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Abstract
Models of the land system are essential to our understanding of the magnitude and impacts of climate change. These models are required to represent a large number of processes in different sectors, but face particular challenges in describing the individual and social behaviours that underpin climate change mitigation and adaptation. We assess descriptions of these behaviours in existing models, their commonalities and differences, and the uses to which they have been put. We find that behavioural models have a distinct and important role to play in climate research, but that they currently suffer from being strongly sectoral in nature, with agricultural models being the most common and behaviourally rich. There are also clear convergences, with economic-based decision-making remaining dominant and behaviours such as diffusion, interaction, anticipation or learning remaining relatively neglected. Active climate change is also rarely modelled, with adaptation and mitigation generally represented as responses to economic drivers under static climatic conditions. Furthermore, dynamic behaviours, objectives or decision-making processes are almost entirely absent, despite their clear relevance to climate change responses. We conclude that models have been more successful in the identification of important processes than in their implementation and that, while some behavioural processes may remain impossible to model, behavioural models of adaptation and mitigation in land-based sectors have substantial unexplored potential. We suggest that greater attention be paid to the cumulative coverage of models in this field, and that improvements in the representation of certain key behaviours be prioritised.
Introduction

Climate change poses various challenges to the ways in which society uses land. It has impacts on land use that necessitate adaptation, but is also strongly affected by biogeochemical and biophysical interactions with the land surface. Changes in land use are therefore at the forefront of climate change mitigation and adaptation, as well as mediating climatic impacts on other human and natural systems. The potential for mitigation and adaptation in different land-based sectors is the subject of intense scrutiny, but is not purely technical in nature. At a fundamental level, this potential depends upon the ability and willingness of people to act, individually and collectively.

Models have transformed our understanding of climate system dynamics, and are similarly required to illuminate climate-land interactions. To date, the majority of suitable models have treated the land system as economic, reflecting the advanced state of economic modelling, the dominance of economics in theoretical accounts of global human activity, and the marginalisation of other (e.g. environmental) factors in large-scale practical decision-making. However, these models typically neglect important forms of individual and social behaviour, resulting in hidden uncertainties that interact and propagate through modelled systems. This articles assesses the extent to which models have been and can be used to explore these uncertainties by incorporating more realistic forms of behaviour in land-based mitigation and adaptation decisions.

A great deal of evidence now shows that the capacity to mitigate or adapt depends upon a wide range of social factors such as levels of education, literacy, cohesion and equality, and upon political rights and structures. Individual adaptations or mitigations further depend upon, for example, values, knowledge and perceived personal efficacy. Indeed, subjective perceptions of change and responsive choices may not align well with concepts of mitigation and adaptation that appear obvious to an outside observer, instead passing through “several layers of institutional, moral and symbolic meaning” (p.76), each of which may be interpreted differently by the various actors involved.

Political, economic and other macro-scale drivers of land use are not immune from behavioural issues either. They can be affected by the values and norms of institutional actors’ internal and external milieu, by spontaneous changes on the demand-side such as increasing environmental rationality, or by broader changes in social structures - all effects that can be expected under climate change. As these effects occur, the scope for mitigation and adaptation at lower levels will also be altered. Perhaps the most significant implication of this interactive dynamism is that models that perform well in current behavioural, social, economic and other contexts do not necessarily have relevance in the contexts of the near future. There is a consequent, general risk of over-fitting to current conditions and taking insufficient account of their potential for change.

The complex social setting in which adaptation and mitigation occur means that models inhabited by populations of homo economicus can easily mislead. Models that take better account of individual and social behaviour do exist, and have developed rapidly in recent years (although their application to questions related to climate change has been more limited). These include a range of agent-based,
multi-agent, microsimulation and similar approaches that prioritise “bottom-up” (or interactional upward and downward) process accuracy in describing land system development (such models are reviewed by, e.g., 41–43). However, the extent to which any model can provide accuracy in this context is debatable. Certainly, none can fully capture the culturally-mediated perceptions about what is “believable, desirable, feasible and acceptable” 27, p.87 that determine real-world decision-making. Furthermore, the treatment of these perceptions as filters of an external reality that is objectively describable may be challenged27,29,44,45, with a full understanding perhaps requiring the immersive techniques of anthropology27.

Notwithstanding the fact that limits to the ability of models to represent climate adaptation and mitigation clearly exist, behavioural modelling retains great importance for our understanding and management of these processes. While forsaking complete accuracy, it has a capacity for representation and projection that can provide unique insights that are complementary to those of the social sciences and biophysical models. Furthermore, Earth systems models make assumptions about human behaviour by definition, whether or not those assumptions are explicit or economic in nature, and the exploration of alternative assumptions is essential to understanding their effects.

Here, we review models designed to represent human behaviour in mitigation and adaptation in land-based sectors. We do so in order to assess the realised and potential value of such models. We identify the applications that exist, their commonalities and differences, and their implications for the field as a whole. We use our findings to describe the coverage of current models and some obvious and important gaps that limit their contribution. This also highlights important processes that are absent from non-behavioural models in the field, and implies certain biases in their results. We use these findings to briefly discuss the future role of behavioural modelling in climate research.

METHODS

We identified models designed or used to study behavioural processes in mitigation or adaptation in land-based sectors (we did not explicitly include the special case of urban development, which is the subject of a largely separate literature). These were primarily identified through ISI Web of Knowledge searches (initially in September 2015 and updated in July 2016) using the following groups of keywords: (‘land use’ or ‘land cover’ or ‘land based’ or ‘agriculture’ or ‘agricultural’ or ‘forest’ or ‘restore’ or ‘restoration’ or ‘conservation’ or ‘rewild’ or ‘ecosystem’) and ‘climate change’ and (‘behaviour’ or ‘behavior’ or ‘behavioural’ or ‘behavioral’ or ‘agent’) and (‘model’ or ‘modelling’ or ‘modeling’). All phrases were included both with and without hyphenation, as appropriate, and all papers published since 2000 were included. These searches returned 1,806 papers. From these, we removed papers that did not include behavioural modelling or climate change (following separate examination of titles, abstracts and entire papers), and added cited papers that had not appeared in the original searches. This left a total of 45 papers (excluding discussion or review papers). For each of these papers, we recorded details about the modelling undertaken, the behavioural processes and actors included, forms of
mitigation or adaptation permitted, modelled impacts of climate change, and methods of validation or uncertainty estimation. We did not formally assess model transparency or availability.

REVIEW FINDINGS

Adaptation or mitigation

At a general level, a majority of behavioural models focus on processes of adaptation rather than mitigation (Table 1). Active mitigation in a changing climate (either in terms of lessening climate change or lessening the impacts of climate change) is rarely treated, even where models focus on relevant processes such as reforestation or the adoption of bioenergy crops (e.g. 46–49). Instead, mitigation is represented as an economic process driven by taxes or subsidies designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 48–55. In some cases, economically-driven mitigation is balanced against climatically-driven adaptation 51,54,56. No models consider either risks or processes of maladaptation, despite these being obvious and important subjects for behavioural modelling 40.

Within models of adaptation, agricultural crop selection is a common focus, with both the nature and timing of arable agricultural activities being varied 39,57, often in response to reductions in water availability 58 (adaptation to flooding, primarily in urban areas, is a separate focus 59,60). Adaptation in pastoral agriculture is less commonly treated (e.g. 61), as is adaptation in commercial forestry (e.g. 62,63). However, a number of models do consider the broader effects of adaptation on competing land uses or between human and natural processes in the land system 51,64–67. More varied is the modelled nature of the adaptation process, with some placing greater emphasis on social, rather than individual, factors 68–71, or short-term risk minimisation rather than long-term planning 71,72.

Sectoral coverage

Agriculture

Of all land-based sectors, agriculture is the principal focus for behavioural models of adaptation (Table 1, Figure 1). These usually focus on arable agricultural management options 49,57,58,67,71,73–75 and timings 39,58,72, although some models include broader decisions related to intensification and extensification 55,65,76, buying or selling of land 77 or competition between arable and pastoral agriculture 39,67. Though less common, a number of models consider competition between agriculture and other land uses such as forestry 50,51,56,64 or urban development 66. Most agricultural models allow decision-making on the basis of direct climatic impacts, but several (especially cross-sectoral models) simulate responses to taxes or subsidies designed to encourage adaptation or mitigation 48,49,51–54,75,76. These decisions tend not to be subject to social pressures, except in studies of communal or marginal agriculture (e.g. 68) or of water resource management 36,58,78,79.

Forestry
Generally, models of the forestry sector are not as numerous as models of agriculture, and this imbalance is also present in models that consider climate change and, especially, human behaviour. In fact, changes in forestry are often modelled as a simple consequence of changes in agriculture, or as purely economic responses to taxes or subsidies. This paucity of modelled forms of management and behaviour does not necessarily impede consideration of some kinds of mitigation or adaptation, but it does mean that their full variety and complexity cannot be considered. A few models have put forestry in the context of cross-sectoral, large-scale adaptive decisions in land management, but we found only two that focused on adaptation within forestry, to maintain yields, economic benefits or, potentially, ecosystem characteristics. This clear gap in model applications is curious given forestry’s socio-economic and environmental importance, and its strong interactions with the climate system manifest in forestry-based mitigation options.

**Nature Conservation**

A considerable literature has accumulated about the social contexts and implications of nature conservation, especially the ways in which environmental and socio-economic objectives can be allied (e.g.). However, there have been very few attempts to consider the ways in which relevant social structures, attitudes or behaviours might vary under climate change, or what the effects of these variations might be. We found one model that represents decisions by conservation NGOs to buy land from farmers in a changing climatic and institutional context, but in the other rare cases where environmental objectives are included, conservation is treated as secondary to decisions about agriculture or forestry.

**Water management**

A substantial subset of models highlight or focus entirely on the water sector. A common theme is the complexity of this sector, with many different actors being involved at many different organisational levels. In some cases this complexity is presented as a substantial barrier to modelling, better captured through scenario development than simulations, although some attempts have been made to simulate limited interactions between actors. One of the main foci of these models is the use of water for agriculture in specific settings, such as water rights frameworks in Chile or reservoir management in Brazil. Others focus on the potential for adaptation in domestic water supply, while a third group address flood control, especially in coastal areas where rivers and urban centres co-exist. Many of these models acknowledge inadequacies in their treatment of water management, and it is clear that interactions with other sectors have not been fully explored.

**Subsistence agricultural land uses**

Land use or management for subsistence can reasonably be considered as distinct from other sectors. Not only are different sets of economic, socio-cultural and personal drivers involved at different spatial scales but, because of an inherent lack of adaptive or mitigative capacity, responses to changes in
climate will also differ\(^{21,72}\). This distinction is borne out in the modelling literature, with models tending either to focus exclusively on subsistence management or to neglect it entirely (but see \(^{54}\)), with the latter approach being more common. Where subsistence land uses are considered, they are usually treated as closely related to social structure, highlighting interactions between climate change, social change and land management decisions\(^{68,70,89}\). These interactions are complex and explorations of them have been limited, however, with some models of marginal agriculture dealing only with individual behaviour\(^{37,61,75}\).

General land use change – cross or non-sectoral

The great majority of models are applied to specific geographical and land-use contexts, but some are designed to include general, theoretical or cross-sectoral processes. These include wholly abstract changes in land management\(^{53,90}\), changes that span a range of specific sectors but include little detail within them\(^{64}\), or competition between sectors in specific contexts (see above). Despite these examples, substantial, cross-sectoral changes and their drivers are clearly under-represented, and there remains considerable uncertainty about how best to balance behavioural richness and generality, both theoretically and methodologically.

Climate Change impacts & responses

Most models include only one form of climate change impact, usually on water resources that affect agricultural crops\(^{36,50,57,58,61,66,68,71,77,88}\), flooding\(^{59,60}\) or other sectors such as tourism\(^{69}\). Less frequently included are other climatic effects on crop yields\(^{54,65,72,76}\) or on agricultural management activities\(^{39}\). In models of forestry, impacts are usually purely economic (in terms of timber prices and/or subsidies and taxes)\(^{51,53,62}\) but may extend to yields\(^{56}\) and even broader ecosystem characteristics\(^{63}\). Otherwise, cross-sectoral impacts are included only once in the models we considered, where they affect ecosystem functioning, resource harvests and, indirectly, community composition and adaptive capacity\(^{89}\).

Some models do not include the direct impacts of climate change, and some do not include direct responses. In the latter class, several models focus on responses to policies (for mitigation\(^{48,49,51,52,55}\), or adaptation\(^{75}\)). Generally, however, specific sectoral responses to specific sectoral impacts are included, especially in forestry\(^{62}\) and water management for flood control\(^{59,60}\). In agriculture, responses are usually expressed through crop choices and changes in the timings of activities\(^{58,68,71,72,75}\). Modelled responses are often notably cross-sectoral, however. In several cases, changes are permitted between arable and pastoral agriculture, between agriculture and other land uses (often forestry), or between use and abandonment of land\(^{37,39,50,51,53–56,61,64,66,77,91}\). Broader still are options for adaptation through general resource usage\(^{36,69,89}\), adoption of technology\(^{69}\), mitigation of poverty\(^{73}\), engagement with social or institutional responses\(^{89}\), or migration\(^{57,88,89,92}\). In sum, modelled responses to climate change are therefore substantially more diverse than the modelled impacts of climate change, suggesting a clear opportunity for further, cross-sectoral impacts to be considered.

Actors & Processes
Behavioural entities and processes are at the core of the models we reviewed, and treatments of them can be very detailed as a result. Unsurprisingly, the most commonly-modelled actors in behavioural models are individual land managers. These are usually represented using agent-based approaches, with greater or lesser degrees of interaction between the agents (Table 1). Other commonly modelled entities include households (either representing cohabiting individuals or a unit of land) or institutions such as government agencies. There are substantial methodological challenges in the parameterisation of such agents, especially over large geographical extents, and attempts to address these challenges are ongoing (e.g. 93). The majority of models we consider do not attempt to advance methodology in this respect (excepting, recently, the increased use of role-playing games for model calibration or validation44,76), but use established forms of model architecture and parameterisation in novel contexts. Nevertheless, the design and emphases placed on different behavioural processes vary widely (Figure 1), suggesting a lack of agreement about which processes are important under climate change, and how they should be modelled. Below, we consider the main behavioural factors included in the models we review and the extent of convergence in their implementation.

Diffusion

Diffusion of knowledge, attitudes or practices between neighbouring or socially-connected individuals is recognised as a fundamental process in all human systems. Many models of land-based sectors include it, and the ability to represent it explicitly is seen as a major advantage of bottom-up modelling approaches87,94,95. It can therefore be expected to play a substantial role in models of the kind we consider, given the importance of information and innovation in adaptation or mitigation in land-based sectors. Many of the models we reviewed do include diffusion of agricultural practices or technology37,47,49,51,66,69,76,79, but fewer include diffusion of information or attitudes, or diffusion in other sectors50,53,60,71 (forestry models were particularly lacking in this respect, including only indirect spatial influences between agents). These latter models are of particular interest where they allow behaviour to change with social (and, potentially, climatic) context, rather than modelling static behaviour within a dynamic environment. This is a key element of adaptation in particular, and is included in terms of socially-mediated attitudes to climate change70, levels of trust in weather forecasts71, or choices between economic and social objectives53. While the absence of socially-driven behavioural change may be a shortcoming of some behavioural models, studies that include diffusion suggest a more basic problem in non-behavioural models. This stems from the fact that diffusion takes time to occur, slowing the speed of adoption of new practices and technologies. Depending on the timescales involved, this could have very significant consequences for the timing and success of adaptation or mitigation actions. The exploration of these consequences therefore appears to be a key contribution of the behavioural models reviewed here.

Institutions

Institutions (which we use here to mean informal social structures as well as formal organisations or actors) play a decisive, but highly complex and sometimes opaque role in land management decisions and responses to climate change. This is regularly acknowledged in modelling papers, but is also used to
excuse a subsequent neglect of institutional actors and effects. In some cases it is explicitly argued that scenarios of institutional interventions are more transparent and appropriate than attempts to model institutional behaviour (e.g. 85), and this certainly seems a logical minimum requirement for models intended to evaluate policy options 49,50,52,54–56,75,76,96.

Most papers are not explicit about the choices involved in selecting and designing institutional agents, but a limited number of such agents is often included. In the simplest cases, these represent particular actors that can monitor and intervene in land use change in some way, for example government bodies 37,60,66, banks 60 or businesses 69. Alternatively, households and communities have been represented as institutions with their own adaptive strategies 57,89 or capacities 70. Others have proposed far more extensive institutional representations, with individuals, communities, companies, regulating authorities and governmental bodies all playing different, but interactive roles 59,86,88. However, the most commonly modelled institution is a market for goods, land or water 36,73,77,79.

Although there are few synergies in the representations of institutional actors, there are some strong commonalities. Considerable attention is paid to governmental taxation, subsidisation, regulation and information dissemination 37,49,54,55,60,66,75,76, and these are often included as exogenous factors even in the absence of modelled institutional agents. The role of social structures in the diffusion of technology, information, practices and behaviour is emphasised 40,53,69 (see above), and some attribute more importance to the effects of such structures than to individual decision-making (especially in studies of the water sector 59,69,85,97 or in marginal or subsistence settings 11,36,40,64,68,86,89). Nevertheless, representations of institutional actors are usually (and avowedly) simplistic. While a wide range of institutions have been modelled in total, little has been done to explore alternative – or more complete – representations of the institutional landscape, or to investigate potential changes in institutional objectives or relationships through time (but see 57,98).

**Learning & anticipation**

The ability to learn from past experience is an important component of adaptive capacity. Nevertheless, a surprisingly large number of behavioural models do not include any form of learning. Of those that do, roughly half allow agents to learn from their own experiences, to a greater or lesser extent 37,47,60,68,86, and half supplement individual learning with social learning on the basis of neighbours’ experiences, perceptions or beliefs 51,53,59,70,71,87. One model was used to study optimal timescales of learning for reactive adaptation 72, but none included further temporal change in learning processes. Most strikingly, no models implemented any form of second-order learning, in which experiences could alter agents’ decision-making rules or objectives (with the exception of social influences on priorities 53).

Anticipation of future economic or climatic conditions is also rarely addressed, but a small number of models include it on the basis of forecasts 68,71, existing knowledge and experience 50,56–58,62,63,86,99 or uncertain perceptions of risk 59,60. In one case, expectations were weighted by length of tenure 56, but other temporal variations again remain unconsidered. This is a significant omission given the known importance of anticipation in motivating mitigation or adaptation 13,21,22.
Type of decision-making

Social and behavioural factors of the kinds discussed above have generally acknowledged importance in climate change adaptation and mitigation, and this is reflected by the inclusion of at least one of these factors in the majority of relevant models. However, while these factors often inform the decisions made by model agents, their exact roles and importance varies widely and often without detailed justification, except where determined by data availability (e.g. 55,75,76). Furthermore, despite the explicitly behavioural focus of models included in this review, the majority assume some form of economic rationality as the basis for land management decisions. This varies from rigid optimisation or equilibrium51,52,56,62,72,78 to heterogeneous, partial or time-dependent satisfaction of economic objectives39,48,49,55,57,60,65–68,75–77,100,101. A (substantial) minority of models prioritise social or environmental factors, sometimes on the basis of empirical evidence37,50,51,53,64,69. As a result, the potential of many models to capture behavioural effects on adaptive capacity appears to be largely unrealised. Almost none are presently able to consider linked changes in social and climatic conditions, and their implications for future decision-making, despite this being technically feasible89.

Validation & Uncertainty

Validation of behavioural models of land-based sectors is not a simple task. Theoretically, validation may be technically impossible in complex human (and natural) systems because unique causality is not necessarily present or provable102,103. Practically, a general lack of suitable or sufficiently extensive data limits validation options104. There is some agreement that replication of observed outcomes risks over-fitting and that validation should therefore focus on process accuracy as far as possible29,39,71,102. These issues are especially pertinent to behavioural models of climate change because, on the one hand, neither climatic (and hence environmental) nor behavioural conditions can be assumed to stay constant, while on the other hand the complexity of these conditions can generate an effectively endless array of spurious results if inadequately constrained.

Despite the importance of validation, it is not always carried out or even discussed (and a lack of transparency often makes subsequent validation impossible)1,105. Where validation does occur, it often takes the form of tuning or ‘calibration’ of models to consistently replicate observed outcomes. Rigorous discussion or application of validation procedures is not uncommon36,56,87,99,106, but has not led to consistency of practice or development of methodology. In the models we reviewed, five main approaches to model validation or evaluation were apparent: checking modelled behaviour against actors’ stated or revealed behaviour36,50,56,68,71,76,87,107 (comparisons of the two25 were not used); extensive sensitivity analyses36,39; comparison (or tuning to ensure agreement) of some modelled and measured outcomes37,39,57,58,60,66,78,87,89,107; comparison to the results of other models73; and reliance on previous validation of the same or a similar model51,53,58,65,69 (Figure 2). Justification of the (usually single) selected approach is rare, as is discussion of implications for model usage and interpretation.
A closely related issue is uncertainty in model results. Some see this as a key consideration in behavioural modelling, because systematic exploration of uncertainties is necessary for models to inform robust policies or management strategies\textsuperscript{39,59,86,99,108}. At the other extreme, uncertainty may be entirely neglected\textsuperscript{57,61,62}, although explicit justifications for this, such as potential detraction from the force of general findings (e.g.\textsuperscript{109}), or irrelevance to the task of improved understanding (e.g.\textsuperscript{54}) is very rare. Between these extremes, a range of approaches are adopted, including discussion of potential uncertainties\textsuperscript{54,63}, the use of a number of social and environmental scenarios\textsuperscript{65,69}, analyses that build on unstructured collections of runs\textsuperscript{51,64,70}, structured (e.g. Monte Carlo) approaches\textsuperscript{36,37,56,71,89}, and mathematically rigorous explorations of parameter space\textsuperscript{39}. Once again, the diversity of approaches limits the scope for general conclusions or cross-model comparisons to be established\textsuperscript{110}. This problem is exacerbated by a tendency for the least behaviourally rich models to make the most confident predictions, overlooking the uncertainties (or even inaccuracies) inherent in their basic assumptions\textsuperscript{111}. This adds considerably to the recognised difficulties of describing uncertainties in climate projections because it obscures the form and potentially the existence of uncertainties in land system contributions to climatic change\textsuperscript{112}.

**Discussion & Conclusion**

Climate adaptation and mitigation decisions are shaped by their social as well as environmental, economic and political contexts\textsuperscript{7,13,16,27}. However, models of the linked development of the climate and land systems have tended to prioritise descriptions based on economic rationality, with relatively little work done to explore the inaccuracies resulting from this approach. In principle, established forms of behavioural models are well-suited to this task because they are designed to represent many of the processes known to be key to adaptation and mitigation. However, it is less clear whether existing models achieve the potential of this approach. In reviewing published behavioural models of climate change adaptation or mitigation in land-based sectors, we are able to identify a number of areas that have received considerable modelling attention, and a number that have received very little. In fact, the latter group is particularly large and significant, containing many types of behaviour that are known to have strong and pertinent effects. This may suggest some theoretical, as well as practical, limits to the scope for modelling the effects of climate change in human systems, but appears to leave substantial unexplored potential.

At a very general level, it is clearly both necessary and possible to move beyond excessively or indiscriminately economic approaches (which have been described as “implausible caricatures...as prescribed by the rationality theory, with a touch of psychological realism in the best possible case”\textsuperscript{113, p.4}). That is not to say that economic processes are unimportant, or even adequately represented in all cases, but they are at least widely included using clear, interpretable assumptions (if not justifications). The same is not true of behavioural processes, and there remains considerable scope for exploring the effects of known\textsuperscript{9,38,71} or theorised forms of behaviour\textsuperscript{13,113}. Many of these behaviours are social in nature, particularly where land uses are part of either very complex or very constrained social systems (e.g. where many actors are present or where poverty and deprivation are particularly
intense\textsuperscript{11,59,69,85,97}). Equally important are dynamic behaviours and social structures that allow for realistic interactions between actors and their environments. In order for models to account for true adaptation - including in the nature, objectives and forms of individual and social behaviours – they need to prioritise generative cognitive processes over more tractable optimisation functions\textsuperscript{113,114}.

Of course, it is not necessarily the case that ever-greater behavioural accuracy is either desirable or possible. Not all forms of individual and social behaviours are amenable to modelling, but the identification of limits is a complex problem involving philosophical and practical considerations\textsuperscript{26,27,29,115}. For example, it may not be possible to usefully simulate the decisions of any particular individual but perfectly possible to explore the effects of particular forms of decision-making, and while culture may not be reducible to model algorithms, specific differences in perceptions can be. This reflects the value of behavioural models in providing controlled experimental settings for improving understanding; a role based on interpretability and exploration rather than attempted descriptive or predictive accuracy\textsuperscript{29,116}.

Certainly, the use of behavioural models to understand effects beyond the scope of economic models is well-supported and relatively common across land system science\textsuperscript{3,10,93,117,118}. This often involves simple models that can illuminate areas of uncertainty or potential developments that were previously unrecognised\textsuperscript{11,22,81,86,119}. Obvious and achievable contributions here include assessments of the role of diffusion in attitudes, knowledge or uptake of novel practices\textsuperscript{47,95}, the potential for particular aspects of local knowledge to alter the impacts of global drivers of change\textsuperscript{54,70,120,121}, and the effects of changes in ecosystem service provision on societal and individual decision-making\textsuperscript{70,89,119}.

More comprehensive analyses face the challenge of incorporating social and ecological systems dynamics more fully\textsuperscript{7,63,72}. While this challenge is not insurmountable, it may require methodological advances alongside complementary approaches such as participatory modelling\textsuperscript{54,76,122,123} and socio-ecological systems modelling\textsuperscript{63,122,124}. Such developments could allow valuable advances in exploring the implications of socially-constructed beliefs, perceptions and resilience, particularly for adaptation options that might wrongly appear feasible or rational to an outside observer, or for an increased likelihood of maladaptation to objective climate impacts\textsuperscript{26,115,125}. Broader techniques are required to move beyond highly specific single applications and represent entire, integrated socio-economic, climatic and environmental systems\textsuperscript{12,63,86,90,126} (largely beyond the scale of current applications; Figure 3). Defining and describing these systems is, inevitably, extremely difficult\textsuperscript{127}, but there are a number of clear steps that can be taken towards this end. The first is to adopt consistent approaches across land-based sectors, so that cross-sectoral models properly represent the interactive processes involved. This requires, for example, models of forestry and pastoral agriculture that approach the richness of models of arable agriculture, including both mitigation and adaptation, dynamic rather than static climatic conditions, and a broader range of behavioural processes\textsuperscript{63,80,128}. The simulated impacts of climate change must be broader too, so that diverse responses to a realistic range of different impacts can occur together. A clear priority here is the treatment of water resources, which are currently the subject of a specialised and largely separate modelling literature (and one that emphasises the importance of institutional actors).
Finally, some general issues of modelling practice, apparent in the models we reviewed (though certainly not unique to them), also prevent models from achieving their full potential. The first concerns transparency, with models often being poorly described and unavailable for further analysis – a particular problem where prototype models are presented, but not subsequently implemented. This has distinct implications for behavioural models to the extent that written descriptions of behaviour sometimes diverge quite significantly from programmed descriptions, making it hard to determine what exactly has been simulated. Secondly, uncertainty in model results is rarely analysed or described in detail, despite the considerable uncertainty inherent in behavioural model design and calibration. More robust handling of uncertainty is essential, especially where models are intended to support real-world decision-making.\cite{105,129}. Thirdly, there remains a disconnect between the identification and modelling of factors important to climate change mitigation and adaptation. Models are rarely founded on a clear conceptualisation of these processes, and frequently fail to account for the ways in which they differ from ‘ordinary’ land use change.

It is important to recognise that many of these criticisms relate to behavioural modelling of climate change mitigation and adaptation in sum, rather than to individual instances that are necessarily limited in scope. Furthermore, many apply equally to non-behavioural models that make unrealistic assumptions about human behaviour. The neglect of non-economic and social behaviours such as diffusion, anticipation and learning in any model suggests an unexplored bias towards artificially rapid responses to economic stimuli and a lack of responses to social or environmental stimuli. Projections of linked changes in climate and land use are therefore likely to be excessively homogeneous, temporally discrete and amenable to simple political interventions. However, it is obvious that some boundaries need to be set if models are to be practicable, and these boundaries will inevitably be artificial in a system as complex as that of the Earth System, its inhabitants and its climate. The greatest gains may therefore be made simply through better recognition of behavioural modelling as a necessary, coherent and distinct area of climate change research, fostering communication between practitioners and systematic methodological developments on clear philosophical foundations.

References


26. Orlove, B. The past, the present and some possible futures of adaptation. (2009).


38. van Sluisveld, M. A. E., Martínez, S. H., Daioglou, V. & van Vuuren, D. P. Exploring the implications


104. van Vliet, J. *et al.* Advancing land-use modeling requires new data to understand and represent human decision making. *Rev.*


121. Lambin, E. F. & Geist, H. Land-use and Land-cover Change: Local Processes and Global Impacts (Google eBook). (Springer, 2006).


**Figure captions**

**Figure 1:** Modelled behaviour by sector. The number of models that include each form of behaviour is shown, so that one model may be included several times across the categories; this also means that cross-sectoral models contribute to more than one sector. Economic and individual behaviour does not include non-economic factors or social processes. Other categories may or may not be based on economic factors, but include distinct decision-making mechanisms.

**Figure 2:** Forms of validation or evaluation adopted by reviewed models

**Figure 3:** Geographical extent of models reviewed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author &amp; reference</th>
<th>Adaptation/ mitigation</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Modelled behaviour</th>
<th>Decision-making</th>
<th>Perception of climate change</th>
<th>Model type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander47</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Diffusion, learning</td>
<td>Crop choice and investment in biomass power plant</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus48</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture, urban</td>
<td>Migration, food consumption</td>
<td>Via market</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antle130</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Adoption of different agricultural practice</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold96</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Crop choice, investments, labour, saving/financing</td>
<td>Via institutions</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badmos75</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Choice of crop system</td>
<td>Via institutions</td>
<td>Microsimulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakker107</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Buying &amp; selling rural land</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barthel86</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Cross-sectoral</td>
<td>Diffusion, social network, learning</td>
<td>Choices about water usage</td>
<td>Via market &amp; institutions</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belem92</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Crop choice, inputs (fertiliser), migration</td>
<td>Direct impacts</td>
<td>Microsimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell50</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry</td>
<td>Social network</td>
<td>Land use (e.g. de/re-forestation) and buying/selling of land</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berger87</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Diffusion, social network</td>
<td>Investment, irrigation, crop type and technology, innovation adoption, persistence/abandonment</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berger99</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Diffusion, social network, learning</td>
<td>Crop selection, investments.</td>
<td>Microsimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berman85</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Form households, harvest and hunt, share resources, look for jobs, migration</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts, via institutions</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharwani68</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts, via market</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone70</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Diffusion, learning</td>
<td>Decisions are scenario-dependent.</td>
<td>Direct impacts, via institutions</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown46</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Adoption of bioenergy crops (forgoing profit)</td>
<td>Via institutions</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng78</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Optimisation of water resource usage</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deng90</td>
<td>Mitigation, adaptation</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Generic land use decision, based on decisions of similar 'households'</td>
<td>Direct impacts, via market</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer46</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Primarily whether to engage in subsidised reforestation scheme</td>
<td>Via market &amp; institutions</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferreira55</td>
<td>Mitigation, adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry</td>
<td>Land use/cover transitions</td>
<td>Via institutions</td>
<td>Microsimulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gimona65</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, conservation</td>
<td>Intensification/extensification based on climate suitability and policy interventions</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Impacts &amp; Mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Harvesting &amp; replanting</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts, via market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiang</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>_decisions affecting cost and value of production</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts, via market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joffre</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, coastal (mangroves)</td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Intensity of production</td>
<td>Direct, via institutions</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr</td>
<td>Mitigation, adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry</td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Land use (land clearance, crop choice).</td>
<td>Direct impacts, via market &amp; institutions</td>
<td>Microsimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Technical options to maintain grazing suitability.</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malanson</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Crop selection</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Social network, learning</td>
<td>Decisions about abstract land uses, made on basis of neighbours' land uses and strategies.</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzega</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>crop allocation, irrigation, reservoir &amp; water resource management.</td>
<td>Direct impacts, via institutions</td>
<td>Multi-agent system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meza</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Adjustments in management (timing etc.) for specific crops</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>Microsimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry</td>
<td>Social network, learning</td>
<td>Selection of land based activity</td>
<td>Via market</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray-Rust</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whether to change/abandon land use</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connell</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture - flooding</td>
<td>Proposed model</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putra</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Urban, coastal</td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>House purchase, modification and sale</td>
<td>Direct impacts, via market &amp; institutions</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rammer</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Forest management strategy and practices</td>
<td>Direct &amp; indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvini</td>
<td>Mitigation, adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Choice of agricultural management, deforestation</td>
<td>Direct impacts, via institutions</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheffran</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crop selection</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seo</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Choice of agricultural systems</td>
<td>Via institutions</td>
<td>Microsimulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soboll</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Water usage; quantities, adoption of new technologies</td>
<td>Direct &amp; indirect impacts, via market &amp; institutions</td>
<td>Microsimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soman</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agents adapt strategies based on context</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>ABM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troost</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Crop selection and management</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Sector(s)</td>
<td>Behaviour(s)</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>Model Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Oel</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Crop irrigation decisions</td>
<td>Indirect (ES) impacts</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yan</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture, urban</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Changes in land cover, primary focus on urban expansion</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yousefpour</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Forest management practice</td>
<td>AES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, conservation</td>
<td>Diffusion, learning</td>
<td>Land use, whether to sell or buy land parcels</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziervogel</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Diffusion, learning</td>
<td>Timing and nature of crop activities</td>
<td>ABM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Overview of models reviewed. Entries are made in a column only where the relevant issue is modelled (e.g. rather than used to motivate the model). Behaviours refer to those discussed in the text, and do not include economic rationality. Model type is based on that given in publication, not independent assessment, and ABM refers to agent-based model. Only papers that present models of land-based sectors are included (several relevant discussion/review papers are not included).