2021

Fighting plastic pollution: An investigation into whether the presence or absence of single-use plastic impacts our impression of others

Spencer, Jennifer

Supplementary information and data

Appendix A: Brief
CONNECT; trialling a new friendship app

Thank you for choosing to take part in our study.
Before you decide to take part in this study it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully. A member of the team can be contacted if you have any questions.

The aim of this study is to gain feedback from a trial of a new friendship app called CONNECT, which is designed to make it easier for university students to make friends. You will view 8 profiles and will then answer questions about each profile. Your data gained from this study will remain confidential and entirely anonymous as you will be given a unique participation number. You have the right to withdraw at any point within the study, this will not affect your participation points. At any point within two weeks after taking part, you can request for your data to be destroyed if you wish, by contacting one of the experimenters.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask.
I confirm that I have read and understand the participation brief.
I have had the opportunity to ask questions if I do not understand something.
I understand that all personal information will remain confidential and that all efforts will be made to ensure I cannot be identified.
I agree that data gathered in this study may be stored anonymously and securely.
I understand that my participati0on is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time.
I agree to take part in this study.

Please sign the consent form given to you by the researcher and make note of your participant number in case you wish to withdraw your data

Appendix B: Debrief
Thank you for taking part in our study.

You signed up to this study under the impression that you were trialing a new friendship app called CONNECT. However, the true aim of this study was to investigate whether the presence or absence of single-use/ reusable items influence impression formation positively or negatively. The second aim investigated whether scores from an ocean connectedness survey influences judgement or not. We apologize for the minor deception, but this was necessary so as to not reveal the true aims of our study.

In the interests of researcher analysis, you have 14 days from the date of your study if you wish to withdraw your data. Please email any of the contacts on this page if you wish to withdraw your data quoting your unique participation number so we know which set to withdraw.

In good nature we ask you not to discuss this study with any other psychology students**.**

Appendix C: Full Table of pictures used in the study, in their relevant photosets.

Profile	SET A	SET B
1	**PROFILE 1: Lucy, 21. PLASTIC** 1a Plastic Bag. 1b Control. 	**PROFILE 1: Lucy, 21. REUSABLE** 1a Reusable Bag. 1b Control.

	1c Plastic Bottle 1d Plastic Coffee Cup 	1c Reusable Bottle 1d Reusable Coffee Cup.
2	**PROFILE 2: Josh, 20. REUSABLE**	**PROFILE 2: Josh, 20. PLASTIC**

2a Reusable Bottle

2a Plastic Bottle

2b Reusable Bag

2b Reusable Bag

2c Reusable Coffee Cup

2c Reusable Coffee Cup

	2d Control 	2d Control
3	**PROFILE 3: Emily, 21. REUSABLE** 3a Reusable Coffee Cup 3b Control	**PROFILE 3: Emily, 21. PLASTIC** 3a Plastic Coffee Cup 3b Control

3c Reusable Bottle

3c Plastic Bottle

3d Reusable Bag

3d Plastic bag

4	**PROFILE 4: Luke, 21. PLASTIC.** 4a Plastic Bottle 4b Control	**PROFILE 4: Luke, 21. REUSABLE** 4a Reusable Bottle 4b Control

4c Plastic Coffee Cup

4c Reusable Coffee Cup

4d Plastic Bag

4d Reusable Bag

5	**PROFILE 5: Lauren, 21. PLASTIC.**	**PROFILE 5: Lauren, 21. REUSABLE.**
	5a Plastic Coffee Cup	5a Reusable Coffee Cup
	5b Plastic Bag	5b Reusable Bag

	5c Control	5c Control
	5d Plastic Bottle	5d Reusable Bottle
6	**PROFILE 6: Matt, 19. REUSABLE** 6a Control	**PROFILE 6: Matt, 19. PLASTIC** 6a Control

6b Reusable Coffee Cup

6b Plastic Coffee Cup

6c Reusable Bag

6c Plastic Bag

7	**PROFILE 7: Hannah, 19. REUSABLE**	**PROFILE 7: Hannah, 19. PLASTIC**
	6d Reusable Bottle	6d Plastic Bottle
	7a Reusable Bag	7a Plastic Bag

7b

7b Reusable Coffee Cup

Plastic Coffee Cup

7c Control

7c Control

7d Reusable Bottle

7d Plastic Bottle

8	**PROFILE 8: Dan, 19. PLASTIC**	**PROFILE 8: Dan, 19. REUSABLE**
	8a Plastic Bag	8a Reusable Bag

8b Plastic Coffee Cup

8b Reusable Coffee Cup

	8c Control	8c Control
	8d Plastic Bottle	8d Reusable Bottle

Appendix D: Full marine litter awareness analysis

Similarity.

There was no significant interaction between marine litter awareness scores, and how participants rated themselves as being 'similar' to those pictured with single-use or reusable items, $F(1, 160) = .02$, $p = .89$. Furthermore, there was no interaction between 'similarity' scores, marine litter and which photoset participants were in, $F(1, 160) = .73$, $p = .40$.

Table 11.

Mean scores showing how 'similar' those with both a low marine litter awareness score and a high marine litter awareness score rated the models in the images to be, depending on whether they were pictured with a single-use item or a reusable item

Photoset	Marine Litter Awareness Score	Single-Use vs Reusable	Mean 'Similarity' Score	Standard Deviation
1	Low	Single-Use	2.49	0.53
		Reusable	2.70	0.67
	High	Single-Use	2.22	0.64
		Reusable	2.52	0.70
2	Low	Single-Use	2.42	0.60
		Reusable	2.46	0.54
	High	Single-Use	2.63	0.68
		Reusable	2.61	0.60

Table 11 shows no real difference across means or standard deviation.

Coolness
There was no significant interaction between marine litter awareness scores, and how 'cool' participants rated to those pictured with single-use or reusable items, $F(1, 160) = .86$, $p = .36$
Furthermore, there was no interaction between 'coolness' ratings, marine litter and which photoset participants were in, $F(1, 160) = .63$, $p = .43$.

Table 12.

Mean scores showing 'coolness' ratings for single-use and reusable items based on low and high marine litter awareness scores and photoset.

Photoset	Marine Litter Awareness Score	Single-Use vs Reusable	Mean 'Coolness' Score	Standard Deviation
1	Low	Single-Use	3.23	0.48
		Reusable	3.63	0.45
	High	Single-Use	2.95	0.67
		Reusable	3.40	0.52
2	Low	Single-Use	3.37	0.55
		Reusable	3.08	0.52
	High	Single-Use	3.35	0.53
		Reusable	3.07	0.55

Table 12 shows no real difference across means or standard deviation.

Caring

There was no significant interaction between marine litter awareness scores, and how 'caring' participants rated to those pictured with single-use or reusable items, F (1, 160) = .04, p =.85

Furthermore, there was no interaction between 'caring' ratings, marine litter and which photoset participants were in, F (1, 160) = .07, p = .80

Table 13.

Mean 'caring' scores participants with both low and high marine litter awareness scores gave to those pictured with single-use and reusable items, across both photosets.

Photoset	Marine Litter Awareness Score	Single-Use vs Reusable	Mean 'Caring' Score	Standard Deviation
1	Low	Single-Use	3.70	0.60
		Reusable	3.64	0.60
	High	Single-Use	3.54	0.58
		Reusable	3.52	0.54
2	Low	Single Use	3.42	0.64
		Reusable	3.54	0.50
	High	Single Use	3.58	0.51
		Reusable	3.70	0.50

Table 13 shows no real difference across means or standard deviation.

Overall Friendship Judgement
There was no significant interaction between marine litter awareness scores and how likely participants were to be friends with those pictured with single-use and reusable items, $F(1, 160) = .50$, $p = .48$. There was no interaction between marine litter awareness scores, participants friendship judgement and which photoset they were in, $F(1, 160) = .001$, $p = .98$.

Table 14.

Mean scores for how likely those with both low and high marine litter awareness scores are to be friends with someone based on if they're pictured with a single- use or a reusable item, across both photosets.

Photoset	Marine Litter Awareness Score	Single-Use vs Reusable	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
1	Low	Single-Use	2.40	0.44
		Reusable	2.56	0.47
	High	Single-Use	2.32	0.48
		Reusable	2.50	0.46
2	Low	Single-Use	2.45	0.46
		Reusable	2.53	0.41
	High	Single-Use	2.58	0.43
		Reusable	2.53	0.43

Table 13 shows no real difference across means or standard deviation.