

Practice essay · Everyday practice

Why the default is not a personal choice

Sofia Mendes · 15 September 2026

Fictional author and institute · Editorial demonstration, not peer reviewed

ABSTRACT

A lower-impact option is not a genuine choice if its surrounding services make it unusable. Beginning with two hypothetical late-shift journeys, this practice essay uses the IPCC's service-based account of demand to distinguish a need from the object or fuel currently meeting it. Schedules, infrastructure, expenses rules, and access arrangements can establish a default before an individual acts. A short friction map identifies the need, available options, obstacle, and institution able to change it. The discussion stresses private exception routes and attention to who bears extra time or cost. It also separates service uptake from demonstrated emissions reductions. Its conclusion places individual experience and institutional change together, directing requests towards the specific arrangements that responsible organisations can actually alter.

Keywords: demand-side mitigation · service access · infrastructure · institutional defaults · transport

Adapted from the Still North field journal. Original article. A source-based editorial text, not a report of original Still North research. Examples and imagery are illustrative.

Consider two people leaving the same workplace after a late shift. One has a frequent bus, a lit walk to the stop, and somewhere safe to wait. The other has a timetable that ended an hour ago. An instruction to drive less reaches both people, but it does not offer them the same choice.

This is why demand is not simply a story about preferences. A person needs to get home, keep warm, eat, work, or care for someone. The buildings, services, prices, schedules, and rules around that need shape how it is met. Those arrangements can make a lower-impact option ordinary, or leave it available only to people with extra time, money, and stamina.

Start with the service, not the object

IPCC Working Group III Chapter 5 frames demand around services that support well-being, rather than energy and material use for their own sake. It also finds that individual behaviour change is insufficient unless embedded in structural and cultural change. That does not make individual action pointless. It changes what a useful action can be.

“A car journey” describes one means. “A dependable trip home after work” describes the need. The second wording opens questions about shift times, transport, safe routes, shared vehicles, and where the work happens. It also protects the essential purpose: nobody is proposing that a worker remain stranded to improve a transport statistic.

The same distinction applies to a warm home and a replacement product. Comfort is not identical to burning a particular fuel, and access to equipment is not identical to owning it. But an alternative must actually deliver the service. A heating upgrade that leaves a vulnerable resident cold, or a lending scheme that is closed when needed, has not solved the underlying task.

Make the hidden default visible

Choose a recurring decision and trace what has already been settled before the individual acts. Who chose the work finish time? Who funds the last bus? Is the secure bicycle store accessible after hours? Does the expenses policy reimburse only a particular mode? A default can be a physical arrangement, an administrative rule, or simply the option requiring the least negotiation.

For a workplace canteen, the default may be the meal included in a meeting booking. For a building, it may be a heating control residents cannot access. For equipment, it may be a purchasing form that offers new stock but no route to internal reuse. None of these arrangements is changed by telling an individual to care more.

A short friction map can help: name the need, the available options, the obstacle, and the person or body able to change it. Keep different experiences separate. A route suitable for a confident cyclist may still be unusable for someone carrying equipment or travelling with a child. One enthusiastic user is not proof of universal access.

Ask for the part someone controls

The employer may not control the bus timetable, but it may control shift coordination, transport discussions, a safe waiting place, or the evidence it supplies to the operator. A council may control the crossing but not the workplace schedule. A useful request names that boundary instead of asking one institution to fix the whole system.

For example, a staff group could ask for a review of transport access across shift patterns before the next roster change. The review should include people who cannot attend daytime meetings and examine the actual late journeys, not just the number of employees living near a bus line. The first deliverable could be a published set of options and a named decision date.

Changing a default also requires an exception route. A standard lower-impact option should not remove necessary disability provision, care arrangements, or safety support. Ask who will bear additional time and cost, and whether people can raise a problem without publicly defending their circumstances.

Do not confuse uptake with an outcome

If a new service is offered, check whether it meets the need. Are the relevant shifts covered? Can people book it? Does it run reliably? Are users replacing a higher-impact journey or simply adding trips? Participation can show usefulness, but it is not by itself a measured emissions reduction. Any climate claim needs appropriate data and a credible comparison.

Infrastructure and personal practice are not competing explanations. A working service makes a choice possible; experience using it can reveal what needs changing. People with more resources and authority also have more scope to alter both their own consumption and the systems around others.

Our travel guide helps assess an available route. Money and voice follows influence into institutions. The next time a choice looks stubbornly unchanged, ask what the default has already decided. That question often finds a more useful place to act than another reminder directed at the person with the fewest options.

References

1. IPCC Working Group III Chapter 5 ([ipcc.ch](https://www.ipcc.ch))