

# Risk Perception: The Case of Microplastics. A Discussion of Environmental Risk Perception Focused on the Microplastic Issue

*Marcos Felipe-Rodriguez, Gisela Böhm, Rouven Doran*

## Introduction

Risk can be generally understood as the possibility that situations or events might lead to consequences that affect aspects of what humans value (Renn and Rohrman 2000). Risk perception involves implicit or explicit judgements of the likelihood or uncertainty as well as the desirability or undesirability of uncertain effects, which yield some benefit or cost (Eiser 2004).<sup>1</sup> The formal definition of risk often entails the magnitude and probability of harmful consequences (Aven and Renn 2009), and risk perceptions include these dimensions, along with perceptions of familiarity and controllability, dread and catastrophic potential, as well as affective and emotional responses (Finucane et al. 2000; Slovic 2000; 2016). Risk perceptions deviate from numerical risk estimates because they are not exclusively determined by statistics and probabilities, but also by qualitative factors related to the risks themselves and those perceiving them (Kortenkamp and Moore 2011).

Environmental risks diverge from other types of risks. First, they are often characterized by high uncertainty and complexity, leading to complicated causal relationships and numerous consequences (Steg and De Groot 2018). Moreover, they tend to develop from the behaviors of many individuals; consequently, mitigation requires the actions of many people. Lastly, their consequences are often temporally delayed and geographically distant. Those who contribute to the risk are not necessarily those who

---

1 Slovic (1999) argued that “danger” is a reality, but “risk” is socially constructed.

suffer its consequences, which raises ethical issues (Steg and De Groot 2018).

The current chapter focuses on risk perception of the environmental problem of microplastics. Microplastics are tiny particles of plastic, smaller than 5 mm. Microplastics are found at growing concentrations in the environment and have accumulated even in the most distant (van Sebille et al. 2015; Egger et al. 2020). The public and academia are increasingly concerned about the possible effects of this global challenge (SAPEA 2019). Accordingly, it is necessary to gain an understanding of people's perceptions and engage the public to tackle this problem effectively (Pahl and Wyles 2017).

The determinants of microplastics risk judgments are numerous and interrelated. Socio-psychological factors have substantial influence on the evaluation of such environmental risks. Furthermore, people's risk perceptions about microplastics are important to consider when addressing the threat microplastics pose. This chapter discusses the different aspects that may affect environmental risk perceptions, focusing on the case of microplastics. It begins by highlighting the characteristics of the hazard itself and moves on to the individual characteristics, with an emphasis on the role of heuristics, emotions, and finally models.

## Hazard Characteristics

There are cases in which people are wary of hazards that experts agree do not cause much significant harm, like electronic radiation from mobile telephones, while in other cases, people are ready and willing to expose themselves to hazards that result in large numbers of fatalities each year, such as drinking alcohol (Siegrist and Arvai 2020). Such divergences can be at least partially explained by specific characteristics of the hazards themselves. The core variables in risk perception research are (perceived) magnitude of the risk and risk acceptance (Renn and Rohrman 2000). Nonetheless, in most studies, many more risk-related aspects are included, such as qualitative features of the hazard (e.g., familiarity with the risk or associated fear), benefits (e.g., attractiveness of the risky activity), personal relation to the hazard (e.g., whether one voluntarily exposes oneself to it, degree of worry about the risk, etc.), and acceptability facets (e.g., willingness to pay or desired level of restrictions) (Renn and Rohrman 2000).

The psychometric paradigm (Fischhoff et al. 1979) suggests that different types of hazards can be mapped onto four dimensions across two axes, labelled dread risk and unknown risk, respectively.<sup>2</sup> Dread risk refers to the level to which the risk is perceived as alarming or as having grave consequences; unknown risk describes the level to which the risk is experienced as unfamiliar, new, unobservable or having delayed effects (Steg and de Groot 2018). Dread risk includes features such as uncontrollable, catastrophic, dreaded, involuntary, fatal, inequitable, global, and difficult to reduce, whereas unknown risk includes risks that are unobservable, not understood by science, new, and have delayed effects (Kortenkamp and Moore 2011). Risks with effects that are perceived as far off in time or as occurring in a faraway place are also included within this dimension (Eyal et al. 2008). Non-experts' risk perceptions have been shown to correlate with these main dimensions. Risks rated as more dreadful and more unknown are perceived as riskier and less acceptable (Kortenkamp and Moore 2011). Other investigations have identified more dimensions that are relevant for environmental challenges, such as whether people have moral concerns related to the risk and whether people feel that issues of equity are related to the risk (e.g., Bostrom et al. 2020). Another important factor discussed in the context of risk acceptance is whether the source of the risk is natural versus human/technological, as people tend to rank natural hazards lowest in risk magnitude ratings. These hazards seem to be perceived and evaluated as more tolerable than those stemming from human activities or technologies, even though objective risk assessments might not differ much (Renn and Rohrmann 2000).

The ubiquity of microplastics in aquatic ecosystems has provoked a broad public debate on the unsustainable use and environmental impact of plastics (Kramm and Völker 2018). However, as stated above, there are cases where the public perception of a particular hazard does not match experts' understanding of its impacts. While the environmental impacts of microplastics are not at all clear from a scientific perspective at present (see Heß et al. in this volume), public awareness of overall plastic pollution is extensive (Völker et al. 2020; Kramm et al. 2022). In fact, most EU citizens worry about the consequences of plastics for the environment (87 percent) and for their own health (74 percent) (European Commission 2017). Mean-

---

2 For empirical evidence, see Slovic (1987) and Teigen et al. (1988).

while, there has been ongoing debate about the relevance of this issue compared to other environmental challenges (Backhaus and Wagner 2020), with some scholars arguing that the levels of environmental toxicity detected so far are too low to be of significant concern (Triebkorn et al. 2019). Such disparity between experts and public opinion can potentially be problematic when it results in policies and decisions that are disproportionate or not supported by science (Rist et al. 2018).

The public indeed has reported to be highly concerned that microplastics could have an impact on the sustainable development of ecosystems and also threaten food safety and public health (European Commission 2020; German Federal institute for Risk Assessment 2020; SAPEA 2019). Such levels of perceived risk might be explained in part by known/dread factors from the psychometric paradigm. With respect to the dread risk dimension, plastic and microplastics pollution are likely to be considered dreadful hazards given that plastic pollution is a form of involuntary exposure for animals and plants in the environment and a problem at a global scale. With respect to the unknown risk dimension, microplastics are a quite new hazard (Pahl and Wyles 2017) that is not well understood by science, since research on them is still in its infancy (Rist et al. 2018). This may lead people to perceive this hazard as less well understood by science. Nonetheless, 53 percent of respondents in Kramm et al. (2022) perceived the state of scientific knowledge on microplastics as rather high or very high, suggesting the contrary. Moreover, microplastics are not easily observable (Pahl and Wyles 2017), which should also make people lean more towards the unknown end of the spectrum. Additionally, regarding the sources of microplastics, since hazards stemming from human activities are perceived as riskier and less tolerable (Renn and Rohrman 2000), the fact that microplastics are a human-caused hazard might contribute to the high levels of perceived risk that have been reported.

## Perceiver Characteristics

Perceivers of risk differ on a wide range of variables that might influence risk perceptions (Siegrist and Árvai 2020). Many such variables have been studied extensively in order to explain and predict individual differences in risk perceptions. In the case of microplastics, only a few studies have been

conducted to investigate public risk perceptions (Yoon et al. 2021). Perceived consequences as well as knowledge and awareness determined pro-environmental attitudes in a study by Soares et al. (2021) in Portugal. Risk perception was also a pivotal determinant of pro-environmental behavioral intention related to microplastics in Korea (Yoon et al. 2021). The relation between expectations and perception (Tsiotsou 2006) has also been found to be key in consumer decisions about green microplastics-free products (Nam et al. 2017; for a discussion on interventions to reduce plastics consumption see Grünzner and Pahl in this volume). On that note, the most relevant individual characteristics and their implications for risk perceptions of microplastics are highlighted in the sections below.

### Socio-Demographics

Gender appears frequently to be weakly associated with risk perceptions (Cullen et al. 2018; Rivers et al. 2010); in addition, small or non-significant effects have been found for age (Bearth et al. 2019) as well as income (Nardi et al. 2020) and education (Bearth et al. 2019; Nardi et al. 2020). However, some studies have yielded more information about the relationship between risk perceptions and demographic characteristics. For example, in studies by Finucane and colleagues (2000), white women perceived significantly higher levels of risk across different hazards compared to white males, while the same was not found for nonwhite women and men. This indicates that gender and/or racial identity per se might not drive risk perceptions to the same extent as other psychological or cultural features (Rivers et al. 2010). There is also a notion that white males tend to have lower risk perceptions than white females, nonwhite males, and nonwhite females across different hazards (cf. white male effect; Kortenkamp and Moore 2011).

Unsurprisingly, gender effects have been found for environmental risks such as climate change (Finucane et al. 2000). Regarding microplastics, Deng et al. (2020) conducted face-to-face interviews and a structured questionnaire among residents of Shanghai (China) to investigate perceptions of microplastics, exploring willingness to reduce microplastics and its influencing factors. In this study, males had a lower average score than females on willingness to reduce microplastics emissions (Deng et al. 2020). Although differences in knowledge have been argued to be a reason for gender differences in environmental risk perceptions, females exhibited higher nuclear

risk perceptions even in a sample of scientists (Barke et al. 1997). Therefore, it has been argued that there is more support for race and gender as explanations for differences in environmental risk perceptions than for differences in knowledge (Davidson et al. 1996).

Furthermore, environmental risk perception differs based on respondents' socio-economic status (Bickerstaff 2004). People with a lower social status and fewer privileges tend to be in a position of less power and control. They are argued to be more vulnerable to economic stressors and therefore perceive the world as a more dangerous place (Finucane et al. 2000). A similar trend was reported by Deng et al. (2020), who noted that people with lower education had higher levels of worry about microplastics, while people with higher education were not as concerned. The authors argued that this was due to a more comprehensive understanding of microplastics in the latter group, which in turn might have reduced unnecessary concerns. Nonetheless, another study by Henderson and Green (2020) concluded that people with high environmental awareness are also more concerned and know more about microplastics.

### Knowledge and Reasoning

It is a common finding in the literature that laypeople and experts tend to differ in their level of perceived risk (Savadori et al. 2004; Siegrist et al. 2018). Sjöberg (1998) classified comparisons of experts' and laypeople's risk perceptions into three types: similar assessments for well-known risks; lower risk perceptions by laypeople for hazards which they have some control over, such as smoking or drinking; and lower risk perceptions by experts for complex topics such as nuclear power. These differences can be accounted for in part by aspects of the psychometric model (Slovic 1987), including familiarity, controllability, and knowledge. The knowledge deficit model argues that if laypeople increased their knowledge, they would reach similar conclusions to those of experts; therefore, general knowledge and risk perception should correlate (Bubela et al. 2009). In its simplest form, however, the knowledge deficit model has not garnered much empirical evidence, and there is research that casts doubt on it (Kellstedt et al. 2008).

Regarding the issue of microplastics, in the study by Deng et al. (2020), the majority of people became worried or even overly worried when informed about possible impacts of microplastics, and increased knowledge

about the issue was also associated with a greater willingness to take action to tackle the problem (Deng et al. 2020). Moreover, Henderson and Green (2020) investigated people's knowledge and understanding of microplastics in the United Kingdom. Particular focus was placed on the role of the media in framing perceptions, involving participants with no knowledge of microplastics as well as participants with particular interest in microplastics. The findings shed light on the importance of environmental awareness and how lack of awareness of the plastics problem represents a barrier to change (Henderson and Green 2020). These findings highlight the importance and benefits of citizen science activities, which can raise awareness and knowledge about plastic litter (for more see Severin et al. in this volume). For instance, participation in beach clean-ups and other coastal activities has been shown to be associated with pro-environmental intentions and higher marine awareness (Wyles et al. 2017).

Recent findings by Kramm et al. (2022) showed that 80 percent of the German public had heard of microplastics, hence indicating that the public is becoming more aware of microplastics. The same investigation also found that level of education was important for microplastics awareness, since 90 percent of people considered to have a high level of education reported having heard of microplastics, whereas only 65 percent of those with low education reported having heard of them. Their results also indicated that higher environmental awareness tends to be associated with higher risk perceptions and that the more frequently one hears about microplastics, the higher the perceived risk of microplastics (Kramm et al. 2022).

According to a study by Grünzner, Pahl, White and Thompson (2021), experts (researchers working primarily on plastics) are more highly concerned about the risks of microplastics for the natural environment than they are about their risks for human health. Accordingly, microplastics have often been depicted in the media as something to be concerned about, as a risk for the environment (Völker et al. 2020). Nonetheless, some recent reports show that laypeople are highly worried about microplastics risks to the natural environment (European Commission 2020), but also quite concerned about possible health risks (German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment 2020).

People with higher levels of scientific reasoning have been found to be more likely to perceive risks consistently with the scientific evidence regarding those risks (Siegrist and Árvai 2020). Nevertheless, risk perceptions among people with high scientific reasoning ability may not correspond to

the actual scientific evidence if people have already made up their minds that the hazard is of high or low risk (Drummond and Fischhoff 2019).

### Fairness, Value Orientations, and Worldviews

Regarding perceptions of environmental risks, people tend to care less about statistics, such as the number of casualties due to a hazard, and more about issues such as justice, fairness, and duties to future generations (Moore 2009). Within the psychometric model, the dread component of risk contains aspects related to ethical issues resulting from the unequal distribution of and lack of informed consent regarding risk exposure (Slovic 1987). Additionally, moral evaluations of risks have proven to be a strong predictor of acceptability and perceived risk (e.g., Sjöberg and Drottz-Sjöberg 2001); likewise, environmental injustice has been found to predict risk perceptions (Satterfield et al. 2004).

Cultural worldviews are defined as the pattern of beliefs and value orientations shared by people in a collective, or orienting inclinations which guide thoughts and behaviors (Mead and Mëtraux 1954). Such worldviews are argued to have a strong influence on risk perceptions. Individuals and collectives ascribe to one or a set of prominent value orientations, namely hierarchism, individualism or egalitarianism (cf. cultural theory of risk; Douglas and Wildawsky 1982). Later research expanded value orientations to include egoism, altruism, and most interestingly for environmental risks, biospherism (e.g., De Groot and Steg 2007). These studies have pointed to a weak relationship between worldviews and risk perceptions overall, albeit with two particular environmental hazards as noteworthy exceptions: nuclear power and climate change (Siegrist and Arvai 2020). On another note, some people hold beliefs that lack scientific basis, such as so-called “New Age beliefs” (Sjöberg and Wahlberg 2002). Sjöberg and Wahlberg (2002) investigated risk perception in relation to these beliefs, including traditional folk superstition, belief in paranormal phenomena and use of alternative healing practices. Such beliefs explained 15 percent of the variance in perceived risk (Sjöberg and Wahlberg 2002). People with such beliefs tend to hold higher risk perceptions regarding environmental hazards such as climate change and nuclear waste (Siegrist and Arvai 2020).

There are no studies on perceptions of microplastics that have explored value orientations or worldviews. Nevertheless, in studies of the risk of nuclear power, altruistic and biospheric values tended to be negatively associated with perceived risks (Siegrist and Arvai 2020). For climate change, on the contrary, biospherism, and to a lesser extent egoism, have been positively associated with perceived risk (Van der Linden 2015). Other evidence suggests that biospheric values may partially undergird climate change worry, whilst being directly and positively related to personal climate mitigation behaviors (Bouman et al. 2020).

## Heuristics

Prospect theory (Kahnemann and Tversky 1979) postulates that people tend to overweight small probabilities and underweight larger probabilities, depending on the type of decision they are making. Specifically, people overweight small probabilities when simply presented with descriptions of these probabilities, yet tend to underweight small probabilities when they are learned through experience (Kahnemann and Tversky 1979). It is important to mention that people often lack the in-depth knowledge needed to evaluate hazards comprehensively, as indicated by studies addressing technologies (Connor and Siegrist 2011) and climate change (Shi et al. 2016).

The elaboration likelihood model (Petty and Cacioppo 1986; for an application in the environmental context, see Meijnders et al. 2001) argues that lack of motivation or knowledge leads to the usage of a peripheral cognitive route, where heuristics are prominent. Heuristics are argued to work through attribute substitution (Kahneman and Frederick 2005). When evaluating a hazard, an attribute that is not cognitively accessible, such as the probability of being exposed to the hazard, it is substituted with an attribute that is more easily accessed, such as recollection of concrete examples of that hazard (Siegrist and Arvai 2020). For example, someone is more likely to evaluate the hazard of plastic pollution based on number of the times they spotted plastic floating in the sea rather than the actual statistical probability of exposure to plastic pollution.

### Availability Heuristic

The availability heuristic is used when people utilize the “ease” with which examples or occurrences can be brought to mind to assess the probability of an event (Tversky and Kahneman 1974). For instance, someone might assess the risk of microplastics negatively affecting the environment by thinking about how often they hear in the news that microplastics have been found in their local area. The availability heuristic has been examined with respect to environmental hazards such as flooding (e.g., Tanner and Arvai 2018), with people who could remember floods perceiving higher risk compared to those who could not remember such events. One might speculate that the use of this heuristic might similarly affect laypeople’s perceived risk when it comes to microplastics. Support is provided by literature indicating that this heuristic may influence risk perception regarding climate change (Demski et al. 2017).

### Affect Heuristic

The affect heuristic maintains that the affective component elicited by a hazard influences risk perception (Finucane et al. 2000). People are argued to base their judgements about risks and benefits on their affective reactions (Slovic 1999). It is further argued that there is an affect “pool” that contains positive and negative markers associated with all mental images (Slovic et al. 2004). Studies investigating this principle suggest that the valence of spontaneous associations is associated with risk perceptions and acceptance of risk (Siegrist and Arvai 2020). The problem is that the affect heuristic might result in biased judgements (Nakayachi 2013) by leading people to ignore information that would have been useful to formulate more accurate risk judgements (Sunstein 2003). Accordingly, one possible explanation for the fact that people have been reported to perceive microplastics as more harmful than what the scientific evidence appears to indicate at this stage (Catarino et al. 2021) could be that people might associate microplastics with a negative affective component. Thus, people might be biased to think negatively about microplastics impacts and ignore certain information, in this case current uncertainty about the impacts, particularly on human health. Furthermore, questions about the causal direction of these associations can be posed. It is hard to exclude the possibility that risk perception

might drive affective responses and not the other way around (Siegrist and Arvai 2020).

### Natural-Is-Better Heuristic

In Western countries, nature is generally perceived as benevolent (Scott and Rozin 2020). The natural-is-better heuristic is defined as neglecting the positive effects of human intervention and negative impacts of natural processes (Siegrist and Hartmann 2020). Research in this vein shows that synthetic chemicals are much more negatively perceived than natural chemicals (Saleh et al. 2019), especially among individuals with high biospheric values (Campbell-Arvai 2019). It follows that people might evaluate the issue of microplastics more negatively because they result from a human process, reducing naturalness. Supporting evidence stems from studies showing that microplastics are indeed perceived quite negatively (e.g., Deng et al. 2020) and that microbeads are perceived as an “unnatural”, unacceptable risk (Anderson et al. 2016).

### Emotions

Risk perception used to be seen as exclusively cognitive, and emotions were not considered in this field for a long time (Böhm and Brun 2008). An early study by Johnson and Tversky (1983) showed that people’s current mood affected their risk judgements, highlighting that people hardly ever react to threats in an emotionally neutral state, and emotions affect how they perceive risks. Emotions have since then come to be considered important factors that affect risk perceptions and evaluations (Böhm and Tanner 2019). The previous section discussed how affect might root judgements about risks and benefits; however, there is an important distinction between general affect and specific emotions or appraisals (e.g., Lerner and Keltner 2001).

Emotions can be connected to complex reasoning; each emotion carries a certain meaning and reflects a cognitive structure or viewpoint (Böhm 2003; Böhm and Pfister 2000; 2017). For example, worry anticipates that something bad might happen in the future; outrage involves assigning blame

to other people; disappointment means that an outcome has fallen short of expectations; regret arises from a sense of responsibility; pity is a social emotion; guilt is more focused on ourselves and our own actions, when we feel we have acted in a way that violates a moral norm; fear is similar to worry because it has to do with anticipating future harm, but is more short-term and intense; hope reflects the belief that there is still a chance to achieve positive outcomes; and lastly, pride is felt when something has been accomplished (Böhm 2003; Böhm and Pfister 2000; 2017). Specific emotions are often explained through the appraisal theoretical framework (Frijda 2007).

Böhm and Pfister (2000; 2017) conceptualized a dual-process model of risk evaluation involving two fundamental appraisal dimensions linked to specific emotions, namely consequences and morality. Fear is an emotion related to consequences, whereas outrage and guilt have more to do with the perception that moral norms have been violated (Böhm 2003; Böhm and Pfister 2000; 2017). Each dimension is associated with characteristic behavioral tendencies. Typical consequentialist behavioral tendencies are mitigation and adaptation, while actions more tied to morality are punishment and redemption, targeting the actor or aggressor (Böhm and Pfister 2017). A consequentialist focus could lead to judgements about the perceived risk of microplastics towards animals, which could trigger an emotion of fear and ultimately a behavioral tendency to help clean up a beach full of plastic litter.

Research indeed shows that some of the intuitive associations with microplastics tend to concern harmful impacts on wildlife (Deng et al. 2020; Henderson and Green 2020). Since the release of microplastics in the environment is evidently due to human activity, deontological evaluations might also be more intense than for natural hazards such as flooding. This interpretation follows literature showing that deontological judgments tend to be more intense in cases of human rather than natural causation, whereas consequentialist evaluations tend to be more intense when the consequences affect humans as opposed to nature (Böhm and Pfister 2000; 2017). Despite the scientific evidence being not yet clear with respect to harmful consequences of microplastics for human health (Catarino et al. 2021), the public has been repeatedly found to be worried about human health effects (Deng et al. 2020; Henderson and Green 2020). It is because of this that microplastics might actually trigger both deontological (outrage, guilt, etc.) and consequentialist emotions (sadness, fear, etc.).

## Mental Models

An important basis for people's risk perceptions is how they mentally represent the risk event in question (Bostrom 2017; Böhm and Pfister 2000; 2017). Such a mental representation, commonly referred to as mental model, is constructed from available information, of which the most important components are the causes and consequences ascribed to the risk event. A person's mental model of microplastics may convey the belief that microplastics are released into aquatic environments by washing fleece and synthetic clothing and that they will result in harm to some fish species. Laypeople's mental models tend to be less structured than those of experts (Bostrom 2017). Inaccuracies in their mental models can lead people to make errors, which in the case of plastic can be seen in the development and promotion of certain actions and policies not fully supported by scientific evidence (Catarino et al. 2021). Common approaches to capture mental models about a given risk event are surveys (Bostrom 2017) as well as thought listing and image association tasks (e.g., Smith and Joffe 2013). Themes are inductively derived from open-ended responses to questions. For example, one might tap into the first things that come to people's minds when thinking of the environmental hazard; additional content analysis might refer to psychological theories (e.g., Böhm et al. 2018).

One manner to assess the utility of mental models is to employ them within a problem-solving or decision-making approach, a strategy exemplified by the mental model approach to risk communication (Morgan et al. 2002). The phases of this approach include, first, developing a conceptual model of the target system, such as microplastics, into a decision model representing how science may best inform policy and risk mitigation decisions. Hence, the conceptual model consists of decisions about risks and what could be done about them (Bostrom 2017). Second, semi-structured interviews assessing mental models and related perceptions of the risks of the issue in question and how to mitigate those risks are content analyzed and compared to the decision model (Bostrom 2017). The interview protocols often include a think-aloud task, inspired by think-aloud studies used in other mental model approaches (Ericsson and Fox 2011), but primarily consist of prompts asking participants to talk about the hazard. The analysis of the interviews is conceptually linked to the decision model, but open-ended (Bostrom 2017). Third, the interviews might inform the design of survey instruments to survey larger samples, ideally representative

of the groups for whom risk communication strategies are being developed (Bostrom 2017). Another way to assess mental models regarding environmental issues is based on systems modelling and entails experiments in which individuals solve tasks such as dynamic greenhouse gas problems (e.g., Moxnes and Assaad 2012).

Regarding what people's mental representations of microplastics might look like, Dilkes-Hoffman et al. (2019) asked members of the Australian public to state the first two words that came to mind when they heard the word "plastic". The most frequent words or concepts were general environmental statements, waste, pollution, ocean impacts, and animal impacts. Participants placed the main responsibility for reducing plastic waste on industry, followed by government, and 80 percent expressed a desire to reduce their personal plastic use (Dilkes-Hoffman et al. 2019). Moreover, the study by Deng et al. (2020) in China found that microplastics seem to be viewed as accumulating mostly in the ocean. The respondents also referred to factory production of plastic particles as the main source of microplastics, although, overall, they did not seem to be fully aware of the origin of microplastics (Deng et al. 2020). In addition, a UK study by Henderson and Green (2020) reported that most respondents were unaware of microplastics, although environmentally conscious individuals had heard about microbeads through media reporting on new regulations. While some people made a connection between their personal use of plastics and ocean pollution, they appeared unable to define the link between macro- and microplastics (Henderson and Green 2020).

The few existing studies on perceptions of microplastics indicate considerable misconceptions, such as the recurrent association of microplastics with plastic islands (Henderson and Green 2020), and that an important share of the public seems to still be unaware of microplastics (Deng et al. 2020; Henderson and Green 2020)—even though microplastics awareness is on the rise (Catarino et al. 2020). It is because of this that one might speculate that laypeople's mental models of microplastics are inaccurate. Notably, laypeople most commonly associate plastic and microplastics with pollution in the environment in general and the ocean in particular (Dilkes-Hoffman et al. 2019). Laypeople seem to often fail to recognize that microplastics also migrate among the atmosphere, freshwater, soil and different creatures (Bin et al. 2020). Further research could investigate whether people are able to understand that microplastics can also be released into these environments and the impacts this could have, such as harmful

effects on wildlife. Regarding human health effects, the public appears to be very concerned about these impacts, despite the fact that scientific evidence for such effects is still unclear (Catarino et al. 2020).

Plastic particles from factories are the main source of global plastic waste (Boucher and Friot 2017), and the public has reportedly made associations between these particles and microplastics (Deng et al. 2020). It could be that the majority of the public understand that these particles are the main source of microplastics, as Deng et al. (2020) argued. Nonetheless, there are various other sources of microplastics that the public generally seems not to be aware of. For instance, the decomposition of synthetic textiles is another important source of microplastics in the ocean (Boucher and Friot 2017), although the public does not make this association often (Deng et al. 2020). Additionally, the public often does not associate individual plastic consumption with the release of microplastics and thus ocean pollution (Henderson and Green 2020); instead, they often attribute responsibility to industry and government (e.g., Dilkes-Hoffman et al. 2019).

Public awareness of microplastics is increasing (Catarino et al. 2021). People are becoming more frequently exposed to the topic through the media, which is why people's awareness of the issue may continue to rise in the future. Media storytelling might indeed have a central role to play in shaping public understanding and bringing the topic to public attention in powerful ways (Henderson and Green 2020). Employing a mental model approach to risk communication may provide valuable insights into how to address the gap between experts' and laypeople's knowledge (Pahl and Wyles 2017). The mental models elicited from this research can be used to adapt messages to communicate the different risks posed by microplastics, and such communications can be evaluated via surveys or focus groups (Pahl and Wyles 2017).

## Conclusions

Microplastics are a global environmental challenge that appears to increasingly concern both the public and academia. As an environmental risk, there are characteristics of microplastics as a hazard that influence people's risk perceptions. They are likely to be considered dreadful hazards given their global scale and potential impacts on animals and plants. Moreover, they are

likely to be perceived as an unknown hazard, given that they are quite new, not well understood by science and not easily observable. This, together with the fact that they are caused by humans, might contribute to the high levels of perceived risk that have been reported.

Nonetheless, there are numerous relevant individual-level variables that can also shape microplastics risk perceptions. Socio-demographic characteristics, such as gender and level of education, have been shown to predict different levels of perceived risk of microplastics. Higher levels of knowledge about the issue tend to be associated with higher risk perceptions, even sometimes leading laypeople to be overly concerned. Perceivers' worldviews and values have also been reported to affect risk perceptions, among which biospherism is particularly relevant for environmental risks such as microplastics. Other potential sources of influence include the use of heuristics as opposed to more complex information processing, particularly the availability, affect, and natural-is-better heuristics.

Emotions are another important factor that affects risk perceptions, and microplastics might trigger both consequentialist and moral emotions, which in turn trigger different behavioral tendencies. Lastly, how people mentally represent microplastics in terms of, amongst other things, its causes, consequences, and possible solutions, that is, people's mental models, might also affect risk perceptions of microplastics.

Given the few studies on microplastics risk perception due to the infancy of the field, it is difficult to make solid claims about how microplastics risk perception is formed. Nonetheless, research on microplastics is increasing exponentially, including interdisciplinary projects that combine findings from the natural sciences with insights from the social and behavioral sciences. This will deepen our understanding of what determines people's perceived risk of microplastics and allow us to effectively tackle this global challenge

### *Acknowledgements*

An earlier version of this chapter was submitted as a report for the project LimnoPlast: Microplastics in Europe Freshwater Ecosystems, from sources to solutions. This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No 860720. Responsibility for the information and views set out in this document lies entirely with the authors.

## References

- Anderson, Alison, Jane Grose, Sabine Pahl, Richard C. Thompson, and Kayleigh J. Wyles (2016). Microplastics in personal care products: Exploring perceptions of environmentalists, beauticians and students. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 113 (1–2), 454–460.
- Aven, Terje, and Ortwin Renn (2009). On risk defined as an event where the outcome is uncertain. *Journal of Risk Research*, 12 (1), 1–11.
- Backhaus, Thomas, and Martin Wagner (2020). Microplastics in the environment: Much ado about nothing? A debate. *Global Challenges*, 4 (6), 1900022.
- Barke, Richard P., Hank Jenkins-Smith, and Paul Slovic (1997). Risk perceptions of men and women scientists. *Social Science Quarterly*, 78 (1), 167–176.
- Bearth, Angela, Rita Saleh, and Michael Siegrist (2019). Lay people's knowledge about toxicology and its principles in eight European countries. *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, 131, 110560.
- Bickerstaff, Karen (2004). Risk perception research: socio-cultural perspectives on the public experience of air pollution. *Environment International*, 30 (6), 827–840.
- Bin, Zhao, Cheng Yongqiang, Guo Cuilian, Liu Maoke, Yao Puyu, and Zhao Yang (2020). Outlook and overview of microplastics pollution in ecological environment. In *E3S Web of Conferences* (Vol. 143, p. 02027). Les Ulis. *EDP Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3conf/202014302027>
- Böhm, Gisela (2003). Emotional reactions to environmental risks: Consequentialist versus ethical evaluation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 23 (2), 199–212.
- Böhm, Gisela, and Wibecke Brun (2008). Intuition and affect in risk perception and decision making. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 3, 1–4.
- Böhm, Gisela, Rouven Doran, and Hans-Rüdiger Pfister (2018). Laypeople's affective images of energy transition pathways. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1904.
- Böhm, Gisela, and Hans-Rüdiger Pfister (2000). Action tendencies and characteristics of environmental risks. *Acta Psychologica*, 104 (3), 317–337.
- Böhm, Gisela, and Hans-Rüdiger Pfister (2017). The perceiver's social role and a risk's causal structure as determinants of environmental risk evaluation. *Journal of Risk Research*, 20 (6), 732–759.
- Böhm, Gisela, and Carmen Tanner (2019). Environmental risk perception. In Linda Steg and Judith I. M. de Groot (eds.). *Environmental psychology: An introduction*, 13–25. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Bostrom, Ann (2017). Mental models and risk perceptions related to climate change. In Ann Bostrom (ed.). *Oxford research encyclopedia of climate science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bostrom, Ann, Gisela Böhm, Adam L. Hayes, and Robert E. O'Connor (2020). Credible threat: perceptions of pandemic coronavirus, climate change and the morality and management of global risks. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 578562.
- Boucher, Julien, and Damien Friot (2017). *Primary microplastics in the oceans: a global evaluation of sources* (Vol. 10). Gland, Switzerland: Iucn.

- Bouman, Thijs, Mark Verschoor, Casper J. Albers, Gisela Böhm, Stephen D. Fisher, Wouter Poortinga, Lorraine Whitmarsh, and Linda Steg (2020). When worry about climate change leads to climate action: How values, worry and personal responsibility relate to various climate actions. *Global Environmental Change*, 62, 102061.
- Bruine de Bruin, Wändi, and Ann Bostrom (2013). Assessing what to address in science communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110 (Supplement\_3), 14062–14068.
- Bubela, Tania, Matthew C. Nisbet, Rick Borchelt, Fern Brunger, Cristine Critchley, Edna Einsiedel, Gail Geller, Anil Gupta, Jürgen Hampel, Robyn Hyde-Lay, Eric W. Jandciu, Ashley Jones, Pam Kopopack, Summer Lane, Tim Lougheed, Brigitte Nerlich, Ubaka Ogbogu, Kathleen O’Riordan, Colin Ouellette, Mike Spear, Stephen Strauss, Thushaanthini Thavaratnam, Lisa Willemse and Timothy Caulfield (2009). Science communication reconsidered. *Nature Biotechnology*, 27 (6), 514–518.
- Campbell-Arvai, Victoria (2019). Visits from the ghost of disturbance past: Information about past disturbance influences lay judgments of ecosystems. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 232, 438–444.
- Catarino, Anna I., Johanna Kramm, Carolin Völker, Theodore B. Henry, and Gert Everaert (2021). Risk posed by microplastics: Scientific evidence and public perception. *Current Opinion in Green and Sustainable Chemistry*, 29, 100467.
- Chang, Michelle (2015). Reducing microplastics from facial exfoliating cleansers in wastewater through treatment versus consumer product decisions. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 101 (1), 330–333.
- Chowdhury, Parnali Dhar, C. Emdad Haque, and S. Michelle Driedger (2012). Public versus expert knowledge and perception of climate change-induced heat wave risk: A modified mental model approach. *Journal of Risk Research*, 15 (2), 149–168.
- Connor, Melanie, and Michael Siegrist (2011). Factors influencing peoples’ acceptance of gene technology: The role of knowledge, health concerns, naturalness, and social trust. *Science Communication*, 32, 514–538.
- Cullen, Alison C., C. Leigh Anderson, Pierre Biscaye, and Travis W. Reynolds (2018). Variability in cross-domain risk perception among smallholder farmers in Mali by gender and other demographic and attitudinal characteristics. *Risk Analysis*, 38 (7), 1361–1377.
- Davidson, Debra J., and William R. Freudenburg (1996). Gender and environmental risk concerns: A review and analysis of available research. *Environment and Behavior*, 28 (3), 302–339.
- De Groot, Judith I., and Linda Steg (2007). Value orientations and environmental beliefs in five countries: Validity of an instrument to measure egoistic, altruistic and biospheric value orientations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38 (3), 318–332.

- Demski, Christina, Stuart Capstick, Nick Pidgeon, Robert G. Sposato, and Alexa Spence (2017). Experience of extreme weather affects climate change mitigation and adaptation responses. *Climatic Change*, 140 (2), 149–164.
- Deng, Lingzhi., Lu Cai, Fengyun Sun, Gen Li., and Yue Che (2020). Public attitudes towards microplastics: Perceptions, behaviors and policy implications. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 163, 105096.
- Dilkes-Hoffman, Leela, Steven Pratt, Bronwyn Laycock, Peta Ashworth, and Paul A. Lant (2019a). Public attitudes towards plastics. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 147, 227–235.
- Douglas, Mary, and Aaron Wildavsky (1982). *Risk and culture: An essay on the selection of technological and environmental dangers*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Drummond, Caitlin, and Baruch Fischhoff (2019). Does “putting on your thinking cap” reduce myside bias in evaluation of scientific evidence? *Thinking & Reasoning*, 25 (4), 477–505.
- Entman, Robert M., and Andrew Rojecki (1993). Freezing out the public: Elite and media framing of the US anti-nuclear movement. *Political Communication*, 10, 155–173.
- Egger, Matthias, Rein Nijhof, Lauren Quiros, Giulia Leone, Sarah-Jeanne Royer, Andrew C. McWhirter, Gennady A. Kantalov, Vladimir I. Radchenko, Evgeny A. Pakhomov, Brian P. V. Hunt, and Laurent Lebretton (2020). A spatially variable scarcity of floating microplastics in the eastern North Pacific Ocean. *Environmental Research Letters*, 15 (11), 114056.
- Ericsson, K. Anders, and Mark C. Fox (2011). Thinking aloud is not a form of introspection but a qualitatively different methodology: Reply to Schooler (2011). *Psychological Bulletin*, 137 (2), 351–354.
- European Commission (2017). Special Eurobarometer 468: Attitudes of European citizens towards the environment. Brussels. <http://ec.europa.eu/comm frontoffice/publicopinon/index.cfm/ResultDoc/download/DocumentKy/1259>.
- European Commission (2019). Special Eurobarometer 501, attitudes of European citizens towards the environment. Brussels. 2020. 10.20.2022 <https://doi.org/10.2779/902489>
- Eyal, Tal, Nira Liberman, and Yaacow Trope (2008). Judging near and distant virtue and vice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44 (4), 1204–1209.
- Finucane, Melissa L., Ali Alhakami, Paul Slovic, and Stephen M. Johnson (2000). The affect heuristic in judgments of risks and benefits. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 13 (1), 1–17.
- Fischhoff, Baruch, Paul Slovic. and Sarah Lichtenstein (1978). Fault trees: Sensitivity of estimated failure probabilities to problem representation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 4, 330–344.

- Fischhoff, Baruch, Paul Slovic., and Sarah Lichtenstein (1979). Weighing the risks: Risks: Benefits which risks are acceptable?. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 21 (4), 17–38.
- Frijda, Nico H. (2007). *The laws of emotion*. New York: Psychology Press.
- German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR), Department of Chemicals and Product Safety, Berlin, Germany, Beneventi, E., T. Tietz., and S. Merkel (2020). Risk assessment of food contact materials. *EFSA Journal*, 18, e181109.
- Greven, Frans E., Liesbeth Claassen, Fred Woudenberg, Frans Duijm, and Danielle Timmermans (2018). Where there's smoke, there's fire: Focal points for risk communication. *International Journal of Environmental Health Research*, 28 (3), 240–252.
- Grünzner, Maja, Sabine Pahl, Matthew White, and Richard C. Thompson (2021). Experts perceptions about microplastic pollution: potential sources and solutions. [Conference presentation], June 14–16, Finland: Society for Risk Analysis-Europe Conference
- Grünzner, Maja, and Sabine Pahl (2022). Behavior change as part of the solution for plastic pollution. In Johanna Kramm and Carolin Völker (eds.). *Living in the plastic age. Perspectives from humanities, social sciences and environmental sciences*. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- Henderson, Lesley, and Christopher Green (2020). Making sense of microplastics? Public understandings of plastic pollution. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 152, 110908.
- Heß, Maren, Carolin Völker, Nicole Brennholt, Pia Maria Herrling, Henner Hollert, Natascha Ivleva, Jutta Kerpen, Christian Laforsch, Martin Löder, Sabrina Schiwiy, Markus Schmitz, Stephan Wagner, and Thorsten Hüffer (2022). Microplastics in the Aquatic Environment. In Johanna Kramm and Carolin Völker (eds.). *Living in the plastic age. Perspectives from humanities, social sciences and environmental sciences*. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- Johnson, Eric J., and Amos Tversky (1983). Affect, generalization, and the perception of risk. *Journal of Personality And Social Psychology*, 45 (1), 20–31.
- Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tverski (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47 (2), 363–391.
- Kellstedt, Paul M., Sammy Zahran and Arnold Vedlitz (2008). Personal efficacy, the information environment, and attitudes toward global warming and climate change in the United States. *Risk Analysis*, 28, 113–126.
- Kortenkamp, Katherine V., and Collen F. Moore (2010). *Psychology of risk perception*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley Encyclopedia of Operations Research and Management Science.
- Kramm, Johanna, and Carolin Völker (2018). Understanding the risks of microplastics: a social-ecological risk perspective. In Martin Wagner and Scott Lambert (eds.). *Freshwater microplastics*, 223–237. Cham: Springer.
- Kramm, Johanna, Stefanie Steinhoff, Simon Werschmöller, Beate Völker, and Carolin Völker (2022). Explaining risk perception of microplastics: Results from a representative survey in Germany. *Global Environmental Change*, 73, 102485.

- Lerner, Jennifer S., and Dacher Keltner (2001). Fear, anger, and risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81 (1), 146–159.
- Lorenzoni, Irene, and Nick F. Pidgeon (2006). Public views on climate change: European and USA perspectives. *Climatic Change*, 77 (1), 73–95.
- Mead, Margaret, and Rhoda Métraux (1954). *Themes in French culture*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Meijnders, Anneloes L., Cees J. Midden, and Henk A. Wilke (2001). Role of negative emotion in communication about CO2 risks. *Risk Analysis*, 21 (5), 955–955.
- Moore, Colleen F. (2009). *Children and pollution: why scientists disagree*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moxnes, Erling, and Carla Susana Assuad (2012). GHG taxes and tradable quotas, experimental evidence of misperceptions and biases. *Environmental Economics*, 3 (2), 44–56.
- Nakayachi, Kazuya (2013). The unintended effects of risk-refuting information on anxiety. *Risk Analysis*, 33 (1), 80–91.
- Nam, Changhyun, Dong, Huanjiao, and Young A. Lee (2017). Factors influencing consumers' purchase intention of green sportswear. *Fashion and Textiles*, 4 (1), 1–17.
- Nardi, Vinicius Antonio Machado, Rafael Teixeira, Wagner Junior Ladeira, and Fernando de Oliveira Santini (2020). A meta-analytic review of food safety risk perception. *Food Control*, 112 107089.
- O'Brien, Joshua, and Gladman Thondhlana (2019). Plastic bag use in South Africa: Perceptions, practices and potential intervention strategies. *Waste Management*, 84, 320–328.
- Pahl, Sabine, and Kayleigh Wyles (2017). The human dimension: How social and behavioural research methods can help address microplastics in the environment. *Analytical Methods*, 9 (9), 1404–1411.
- Petty, Richard E, and John T. Cacioppo (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 19, 124–129.
- Phelan, Anna (Any), Helen Ross, Novie Andri Setianto, Kelly Fielding, and Lenggga Pradipta (2020). Ocean plastic crisis—Mental models of plastic pollution from remote Indonesian coastal communities. *PLOS ONE*, 15 (7), e0236149.
- Poortinga, Wouter, Lorraine Whitmarsh, Linda Steg, Gisela Böhm, and Stephen D. Fisher (2019). Climate change perceptions and their individual-level determinants: A cross-European analysis. *Global Environmental Change*, 55, 25–35.
- Renn, Ortwin, and Bernd Rohrman (eds.). (2000). *Cross-cultural risk perception: A survey of empirical studies*. Dordrecht: Springer Science.
- Rist, Sinja, Bethanie Carney Almroth, Nanna B. Hartmann, and Therese M. Karlsson (2018). A critical perspective on early communications concerning human health aspects of microplastics. *Science of the Total Environment*, 626, 720–726.
- Rivers, Louie, Joseph Arvai, and Paul Slovic (2010). Beyond a simple case of black and white: Searching for the white male effect in the African-American community. *Risk Analysis*, 30 (1), 65–77.

- SAPEA (2019). *A scientific perspective on microplastics in nature and society*. Berlin: SAPEA-Science Advice for Policy by European Academies.
- Rohrmann, Bernd, and Huichang Chen (1999). Risk perception in China and Australia: an exploratory crosscultural study. *Journal of Risk Research*, 2 (3), 219–241.
- Sabine, Pahl, Bonny Hartley, and Thompson, Richard C. (n.d.). Communicating about marine litter: Insights from the European Marisco Project. 2. Commocean.org. Available online: [https://commocean.org/sites/commocean.org/files/public/docs/abstracts/0712\\_1530\\_B2\\_PahlSabine.pdf](https://commocean.org/sites/commocean.org/files/public/docs/abstracts/0712_1530_B2_PahlSabine.pdf).
- Satterfield, Terre A., C. K. Mertz, and Paul Slovic (2004). Discrimination, vulnerability, and justice in the face of risk. *Risk Analysis*, 24 (1), 115–129.
- Savadori, Lucia, Stefania Savio, Eraldo Nicotra, Rino Rumiati, Melissa Finucane, and Paul Slovic (2004). Expert and public perception of risk from biotechnology. *Risk Analysis*, 24 (5), 1289–1299.
- Scott, Sydney E., and Paul Rozin (2020). Actually, natural is neutral. *Nature Human Behavior* 4 (10), 989–990.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. (1977). Normative influences on altruism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 221–279.
- Severin, Marine Isabel, Alexander Hooyberg, Gert Everaert, and Ana Isabel Catarino (2022). Using citizen science to understand plastic pollution: Implications for science and participants. In Johanna Kramm and Carolin Völker (eds.). *Living in the plastic age. Perspectives from humanities, social sciences and environmental sciences*. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- Shi, Jing, Vivianne H. Visschers, and Michael Siegrist (2015). Public perception of climate change: The importance of knowledge and cultural worldviews. *Risk Analysis*, 35 (12), 2183–2201.
- Siegrist, Michael, Philipp Hubner, and Christina Hartmann (2018). Risk prioritization in the food domain using deliberative and survey methods: Differences between experts and laypeople. *Risk Analysis*, 38, 504–524.
- Siegrist, Michael, and Joseph Árvai (2020). Risk perception: Reflections on 40 years of research. *Risk Analysis*, 40 (S1), 2191–2206.
- Siegrist, Michael, and Christina Hartmann (2020). Consumer acceptance of novel food technologies. *Nature Food*, 1, 343–350.
- Sjöberg, Lennart (1998). Risk perception: Experts and the public. *European Psychologist*, 3 (1), 1–12.
- Sjöberg, Lennart, and Anders af Wåhlberg (2002). Risk perception and new age beliefs. *Risk Analysis*, 22 (4), 751–764.
- Sjöberg, Lennart, and Britt-Marie Drottz-Sjöberg (2001). Fairness, risk and risk tolerance in the siting of a nuclear waste repository. *Journal of Risk Research*, 4 (1), 75–101.
- Slovic, Paul (1987). Perception of risk. *Science*, 236 (4799), 280–285.
- Slovic, Paul (1999). Trust, emotion, sex, politics, and science: Surveying the risk-assessment battlefield. *Risk Analysis*, 19 (4), 689–701.

- Slovic, Paul E. (2000). *The perception of risk*. London, UK: Earthscan publications.
- Slovic, Paul, Melissa L. Finucane, Ellen Peters, and Donald G. MacGregor (2004). Risk as analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk, and rationality. *Risk Analysis*, 24 (2), 311–322.
- Slovic, Paul (2016). Understanding perceived risk: 1978–2015. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 58 (1), 25–29.
- Shi, Xingmin, Lifan Sun, Xieyang Chen, and Lu Wang (2019). Farmers' perceived efficacy of adaptive behaviors to climate change in the Loess Plateau, China. *Science of the Total Environment*, 697, 134217.
- Smith, Nicholas, and Helene Joffe (2013). How the public engages with global warming: A social representations approach. *Public Understanding of Science*, 22 (1), 16–32.
- Soares, Joana, Isabeñ Miguel, Cátia Venâncio, Isabel Lopes, and Miguel Oliveira (2021). Public views on plastic pollution: Knowledge, perceived impacts, and pro-environmental behaviours. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 412, 125227.
- Stentjes, Katharine, Nick F. Pidgeon, Wouter Poortinga, Adam J. Corner, A. Arnold, Gisela Böhm, Claire Mays, Marco Sonnberger, Michael Ruddat, Marc Poumadere, Dirk Scheer and Endre Tvinnereim (2017). *European perceptions of climate change (EPCC): Topline findings of a survey conducted in four European countries in 2016*. Cardiff, UK: Cardiff University.
- Steg, Linda, and Judith I. M. de Groot (2018). *Environmental psychology. An introduction*. Second edition. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell; John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Stern, Paul (2000). Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior. *Journal of Social Issues* 56 (3), 407–424
- Tanner, Alexa, and Joseph Arvai (2018). Perceptions of risk and vulnerability following exposure to a major natural disaster: The Calgary flood of 2013. *Risk Analysis*, 38, 548–561.
- Teigen, Karl Halvor, Wibecke Brun, and Paul Slovic (1988). Societal risks as seen by a Norwegian public. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 1 (2), 111–130.
- Thacker, Ian, and Gale Sinatra (2019). Visualizing the greenhouse effect: Restructuring mental models of climate change through a guided online simulation. *Education Sciences*, 9 (1), 14.
- Thompson, Michael, and Aaron Wildavsky (1982). A proposal to create a cultural theory of risk. In Howard C. Kunreuther and Eryl V. Ley (eds.). *The risk analysis controversy*, 145–161. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Triebkorn, Rita, Thomas Braunbeck, Tamara Grummt, Lisa Hanslik, Sven Huppertsberg, Martin Jekel, Thomas P Knepper, Stefanie Kraus, Yanina Müller, Marco Pittroff, Aki S. Ruhl, Hannah Schmieg, Christoph Schür, Claudia Strobel, Martin Wagner, Nicole Zumbülte and Heinz R. Köhler (2019). Relevance of nano- and microplastics for freshwater ecosystems: A critical review. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, 110, 375–392.

- Tsiotsou, Rodoula (2006). The role of perceived product quality and overall satisfaction on purchase intentions. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30 (2), 207–217.
- Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185 (4157), 1124–1131.
- van der Linden, Sander (2015). The social-psychological determinants of climate change risk perceptions: Towards a comprehensive model. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 41, 112–124.
- Van Sebille, Erik, Chris Wilcox, Laurent Lebreton, Nikolai Maximenko., Britta Denise Hardesty, Jan A. Van Franeker, Marcus Eriksen, David Siegel, Francois Galgani and Kara Lavender Law (2015). A global inventory of small floating plastic debris. *Environmental Research Letters*, 10 (12), 124006.
- Völker, Carolin, Johanna Kramm, and Martin Wagner (2020). On the Creation of Risk: Framing of Microplastics Risks in Science and Media. *Global Challenges*, 4 (6), 1900010.
- Wyles, Kayleigh J., Sabine Pahl, Matthew Holland, and Richard C. Thompson (2017). Can beach cleans do more than clean-up litter? Comparing beach cleans to other coastal activities. *Environment and Behavior*, 49 (5), 509–535.
- Xie, Belinda, Marilyn B. Brewer, Brett K. Hayes, Rachel I. McDonald, and Ben R. Newell (2019). Predicting climate change risk perception and willingness to act. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 65, 101331.
- Yoon, Ahyoung, Daeyoung Jeong, and Jinhyung Chon (2021). The impact of the risk perception of ocean microplastics on tourists' pro-environmental behavior intention. *Science of the Total Environment*, 774, 144782.