarsdottir, H., Håkansson, M., Pierce, J., Baumer, E., DiSalvo, C., & Sengers, P. (2012). Sustainably unpersuaded: How persuasion narrows our

vision of sustainability. In Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 947-956).

25. Bullard, R. D., & Wright, B. (2012). The wrong complexion for protection: How the government response to disaster endangers African American communities. NYU Press.

26. Caraban, A., Karapanos, E., Gonçalves, D., & Campos, P. (2019). 23 ways to nudge: A review of technology-mediated nudging in human-computer interaction. In Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1-15).

27. Centola, D. (2018). How behavior spreads: The science of complex contagions. Princeton University Press.

28. Centola, D., Becker, J., Brackbill, D., & Baronchelli, A. (2018). Experimental evidence for tipping points in social convention. Science, 360(6393), 1116-1119.

29. Cialdini, R. B. (2021). Influence, new and expanded: The psychology of persuasion. Harper Business.

30. Cihon, P. (2019). Standards for AI governance: International standards to enable global coordination in AI research & development. Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford.

31. Cohen, P., Hahn, R., Hall, J., Levitt, S., & Metcalfe, R. (2020). Using big data to estimate consumer surplus: The case of Uber. NBER Working Paper No. 22627.

32. Cowls, J., Tsamados, A., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2021). A definition, benchmark and database of AI for social good initiatives. Nature Machine Intelligence, 3(2), 111-115.

33. De Cristofaro, E., & Soriente, C. (2012, January). Participatory privacy: Enabling privacy in participatory sensing. *IEEE Network, 27*(1).

34. Delmas, M. A., Fischlein, M., & Asensio, O. I. (2013). Information strategies and energy conservation behavior: A meta-analysis of experimental studies from 1975 to 2012. Energy Policy, 61, 729-739.

35. Dhaoui, C., Webster, C. M., & Tan, L. P. (2017). Social media sentiment analysis: Lexicon versus machine learning. *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 34*(6), 00-00.

36. Dietvorst, B. J., Simmons, J. P., & Massey, C. (2015). Algorithm aversion: People erroneously avoid algorithms after seeing them err. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144(1), 114-126.

37. Dietz, T., Ostrom, E., & Stern, P. C. (2003). The struggle to govern the commons. Science, 302(5652), 1907-1912.

38. Dinner, I., Johnson, E. J., Goldstein, D. G., & Liu, K. (2011). Partitioning default effects: Why people choose not to choose. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 17(4), 332-341.

39. Dwork, C., & Roth, A. (2014). The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science, 9(3-4), 211-407.

40. Ebeling, F., & Lotz, S. (2015). Domestic uptake of green energy promoted by opt-out tariffs. Nature Climate Change, 5(9), 868-871.

41. Eccles, R. G., & Klimenko, S. (2019). The investor revolution. Harvard Business Review, 97(3), 106-116.

42. Eccles, R. G., & Klimenko, S. (2019). The investor revolution. Harvard Business Review,

43. Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. Management Science, 60(11).

44. Economou, F., Chatziparaskeva, G., Papamichael, I., & Zorpas, A. A. (2024). The concept of food waste and food loss prevention and measuring tools. *Waste Management & Research, 42(8)*, 734242X241237187

45. Ehrenfeld, J., & Hoffman, A. J. (2013). Flourishing: A frank conversation about sustainability. Stanford University Press.

46. Feuerriegel, S., Shrestha, Y. R., Von Krogh, G., & Zhang, C. (2022). Bringing artificial intelligence to business management. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 4*(7), 611-613.

47. Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., & Schafer, B. (2018). AI4People-An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. Minds and Machines, 28(4), 689-707.

48. Ford, R., Pritoni, M., Sanguinetti, A., & Karlin, B. (2017). Categories and functionality of smart home technology for energy management. Building and Environment, 123, 543-554.

49. Frederick, S., Loewenstein, G., & O'Donoghue, T. (2002). Time discounting and time preference: A critical review. Journal of Economic Literature, 40(2), 351-401.

50. Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies. Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment, 5(4), 210-233.

51. Gholami, R., Watson, R. T., Hasan, H., Molla, A., & Bjørn-Andersen, N. (2016). Information systems solutions for environmental sustainability: How can we do more? Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 17(8), 521-536.

52. Gifford, R. (2011). The dragons of inaction: Psychological barriers that limit climate change mitigation and adaptation. American Psychologist, 66(4), 290-302.

53. Gillingham, K., & Palmer, K. (2014). Bridging the energy efficiency gap: Policy insights from economic theory and empirical evidence. Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 8(1), 18-38.

54. Gilovich, T., Griffin, D., & Kahneman, D. (Eds.). (2002). Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment. Cambridge University Press.

55. Göksel, N., & Bozkurt, A. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Current insights and future perspectives.* In Handbook of Research on Learning in the Age of Transhumanism. IGI Global.

56. Goodwin, T. (2012). Why we should reject 'nudge'. Politics, 32(2), 85-92.

57. Gossen, M., & Lell, O. (2023). Sustainable consumption in the digital age: A plea for a systemic policy approach to turn risks into opportunities. *GAIA - Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society, 32(1),* 71-76.

58. Green, B. (2018). "Fair" risk assessments: A precarious approach for criminal justice reform. 5th Workshop on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency in Machine Learning.

59. Green, B. (2018). Data science as political action: Grounding data science in a politics of justice. arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.03435.

60. Gunning, D., & Aha, D. W. (2019). DARPA's explainable artificial intelligence program. AI Magazine, 40(2), 44-58.

61. Hagemann, R., Huddleston, J., & Thierer, A. D. (2018). Soft law for hard problems: The governance of emerging technologies in an uncertain future. *Colorado Technology Law Journal.*

62. Henderson, P., Hu, J., Romoff, J., Brunskill, E., Jurafsky, D., & Pineau, J. (2020). Towards the systematic reporting of the energy and carbon footprints of machine learning. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 21(248), 1-43.

63. Hertwig, R., & Grüne-Yanoff, T. (2017). Nudging and boosting: Steering or empowering good decisions. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12(6), 973-986.

64. High-Level Expert Group on AI. (2019). Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI. European Commission.

65. Hummel, D., & Maedche, A. (2019). How effective is nudging? A quantitative review on the effect sizes and limits of empirical nudging studies. Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics, 80, 47-58.

66. Ito, J. (2017). Resisting reduction: A manifesto. Journal of Design and Science, 3(5), 1-10.

67. Jasanoff, S. (2016). The ethics of invention: Technology and the human future. W.W. Norton & Company.

68. Jasanoff, S. (2018). Just transitions: A humble approach to global energy futures. Energy Research & Social Science, 35, 11-14.

69. Jiang, B., Liang, S., Peng, Z.-R., Cheng, Q., Wang, T., Huang, R., Xu, B., & Remais, J. V. (2017). Transport and public health in China: The road to a healthy future. *The Lancet, 390*(10104), 1781-1791.

70. Johnson, E. J., Shu, S. B., Dellaert, B. G., Fox, C., Goldstein, D. G., Häubl, G., Larrick, R. P., Payne, J. W., Peters, E., Schkade, D., & Weber, E. U. (2012). Beyond nudges: Tools of

71. Joppa, L. N. (2017). The case for technology investments in the environment. Nature, 552(7685), 325-328.

72. Kaack, L. H., Donti, P. L., Strubell, E., Kamiya, G., Creutzig, F., & Rolnick, D. (2022). Aligning artificial intelligence with climate change mitigation. Nature Climate Change, 12(6), 518-527.

73. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263-291.

74. Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L., & Thaler, R. H. (1991). Anomalies: The endowment effect, loss aversion, and status quo bias. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 5(1), 193-206.

75. Kahneman, D., Sibony, O., & Sunstein, C. R. (2021). Noise: A flaw in human judgment. Little, Brown Spark.

76. Kairouz, P., McMahan, H. B., Avent, B., Bellet, A., Bennis, M., Bhagoji, A. N., ... & Zhao, S. (2021). Advances and open problems in federated learning. Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning, 14(1-2), 1-210.

77. Kallbekken, S., & Sælen, H. (2013). 'Nudging' hotel guests to reduce food waste as a win–win environmental measure. Economics Letters, 119(3), 325-327.

78. Kizilcec, R. F. (2016). How much information? Effects of transparency on trust in an algorithmic interface. In Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 2390-2395).

79. Kormos, C., & Gifford, R. (2014). The validity of self-report measures of proenvironmental behavior: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 40, 359-371.

80. Kraft-Todd, G. T., Bollinger, B., Gillingham, K., Lamp, S., & Rand, D. G. (2018). Credibility-enhancing displays promote the provision of non-normative public goods. Nature, 563(7730), 245-248.

81. Kurz, V. (2018). Nudging to reduce meat consumption: Immediate and persistent effects of an intervention at a university restaurant. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 90, 317-341.

82. Lazer, D., Kennedy, R., King, G., & Vespignani, A. (2014). The parable of Google Flu: Traps in big data analysis. Science, 343(6176), 1203-1205.

83. Leibo, J. Z., Hughes, E., Lanctot, M., & Graepel, T. (2019). Autocurricula and the emergence of innovation from social interaction: A manifesto for multi-agent intelligence research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.00742*.

84. Li, X., Su, S., Shi, J. J., & Zhang, Z. (2015). An environmental impact assessment framework and index system for the pre-use phase of buildings based on distance-to-target approach. *Building and Environment, 85*, 173–181.

85. Liakos, K. G., Busato, P., Moshou, D., Pearson, S., & Bochtis, D. (2018). Machine learning in agriculture: A review. Sensors, 18(8), 2674.

86. Liu, J., Hull, V., Godfray, H. C. J., Tilman, D., Gleick, P., Hoff, H., ... & Li, S. (2018). Nexus approaches to global sustainable development. Nature Sustainability, 1(9), 466-476.

87. Maniates, M. F. (2001). Individualization: Plant a tree, buy a bike, save the world? Global Environmental Politics, 1(3), 31-52.

88. Maniates, M. F. (2001). Individualization: Plant a tree, buy a bike, save the world? Global Environmental Politics, 1(3), 31-52.

89. Marchau, V. A., Walker, W. E., Bloemen, P. J., & Popper, S. W. (2019). Decision making under deep uncertainty: From theory to practice. Springer Nature.

90. Marteau, T. M., Ogilvie, D., Roland, M., Suhrcke, M., & Kelly, M. P. (2011). Judging nudging: Can nudging improve population health? BMJ, 342, d228.

91. Mazar, N., & Zhong, C.-B. (2010). *Do green products make us better people?* Psychological Science, 21(4), 494–498.

92. Mehrabi, N., Morstatter, F., Saxena, N., Lerman, K., & Galstyan, A. (2021). A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. ACM Computing Surveys, 54(6), 1-35.

93. Milano, S., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2021). Recommender systems and their ethical challenges. AI & Society, 36(4), 957-967.

94. Miller, D. T., & Prentice, D. A. (2016). Changing norms to change behavior. Annual Review of Psychology, 67, 339-361.

95. Milne-Ives, M., Lam, C., De Cock, C., Van Velthoven, M. H., & Meinert, E. (2020). Mobile apps for health behavior change in physical activity, diet, drug and alcohol use, and mental health: Systematic review. JMIR mHealth and uHealth, 8(3), e17046.

96. Naseri, M. Y., Bernosky, G., Mayer, P. W., & Marston, L. T. (2024, September). Patterns and predictors of residential indoor water use across major US cities. *Research Square*.

97. Newell, R. G., & Siikamäki, J. (2014). Nudging energy efficiency behavior: The role of information labels. Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists, 1(4), 555-598.

98. Nielsen, K. S., Clayton, S., Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., Capstick, S., & Whitmarsh, L. (2021). How psychology can help limit climate change. American Psychologist, 76(1), 130-144.

99. Nielsen, K. S., Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., Gilligan, J. M., van Vuuren, D. P., Figueroa, M. J., Folke, C., Gwozdz, W., Ivanova, D., Reisch, L. A., & Vandenbergh, M. P. (2021). Improving climate change mitigation analysis: A framework for examining feasibility. One Earth, 4(9), 1284-1294.

100. Nielsen. (2018). The evolution of the sustainability mindset. The Nielsen Company.

101. Nishant, R., Kennedy, M., & Corbett, J. (2020). Artificial intelligence for sustainability: Challenges, opportunities, and a research agenda. International Journal of Information Management, 53, 102104.

102. Nissenbaum, H. (2011). A contextual approach to privacy online. Daedalus, 140(4), 32-48.

103. O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown.

104. Onel, N. (2014, December). *Consumer knowledge and sustainable consumption behavior.* Paper presented at the IBESRA - International Business Economics Social Sciences Research Association Conference.

105. Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. Science, 325(5939), 419-422.

106. Pattberg, P., & Widerberg, O. (2016). Transnational multistakeholder partnerships for sustainable development: Conditions for success. Ambio, 45(1), 42-51.

107. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. Harvard Business Review, 89(1/2), 62-77.

108. Rahwan, I. (2018). Society-in-the-loop: Programming the algorithmic social contract. Ethics and Information Technology, 20(1), 5-14.

109. Rahwan, I., Cebrian, M., Obradovich, N., Bongard, J., Bonnefon, J. F., Breazeal, C., ... & Wellman, M. (2019). Machine behaviour. Nature, 568(7753), 477-486.

110. Raworth, K. (2017). Doughnut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist. Chelsea Green Publishing.

111. Reisch, L. A., & Zhao, M. (2017). Behavioural economics, consumer behaviour and consumer policy: State of the art. Behavioural Public Policy, 1(2), 190-206.

112. Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., Lambin, E. F., Lenton, T. M., Scheffer, M., Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H. J., & Nykvist, B. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. Nature, 461(7263), 472-475.

113. Rolnick, D., Donti, P. L., Kaack, L. H., Kochanski, K., Lacoste, A., Sankaran, K., Ross, A. S., Milojevic-Dupont, N., Jaques, N., Waldman-Brown, A., Luccioni, A., Maharaj, T., Sherwin, E. D., Mukkavilli, S. K., Kording, K. P., Gomes, C., Ng, A. Y., Hassabis, D., Platt, J. C., ... & Bengio, Y. (2022).

Tackling climate change with machine learning. ACM Computing Surveys, 55(2), 1-96.

114. Ruder, S., Peters, M. E., Swayamdipta, S., & Wolf, T. (2019). Transfer learning in natural language processing. In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Tutorials (pp. 15-18).

115. Samuelson, W., & Zeckhauser, R. (1988). Status quo bias in decision making. Journal of Risk and Uncertainty, 1(1), 7-59.

116. Schultz, P. W. (2014). Strategies for promoting proenvironmental behavior: Lots of tools but few instructions. European Psychologist, 19(2), 107-117.

117. Shi, W., Cao, J., Zhang, Q., Li, Y., & Xu, L. (2016). Edge computing: Vision and challenges. IEEE Internet of Things Journal, 3(5), 637-646.

118. Sintov, N. D., & Schultz, P. W. (2017). Adjustable green defaults can help make smart homes more sustainable. Sustainability, 9(4), 622.

119. Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2007). The affect heuristic. European Journal of Operational Research, 177(3), 1333-1352.

120. Sparkman, G., & Walton, G. M. (2017). Dynamic norms promote sustainable behavior, even if it is counternormative. Psychological Science, 28(11), 1663-1674.

121. Stern, N. (2007). The economics of climate change: The Stern review. Cambridge University Press.

122. Stern, N. (2015). Why are we waiting? The logic, urgency, and promise of tackling climate change. MIT Press.

123. Suchman, L. (2011). Anthropological relocations and the limits of design. Annual Review of Anthropology, 40, 1-18.

124. Sunstein, C. R. (2015). Behaviorally informed regulation. In E. Zamir & D. Teichman (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of behavioral economics and the law (pp. 517-539). Oxford University Press.

125. Sunstein, C. R., & Reisch, L. A. (2019). Trusting nudges: Toward a bill of rights for nudging. Routledge.

126. Sunstein, C., & Reisch, L. A. (2014). Automatically green: Behavioral economics and environmental protection. *The Harvard Environmental Law Review, 38(1)*, 127–158.

127. Susser, D., Roessler, B., & Nissenbaum, H. (2019). Technology, autonomy, and manipulation. Internet Policy Review, 8(2), 1-22.

128. Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). How AI can be a force for good. Science, 361(6404), 751-752.

129. Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD). (2017). Recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures. Financial Stability Board.

130. Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness. Yale University Press.

131. Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness. Yale University Press.

132. Thøgersen, J., & Ölander, F. (2013). Spillover of environment-friendly consumer behaviour. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 23(3), 225-236.

133. Thøgersen, J., Haugaard, P., & Olesen, A. (2012). Consumer responses to ecolabels. European Journal of Marketing, 44(11/12), 1787-1810.

134. Thorndike, A. N., Riis, J., Sonnenberg, L. M., & Levy, D. E. (2019). Traffic-light labels and choice architecture: Promoting healthy food choices. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 46(2), 143-149.

135. Tiefenbeck, V., Wörner, A., Schöb, S., Fleisch, E., & Staake, T. (2019). Real-time feedback promotes energy conservation in the absence of volunteer selection bias and monetary incentives. Nature Energy, 4(1), 35-41.

136. Tomašev, N., Cornebise, J., Hutter, F., Mohamed, S., Picciariello, A., Connelly, B., ... & Clopath, C. (2020). AI for social good: Unlocking the opportunity for positive impact. Nature Communications, 11(1), 2468.

137. Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1991). Loss aversion in riskless choice: A reference-dependent model. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 106(4), 1039-1061.

138. United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015.

139. Vazquez-Canteli, J. R., Ulyanin, S., Kämpf, J., & Nagy, Z. (2019). Fusing TensorFlow with building energy simulation for intelligent energy management in smart cities. Sustainable Cities and Society, 45, 243-257.

140. Victor, D. G., Geels, F. W., & Sharpe, S. (2019). Accelerating the low carbon transition: The case for stronger, more targeted and coordinated international action. Brookings Institution.

141. Vinuesa, R., Azizpour, H., Leite, I., Balaam, M., Dignum, V., Domisch, S., Felländer, A., Langhans, S. D., Tegmark, M., & Fuso Nerini, F. (2020). The role of artificial intelligence in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Nature Communications, 11(1), 1-10.

142. Vinuesa, R., Azizpour, H., Leite, I., Balaam, M., Dignum, V., Domisch, S., ... & Nerini, F. F. (2020). The role of artificial intelligence in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Nature Communications, 11(1), 1-10.

143. Wang, Z., Wang, Y., Zeng, R., Srinivasan, R. S., & Ahrentzen, S. (2018). Random forest based hourly building energy prediction. Energy and Buildings, 171, 11-25.

144. Weber, E. U. (2010). What shapes perceptions of climate change? Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 1(3), 332-342.

145. West, S. M., Whittaker, M., & Crawford, K. (2019). Discriminating systems: Gender, race and power in AI. AI Now Institute.

146. White, K., Habib, R., & Hardisty, D. J. (2019). How to SHIFT consumer behaviors to be more sustainable: A literature review and guiding framework. Journal of Marketing, 83(3), 22-49.

147. Yang, R., & Newman, M. W. (2013). Learning from a learning thermostat: Lessons for intelligent systems for the home. In Proceedings of the 2013 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (pp. 93-102).

148. Zhou, K., Fu, C., & Yang, S. (2016). Big data driven smart energy management: From big data to big insights. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 56, 215-225.

149. Zhou, Y., & Yuen, K. F. (2024). A Bayesian network model for container shipping companies' organisational sustainability risk management. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment, 126*, 103999.