



Open Science and Transparency Summary

Document created: 2022-09-30

Manuscript Overview

Manuscript Title	Recycling Revised
Article type	Research article
Submission Form ID	dutiz-habak-nukuh
First submitted	2022-09-21 12:37
Special Issue (if any)	__Responding to the Socio-Ecological Crisis: Collective Action and Activism__ (Guest Editors: Sara Vestergren, Sebastian Bamberg, Winnifred Louis)
Presents empirical data	yes
Type of data used	New, original data
Manuscript has an ethics statement	yes
Approved by ethics committee	yes
Comments about ethics	
Registered report	yes
Replication	yes
Pre-registered	yes
Submission form completed up to	Diversity

Registered Report

Stage 1

Type of data	New, original data
Data already collected	no

<i>Data already explored / analysed</i>	no
<i>How / in what way?</i>	
<i>Timeline for completing the study</i>	more than 9
<i>Why longer than 9 months?</i>	Longitudinal study that takes longer than 1 year
<i>Agree to share all data, digital materials, code</i>	yes
<i>Agree to register protocol</i>	yes
<i>Comments</i>	Really curious

Transparency and Openness

Pre-registration Details

<i>Location of pre-registration (URL)</i>	www.osf.fiction1
<i>Content of Pre-Registration / Study Protocol (if Registered Report):</i>	
<i>Theory</i>	yes
<i>Hypotheses</i>	yes
<i>Design</i>	yes
<i>Methods Materials</i>	yes
<i>Data Analyses</i>	no
<i>Guidelines for the Interpretation of Findings</i>	no
<i>If analyses (in addition to hypotheses) were pre-registered:</i>	
<i>Pre-registration / study protocol fully describes intended analyses</i>	
<i>Manuscript reports all pre-registered analyses</i>	
<i>Timing</i>	after some data were collected, but before exploring the data
<i>At another time:</i>	
<i>Additional pre-reg. other than the one reported</i>	no
<i>Explanation</i>	
<i>Any changes to pre-registration / study protocol</i>	yes
<i>Manuscript fully describes these changes</i>	yes
<i>Clear distinction pre-registered vs. not pre-registered analyses</i>	yes
<i>Comments about pre-registration / study protocol</i>	

Reporting Standards

The following questions concern the principle of transparent and full reporting and thus should be implemented by each empirical study.

Questions Relevant for Most Types of Empirical Studies

Does the manuscript fully describe the study design, procedures, and materials to allow independent replication?	yes
Does the manuscript fully describe the measures of interest (e.g., pro-environmental attitude) and their operationalizations (e.g., a questionnaire measuring pro-environmental attitude)?	yes
What type of data and analysis does your submission present?	Quantitative data
Other type of analysis (if applicable)	
Other reporting standard used (if applicable)	
If you believe your study should be exempted from a reporting requirement, please explain why	
Other comments about your Methods, Results, or Discussion	

Requirements for Quantitative Data

Does the manuscript fully describe the rationale for the sample size used?	yes
Were any observations / participants / data excluded from the analyses?	yes
Does the manuscript report the total number of excluded observations?	yes
Does the manuscript report all data exclusion criteria?	yes
Does the manuscript report all levels of all independent variables (e.g., experimental groups)?	yes
Does the manuscript report all levels of all measures / dependent variables that were analysed for this article's target research question?	no
Does the manuscript report estimates related to the reliability of measures (e.g., internal consistency, interrater reliability)?	no
Does the manuscript report basic descriptive statistics of all variables that are used in the analyses (n, mean, sd) for the total sample and for each subgroup (e.g., cells in experimental designs)?	N/A
Does the manuscript report all exact *p* values, effect sizes, and 95% CIs for inferential tests?	yes

Data, Code, and Materials Transparency

The following questions focus on the transparency of the data, methods, and materials involved in the research. The requested information and files should enable any researcher to replicating the research.

Open Data, Materials, and Code

Data used in your research	New, original data
Other:	
Data publicly available	yes
Where:	www.osf.fiction2
Why are the data not publicly available (repository)	
Are all variables, treatment conditions, and observations included that yes are described in the manuscript	
Codebook included (lists and describes all variables in the dataset incl. answer options)	no
Why not documented in a codebook	I didn't know how to do this
Fully described the procedures used to collect, preprocess, clean, or generate the data	no
All code and software publicly available	yes
Where:	www.osf.fiction6
Why not publicly available:	
Instructions, stimuli, and test materials publicly available	no
Where:	
Why not publicly available:	
Steps others should follow to request access to data / materials not publicly shared	Don't know what to write here.
Possible to share a subset of the data, code, or other materials that cannot be publicly shared?	no
Possible to post data, code, or other materials that cannot be publicly shared into a protected access repository	no
Comments about your Data, Code, and Materials	

Citation Standard

All data, programme code / scripts / syntax (e.g., from R, Stata, SPSS), materials, and other methods must be appropriately cited in the text and listed in the reference section. As such, these materials are recognized as original intellectual contributions and afforded recognition through citation.

Are all data, program code and other methods appropriately cited within the text and listed in the reference section?	yes
If no, please explain why these things were not cited within the text and/or not listed in the reference section.	
Are all data, code, and methods citations given unique, persistent IDs (e.g. DOI)?	yes
If no, please explain why these items weren't given unique, persistent IDs (e.g., DOI)?	

Diversity

GEP strongly encourages to justify and extensively describe the sample(s) of empirical work, to discuss the generalizability of the insights (culture/context), and strive for diversity when citing previous work. If authors don't follow these guidelines, they should explain why.

<i>We provided a justification for the population we investigated</i>	no
<i>Why not?</i>	didn't know this was necessary, will do later
<i>We provided an extensive sample description (e.g., study country, participants' language)</i>	yes
<i>Why not?</i>	
<i>We discussed the generalisability of our findings and implications in relation to culture and context</i>	yes
<i>Why not?</i>	
<i>We strived for diversity when citing previous work (e.g., gender, underrepresented geographical areas)</i>	yes
<i>Why not?</i>	