Beliefs about Human-Nature Relationships and Implications for Investment and Stewardship surrounding Land-Water System Conservation

*John D. Coley^{1,2}, Nicole Betz^{1,3}, Brian Helmuth^{1,4,5}, Keith Ellenbogen^{1,6}, Steven Scyphers^{1,4}, and Daniel Adams^{1,7}

¹Cognitive Laboratory of Environmental and Arts Research (CLEAR), Northeastern University

²Department of Psychology, Northeastern University

³Department of Psychology, Yale University

⁴Department of Marine and Environmental Sciences, Northeastern University

⁵School of Public Policy and Urban Affairs, Northeastern University

⁶Department of Photography, SUNY The Fashion Institute of Technology

⁷School of Architecture, Northeastern University

*Author to whom correspondence should be addressed: John D. Coley, Department of Psychology, Northeastern University, 360 Huntington Ave., MS 125NI, Boston, MA 02115 USA. Phone: +1 (617) 373-3548 Email: j.coley@northeastern.edu

Abstract

When engaging stakeholders in environmental conservation, it is critical to understand not only their group-level needs but also the individually held beliefs that contribute to each person's decisions to endorse or reject policies. To this end, we examined the extent to which people conceptualize the interconnected relationship between humans and nature in the context of a hypothetical urban waterway, and the implications thereof for environmental investment and stewardship. We also explored how these beliefs varied based on describing the waterway as having either local or global impacts, and as originating either naturally or through artificial processes. Three hundred and seventy-nine United States adults read vignettes about a polluted urban waterway that varied by these descriptions and thereafter reported their investment in river clean-up, their stewardship of the river, and their beliefs surrounding human-nature relationships. Results revealed a common belief pattern whereby humans were believed to impact the urban river disproportionately more than the river impacts humans, suggesting that lay adults often weigh the impacts of humans on the natural world disproportionately. Critically, this disproportionate pattern of thinking inversely predicted investment of time and money in river clean-up. Results also revealed a potential solution to this psychological bias; highlighting local benefits of the waterway decreased the asymmetry of the human-nature relationship. We discuss the psychological factors contributing to this cognitive bias, and the implications of these findings on stakeholder engagement.

Keywords: Stakeholder engagement, pro-environmentalism, human exceptionalism, ecological connectedness, psychological distance.

1. Introduction

Sustainable and equitable solutions to the persistent and accelerating threats posed by climate change and habitat destruction require effective stakeholder engagement and public support [1, 2]. To accomplish these goals, and especially to do so in ways that are equitable and ensure that diverse voices are included in the discussion, we need to better understand how to attract and engage with participants who may come to the table with diverse and sometimes conflicting perceptions and priorities. A central question is, how do we encourage affected individuals to prioritize the conservation of their local ecosystems within the larger context of global climate change? Lessons from cognitive psychology offer an opportunity to explore how people consider the interconnections between human behaviors and land/water systems, and how these conceptualizations might predict levels of investment and stewardship [3]. In this study we examine the extent to which people's conceptualizations of their environment and their place within (or separate from) social-ecological systems can serve as a predictor of how connected people feel to nature, and subsequently their willingness to be involved in conservation and stewardship in the context of land-river systems. We further explore whether framing descriptions of land-river systems as local or global phenomena and as natural or artificial waterways impacts both the conceptualization and commitment to conservation of these social-ecological systems.

A large body of literature has shown that when communicating with stakeholders, it is important to understand the needs, biases, priorities and perceptions of the group(s) of people with which one is working [4, 5]. Such an understanding can also play an important role in ensuring that decisions are equitable and consider the views of vulnerable and underserved populations, which can differ from those of the majority population [6]. For example, people who live on the "hidden coast" (non-ocean-front properties frequently occupied by minority and socioeconomically disadvantaged communities) are usually neglected when developing coastal adaptation strategies [7]. However, while demographic information such as race, socioeconomic status, political affiliation or home ownership can provide valuable insights into group-level perceptions of climate risk and their willingness to act, at best these correlations provide only guideposts. Ultimately, a person's attitudes and behaviors are driven by the complex interplay of societal norms and lived experiences and therefore vary from person to person, especially in individualistic cultures characteristic of Western societies [8].

Cognitive psychology techniques can help to untangle these influences by investigating mental processes, such as cognitive biases, that can stem from an individuals' unique experiences that shape their beliefs about conservation. This includes understanding stakeholders' perceptions of risk and their priorities for addressing threats [9] as well as how they think about relevant social-ecological relationships [10]. In the context of environmental management or policies [11], one understudied factor that may influence stakeholder engagement is how a person considers their own relationship to nature (e.g., [12]), and specifically the degree to which they consider themselves as part of a coupled human-natural system, as opposed to being apart from nature and the services it provides.

Engaging stakeholders in planning and management through approaches such as community science can bolster the success of environmental initiatives [13-15]. However, stakeholder

engagement is challenging, and many projects fail to move beyond planning stages. Often described as the “planning-implementation gap” in conservation, scientists and practitioners have argued that greater emphasis and application of cognitive frameworks is needed to improve communication, integrate multiple sources of knowledge, and promote shared ownership of the prevailing issue and initiatives [16, 17]. Below, we discuss two potentially relevant cognitive frameworks for these purposes: ecological connectedness and human exceptionalism.

1.1 Human Exceptionalism and Ecological Connectedness

Cognitive research demonstrates that humans possess powerful intuitive frameworks that provide efficient, but often fallible, guidelines for dealing with complex scientific concepts (e.g., [18-21]) such as land-water systems (e.g., [22]). Of particular relevance for conceptualizing social-ecological systems are the intuitive ways that people conceptualize the relationship between humans and the environment [12]. Two of these intuitive frameworks have been consistently linked to environmental engagement: *human exceptionalism* and *connectedness to nature*.

Human exceptionalism is the belief that humans are qualitatively distinct and separate from all other forms of life as well as from natural systems, and/or the belief that natural and biological laws do not apply to humans [23-25]. While humans may have many unique abilities (e.g., advanced technologies and complex language) this type of thinking can be deleterious for scientific understanding when overextended. Indeed, human exceptionalist beliefs have been associated with misunderstanding ecosystem processes [26], and reduced concerns about climate change impacts [27, 28].

Whereas human exceptionalism describes a perceived separation between humans and the natural world, ecological connectedness describes perceptions of human/nature interrelatedness [29-31]. Most often, this has been assessed in terms of feeling personally connected with nature [32]. Individuals who have a personal connection with nature are more likely to engage in pro-environmental behaviors [33], feel more concerned about environmental issues, such as global climate change [34] and display other pro-environmental behaviors and attitudes. Among other factors, feeling more connected to nature can stem from frequent or meaningful nature experiences (e.g., [35]) or physical proximity to natural environments, such as living on the coast [36]. With modern comforts providing extensive indoor spaces and built environments, individuals have become increasingly distanced from the natural world, impacting how they conceptualize human-nature relationships such as ecological connectedness [12, 37].

1.2 Psychological Distance

Another potential factor impacting beliefs and attitudes about land-water systems could be *psychological distance*. Psychological distance is the subjective distance between one’s immediate experience and representations of other experiences separated in time and/or space [38, 39]; this perceived distance may facilitate or inhibit feelings of connection to ecosystems. There is increasing interest in understanding psychological distance through the scales at which information and solutions are presented to stakeholders (e.g. local vs. global), including debate over the effectiveness of “proximizing” the impacts of global climate change [40-42]. One

approach to studying this issue is through manipulations of framing [43, 44]. Presumably, framing an issue in terms of local consequences reduces the psychological distance between the reader and the issue, thereby increasing engagement. However, results to date have not been straightforward [40], and can vary with the characteristics of the particular audience (e.g., [45]). In some cases, framing environmental issues in local terms increases sustainable attitudes and behaviors (e.g., [46, 47]) whereas in others, local framing has no effect (e.g., [48, 49]). Brügger et al. (2015) [40] argue that one explanation for the inconsistent results is failure to consider underlying cognitive mechanisms, and that proximizing might be expected to have more impact on beliefs and mental representations than on attitudes and motivations.

Another way to conceptualize psychological distance is by direct analogy to physical distance. In other words, when investigating beliefs and attitudes about ecological issues at the land-water interface, people who live closer to bodies of water may feel less psychological distance to such issues because of the physical proximity and therefore personal relevance of such issues. As with the literature on local framing cited above, results seem complex. For example, Milfont et al. (2014) [50] found that New Zealand residents living closer to a shoreline expressed greater belief that climate change is real and greater support for government regulation of carbon emissions. In a sample of landowners living in the Johnson Creek Watershed in Oregon, proximity to water was most strongly related to economic support for water resource protection (via taxes, fees, or fines) rather than to general pro-water attitudes (e.g., the importance of protecting lakes and streams; [51]). In contrast, while proximity to wetlands was associated with increased knowledge of wetlands in a national US sample, it was unrelated to concern for wetlands ecosystem services or conservation involvement [52].

In the present study, we examine the impact of psychological distance on beliefs about exceptionalism and connectedness, as well as support for environmental investment and stewardship. We do so both by manipulating global (i.e., more psychologically distant) versus local (i.e., more psychologically proximal) framing, and by asking participants to report their physical proximity to a body of water.

1.3 The Current Study

Rivers and waterways support a wide variety of benefits for people, including recreation (swimming, fishing, etc.) and access to drinking water [53]. Yet, especially in urban environments [54], benefits such as these are often underappreciated [55, 56]. For example, while an urban resident may regularly travel to a rural environment for recreation in “nature”, they may fail to recognize the value of waterways in their own neighborhood [57]. Moreover, as communities adapt to climate change using a range of artificial (“gray”) and living (“green”) infrastructure [58, 59] there is considerable interest in understanding people’s perceptions of, and preference for, gray and green adaptation solutions [15, 60, 61]. This conceptualization of nature as primarily “distant” can have spillover effects on a person’s willingness to engage in local activities and their willingness to invest in the protection or recovery of local ecosystems. In this paper we explore the potential influence of human exceptionalism and connectedness to nature on people’s willingness to invest in the preservation and restoration of urban waterways. We address three specific research questions about relations among social-ecological beliefs (i.e., human exceptionalism and ecological connectedness), investment, and stewardship: (1) What do

people believe about the relationship between humans and urban waterways? (2) How are beliefs related to environmental investment or stewardship? (3) How does framing influence beliefs, investment, and stewardship?

2. Materials and Methods

Participants read a brief scenario about a hypothetical polluted river that ran through an urban area. The river was described as either artificial or natural, and the ability of the waterway and surrounding wetlands to filter pollution and nutrients from the city was described as benefitting either local or global regions. Participants then answered a series of questions to assess their tendencies toward environmental investment and environmental stewardship, and their beliefs about human exceptionalism and ecological connectedness in the context of the hypothetical urban waterway.

2.1 Participants

379 American participants (156 female, 222 male, 1 undisclosed gender; Age $M=37.46$, $SD=12.00$; Range 19-78) participated through the online platform Amazon Mechanical Turk. On average, participants reported left-leaning fiscal and social political beliefs (see Supplementary Materials). All participants were fluent English speakers. All participants gave their informed consent for inclusion before they participated in the study. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and the protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Northeastern University (IRB# 18-04-20).

2.2 Materials

2.2.1 Manipulation: River Vignettes. Our manipulation featured short vignettes that described a small river located in a city. Vignette content varied by two orthogonal dimensions: natural/artificial and local/global impacts, resulting in four target vignette types: natural/local, natural/global, artificial/local, and artificial/global. In addition, we had a control vignette that did not contain language affiliated with these dimensions. The ‘natural’ river was described as pre-existing the city, while the ‘artificial’ river was described as manmade with the intention of funneling the city’s runoff. The ‘local’ impact of the river and its surrounding wetlands was the function of serving as a drainage system that removes waste from the city, while the global impact was the function of filtering the city’s polluted run-off water before the water enters the ocean. All vignettes ended with “The local, state, and federal government will all need to make significant investments in the river to restore the ecosystem and therefore fix this issue.”

Target vignette variants had similar word lengths (219-227 words), while the control vignette was shorter (115 words). See Table 1 for sample language manipulated across vignettes and Supplementary Materials for full examples of all vignettes. To increase the tangibility of the river in the story, we also included the same image of a river within a city: a picture of the Muddy River in Boston alongside each vignette.

Table 1. *Sample content manipulated across vignettes.*

Condition	Relevant Content
Natural	Today, there is a natural river flowing through a city. The river was there long before people established the city. In the 1880s, the city began to connect its drainage systems to the river.
Artificial	Today, there is a manmade river of water flowing through a city. The river was built by people who established the city. In the 1880s, the city was rapidly developing and all the water from around the city was funneled to create this new river.
Local	But, the river remains a local resource because the river serves as a drainage system that takes run-off away from the city into the nearby lake.... In this way, the river benefits the local life of the city.
Global	But, the river remains a global resource because the river filters water run-off from the city before the water enters into the nearby ocean... In this way, the river benefits all areas connected to the ocean.

2.2.2 Measures. As described in Table 2, participants completed measures assessing environmental investment, environmental stewardship, beliefs about human exceptionalism, and beliefs about ecological connectedness.

2.2.3 Demographics. Participants reported their age, gender, and political affiliation. They also rated how conservative and liberal their beliefs about fiscal and social issues are on a scale from 0 (liberal) to 100 (conservative), the rurality of the area where they live (rural, urban, suburban), and the proximity that they live to a body of water on a scale of 0 (no bodies of water nearby) to 100 (live on a body of water).

2.3 Design

Participants were shown one of five vignettes about a fictitious river. The four target vignettes varied orthogonally in terms of their descriptions of the origin of the river (i.e., naturally occurring versus artificially built) and the location of pollution effects (i.e., local versus global). The control vignette contained none of these descriptors. All participants then completed all measures.

2.4 Procedure

Testing was done online using Qualtrics survey software (Qualtrics, Provo UT). After consenting, participants read one vignette and had to correctly answer two comprehension check questions that reaffirmed content manipulated in vignettes (for targets) or incidental content (for control vignette) to advance. All participants then were told to imagine that the river in the story was real prior to completing the measures in the order presented in Table 2. At the end of the survey, participants answered demographics questions. Participants were tested in two cohorts, one in December 2019 and one in February 2020. The vignettes, questions on which we focus here, and order of measures was identical in both cohorts. Each cohort was also asked additional unique questions not analyzed here.

Table 2: Summary of Study Measures

Question Type	Target Construct(s)	Question	Scale
<i>Investment</i>	Amount of Government Investment	A full restoration of the river would cost \$100 million. How many tax dollars do you think that the different branches of government should invest in river clean up? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local (City) Government • State Government • Federal Government 	\$0 million to \$100 million
	Willingness to Volunteer	If you were a resident of the city, how many hours would you be willing to spend on a Saturday to volunteer to clean up the river?	0 hours to 12 hours
<i>Stewardship</i>	Prioritization of Programs	What is the order in which you think that the following issues should be prioritized? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River Cleanup Project • Reducing Local Property Taxes • Purchasing New Textbooks for Elementary Schools • Expanding the City's Recycling Program • Litter Removal from the City Streets 	1 to 5 priority rank (mutually exclusive)
	Favorability of Protective Actions	To what extent would you be in favor of... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New laws designed to protect the river • Community-based initiatives to protect the river 	1 ("Fully Against") to 5 ("Fully in Favor")
	Perceived Human Responsibility	To what extent do humans have a responsibility to protect their surrounding ecosystems?	0 ("None at all. They should let nature run its course") to 100 ("Humans are fully responsible")
<i>Beliefs</i>	Human Exceptionalism	To what extent do you think that... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the behaviors of people in the city impact the river? • the river impacts the people in the city? 	0 ("None at all") to 100 ("To a Great Extent")
	Perceived Ecological Connectedness	To what extent do you think that people are ecologically connected to other living things?	0 ("Not Connected at all") to 100 ("Fully Connected")

3. Results

3.1 What do people believe about the relationship between humans and urban waterways?

One potentially relevant aspect of ecological beliefs is the degree to which humans and local waterways are perceived to impact each other. To examine these beliefs, we focused on responses to two survey questions: “To what extent do you think that the river impacts the people in the city?” (hereafter RiH for “river impacts humans”) and “To what extent do you think that the behaviors of people in the city impact the river?” (hereafter HiR for “humans impact river”). Both ratings were high in absolute terms (see Table 3), and differed significantly from the midpoint (50) of the scale ($t(378) > 20.71$, $p < .001$, Cohen’s $d > 3.60$) indicating the general belief that there were notable impacts in both directions. Moreover, these two scores showed a strong positive correlation (*Spearman’s rho*(379) = .587, $p < .001$) suggesting that people tended to perceive both impacts as having similar magnitude.

Table 3. Mean, standard deviation, and range for investment, stewardship, and belief variables ($N=379$).

	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
<i>Investment Composite</i>	City Government	39.79	24.70	1-100
	State Government	40.89	21.12	0-100
	Federal Government	38.26	26.30	0-100
	Volunteer Hours	3.97	3.05	0-12
<i>Stewardship Composite</i>	Ranked Priority of River Cleanup Project	1.91	1.18	1-5
	Support for Protective Laws	4.32	1.04	1-5
	Support for Protective Community Initiatives	4.37	1.07	1-5
	Perceived Human Responsibility	84.59	19.65	0-100
<i>Beliefs</i>	Human Impacts on River (HiR)	85.70	17.59	10-100
	River Impacts on Humans (RiH)	78.85	21.84	1-100
	Human Exceptionalism*	7.04	18.79	-40-99
	Ecological Connectedness	82.22	19.81	0-100

*Note: Exceptionalism was not measured directly, but rather computed by subtracting RiH from HiR.

We looked for human exceptionalism beliefs in three ways. First, we compared HiR and RiH scores directly, and found that HiR scores were significantly higher, $t(378) = 7.22$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.37$, demonstrating a belief that humans would have a disproportionate impact on the river relative to the river’s perceived impact on humans.

Second, we classified participants into three groups based on the magnitude of difference between HiR and RiH scores. If scores differed by 3 or less (on a scale of 0-100), we classified a participant as perceiving *equal influence*. If the differences exceeded 3, we classified the

participant as either *human > river* influence or *river > human* influence, depending on the direction of the difference. Frequencies are presented in Figure 2. Human > river was the modal response pattern, and out of 246 participants who gave differential ratings to these two questions, more than twice as many participants rated *humans impact river* higher than *river impacts humans* ($\chi^2(1, N=246)=34.41, p<.001$, see fig. 1).

Figure 1. Frequency of belief patterns about human/river impact.

Finally, we explored the extent to which HiR scores and RiH scores predicted ecological connectedness. A multiple regression analysis showed that both HiR and RiH beliefs were associated with connectedness beliefs ($R^2=.362, p<.001$), but that HiR scores ($\beta=0.483, 95\% CI .384-.583$) were a significantly stronger predictor than RiH scores ($\beta=0.174, 95\% CI .075-.275$). In other words, beliefs about connectedness were driven by beliefs about human impact on the environment much more strongly than beliefs about the environment's impact on humans.

3.2 How are beliefs related to environmental investment and stewardship?

As detailed in Table 1, the majority of our questions can be interpreted as measures of willingness to *invest* (both time and money) in environmental restoration efforts, or as measures of a sense of *stewardship* or willingness to take responsibility for environmental restoration. A principal components factor analysis of scores on the dependent measures in Table 1 confirmed this structure. Two factors emerged, with all hypothesized stewardship measures loading on one factor, and all hypothesized investment measures loading on the other (see Table S3, of Supplementary Online Materials). Based on this analysis, we constructed a composite measure of *environmental investment* by averaging standardized scores for beliefs about the amount of local, state, and federal tax dollars that should be invested in restoration, and volunteer hours, and another for *environmental stewardship* by averaging standardized scores for support for protective laws, support for community initiatives, belief that it's humans' responsibility to restore the river, and ranking of importance for river restoration. We also calculated individual exceptionalism scores by subtracting each participants' *RiH* score from their *HiR* score, yielding a measure of the difference in perceived impact, with higher scores representing more disproportional human impact. We then conducted two multiple regression analyses, in which we

used exceptionalism, beliefs about connectedness, and proximity to water (as a measure of psychological distance) to predict each composite. Results are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Multiple regression models examining the degree to which beliefs about exceptionalism and connectedness, as well as reported proximity to water, predict investment and stewardship.

Composite Outcome Measure	R^2	Standardized coefficient Beta		
		Exceptionalism	Connectedness	Proximity to Water
<i>Investment</i>	.072***	-.187***	-.001	.187***
<i>Stewardship</i>	.249***	-.050	.496***	.011

*** $p < .001$

Results differed substantially across the investment and stewardship models. Willingness to invest in river restoration (local, state, and federal tax dollars as well as volunteer hours) was consistently associated with lower levels of exceptionalism, and greater reported proximity to water, but unrelated to beliefs about connectedness. In contrast, beliefs about stewardship (i.e., that humans are responsible for protecting surrounding ecosystems, and support for protective laws and community-based initiatives, and ranking river restoration as a priority) was associated with increased beliefs about connectedness, but unrelated to exceptionalism or proximity to water.

3.3 How does framing an explanation of the waterway impact beliefs, investment, and stewardship?

Recall that participants read a short vignette that introduced the urban river as naturally formed or artificially created, and orthogonally, described the consequences of pollution in global or local terms. To examine the impact of this manipulation on responses, we conducted 2 (River: Natural v Artificial) x 2 (Consequences: Global v Local) *ANOVAs* on exceptionalism, connectedness, investment, and stewardship scores. Participants showed lower exceptionalism when the vignette was framed locally than when it was framed globally, $F(1,291)=5.30$, $p=.022$, $\eta^2=.018$. Exceptionalism was also lower in the local condition than in the control condition (in which the river was described in neutral terms), $t(245)=2.38$, $p=.018$, $d=0.319$, see fig. 2. Describing the river as natural or artificial had no effect on exceptionalism.

Figure 2. Mean human exceptionalism scores for participants in global framing, local framing, and control conditions. Note: error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

To further explore this finding, we examined framing effects on the components of the exceptionalism index by conducting a 2 (Consequences: Global v Local) x 2 (Beliefs: HiR, RiH) mixed ANOVA on perceived impact scores. As reported above, HiR beliefs were higher than RiH beliefs, $F(1,291)=38.07$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.027$. We also observed an beliefs x consequences interaction, $F(1,291)=5.30$, $p=.022$, $\eta^2=.004$. Simple effect analysis showed that RiH beliefs were higher when the consequences of river pollution were presented in local terms than when they were presented in global terms ($p=.028$, see fig. 3). Framing had no effect on HiR beliefs ($p=.726$). In other words, local framing reduced human exceptionalism by increasing the degree to which people believed that the urban waterway impacts humans. Framing had no direct effect on beliefs about connectedness ($p>.510$), stewardship ($p>.106$) or investment ($p>.570$).

Figure 3. Mean HiR and RiH scores for participants in global and local framing conditions. Note: error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

4. Discussion

Our goals were to investigate beliefs about connectedness with nature and human exceptionalism in the context of a hypothetical urban waterway, to examine the degree to which these beliefs influenced stewardship and investment, and to ascertain the impact of framing on any of these constructs. To do so we presented participants with a brief scenario describing an urban waterway as natural or artificial, and pollution of the waterway (and the ability of the waterway and surrounding wetlands to remove this pollution) as having global or local consequences. After reading the scenario, participants answered a series of questions about beliefs, stewardship, and investment.

4.1 What do people believe about the relationship between humans and urban waterways?

In general, participants believed that humans and urban waterways strongly impacted each other. Participants' ratings of human impact on the river were high, demonstrating an acknowledgement of the influence of humans on their surrounding land-water environments, even in urban settings. Ratings of the river's impact on humans were also high, suggesting a corresponding acknowledgement that our natural environment influences us.

Nevertheless, responses demonstrated human exceptionalism in several ways. Ratings of human impact on the river were higher than ratings of the river's impact on humans, and more than twice as many people asymmetrically rated humans' impact on rivers higher, reflecting a belief that humans have a disproportionate impact on their environment, rather than a reciprocal mutual influence. This pattern aligns with other exceptionalist findings demonstrating the belief that people have more impact on nature than vice-versa, for example believing that humans can cause climate change, but will be uniquely immune from the effects of climate change [27, 28]. Moreover, beliefs about human impact were a stronger predictor of beliefs about connectedness than beliefs about the river's impact, suggesting that "connectedness" was perceived largely in terms of humans' unidirectional impact on the other organisms, rather than our dependence on them or mutuality.

In many ways these asymmetrical relationships are diagnostic of continually evolving views of the role of humans in nature in majority populations in the U.S. While earlier environmentalists focused primarily the protection of nature from the impacts of humans (for example, Rachel Carson's 1962 *Silent Spring* [62]), more modern views envision people as part of a coupled human-natural ecosystem where feedbacks occur between human behavior and the resulting effects of ecosystem services on people [63, 64]. Even more recently, relativistic approaches capture these relationships in concepts such as Nature's Contribution to People or Social-Ecological Systems [65]. However, despite these evolving views in academic circles, it is not always clear as to the degree to which these ideas permeate the general public [66, 67]. Our results suggest that there is still a lack of understanding of these feedback loops, and especially of the value of ecosystems to human well-being [68].

4.2 How are beliefs related to environmental investment or stewardship?

Human exceptionalism predicted environmental investment; the more a person held exceptionalist beliefs, the less likely they were to endorse investing time and money in restoration efforts.. This finding importantly demonstrates that exceptionalist beliefs could have implications for environmentally relevant attitudes and behaviors, adding to other findings demonstrating the inverse relationship between human exceptionalism and pro-environmentalism (e.g., [27, 28]). Although we cannot make causal inferences, it also raises the possibility that interventions aimed at reducing exceptionalist thinking might also impact willingness to invest in environmental initiatives.

Investment also increased with reported proximity to water. This relationship could be interpreted through the lens of psychological distance, suggesting that reduced perceived physical distance to a waterway is associated with a stronger desire for investment in conservation. In conjunction, the finding that psychological distance, as measured by self-reported proximity, predicted investment but not stewardship replicates the findings of Larson and Santelman (2007)[51], and underscores the complex relationship of psychological distance to environmental attitudes. Adding to this complexity, investment was unrelated to perceived ecological connectedness. This suggests that perceived proximity to water provided unique explanatory value towards investing time and money in river restoration, beyond increasing feelings of ecological connectedness.

In contrast to investment, environmental stewardship was unrelated to human exceptionalism or proximity to water, but was positively predicted by ecological connectedness. The more one believed that humans are ecologically connected to other living things, the more one also supported environmental stewardship (specifically protective laws and initiatives, human responsibility, and prioritization of river restoration). This finding adds to growing evidence that ecological connectedness positively impacts pro-environmentalism (e.g., [12, 69]), expanding this account to clarify that this effect provides unique explanatory value separate from the related constructs of human exceptionalism and psychological distance to similar ecosystems (e.g., waterways). Bearing in mind the causal caveat mentioned above, this finding nevertheless suggests that efforts aimed at increasing perceptions of ecological connectedness may in turn have positive effects on environmental stewardship.

4.3 How does framing influence beliefs, investment, and stewardship?

To examine the degree to which framing impacts environmental beliefs and attitudes, we manipulated whether the urban river described in our brief vignette had natural (pre-existing the city) or artificial (human-made with the intention of funneling the city's runoff) origins, and whether the consequences of the river's ecological impact was described in local (serving as a drainage system that removes waste from the city) or global (filtering the city's polluted run-off water before the water enters the ocean) terms. Describing the river's ecological impact in local terms resulted in lower human exceptionalism than describing this in global terms, or when impact wasn't mentioned at all. Moreover, this reduction was due to an increase in the perceived impact of the river on the people living in the city. The artificial-natural manipulation had no

effect on exceptionalism, suggesting that the distinction between green and gray infrastructure may not have been salient to our participants.

This finding is consistent with previous work demonstrating the efficacy of emphasizing local implications of ecological issues when trying to influence attitudes (e.g., [46, 47]). It also extends that finding by demonstrating that emphasizing local impacts of an urban waterway can increase the degree to which that river is perceived to impact residents, and thereby reduce asymmetries in perceived impact of humans and the waterway associated with exceptionalist thinking. Thus, framing has the potential to impact beliefs about relations between humans and the ecosystems they inhabit. We believe this evidence supports the position articulated by Brügger et al. (2015)[40] that “proximizing” (i.e., stressing local consequences) changes mental representations and the basis for decision-making, rather than directly impacting behavioral motivation.

4.4 Implications for Stakeholder Engagement

In keeping with the theme of this special issue, we see important implications of this work for stakeholder engagement. The vast majority of environmental problems require understanding and engaging stakeholders, yet this latter task is notoriously difficult [70]. One of the most common challenges and pitfalls of previous stakeholder engagement efforts is an oversimplification of the links among environmental awareness, concern, and behavior [71, 72]. Our study evaluates and discusses the importance of several key influences on stakeholder engagement.

We’ve shown that beliefs about human exceptionalism—which in our sample were common regarding urban waterways—and ecological connectedness are important predictors of environmental investment and stewardship. This demonstrates the larger point that how one conceptualizes the world and one’s place in it plays an important role in how one chooses to engage with the world. Conversely, in order to influence environmental behavior, we need to understand environmental beliefs and cognition [73]. By understanding stakeholders’ beliefs—about human exceptionalism, ecological connectedness, psychological distance, and other relevant dimensions—we can better craft effective ways to engage and motivate them [70]. For example, if stakeholders hold beliefs that are contradictory to investment and stewardship, it may be helpful to directly address these beliefs to undermine their maleffects [74].

While others have also shown that the way in which information is presented can impact stakeholder beliefs [75, 76], our results also show that considering individual-level beliefs like human exceptionalism is important. Emphasizing local consequences increased the degree to which a river was thought to impact people in the surrounding city, thereby decreasing human exceptionalism. This suggests that proximizing ecological information has the potential to reduce exceptionalist thinking. And although framing had no direct effect on investment, reducing exceptionalist thinking may have the indirect effect of increasing investment.

Finally, by demonstrating the importance of beliefs and their potential for plasticity, our findings also emphasize the importance of understanding differences in beliefs between stakeholder

groups, which might represent both a source of conflict and a potential path to broader and more successful engagement.

4.5 Limitations and Future Directions

Several limitations of the current study set the stage for future follow-up work. One involves measures; for example, our measure of human exceptionalism was based on responses to two items; it would be useful to develop more extensive and converging measures of human exceptionalism. Likewise, our measure of ecological connectedness was based on responses to a single item; future work could employ converging validated measures (e.g., [29, 33, 77]). On another front, although the use of hypothetical scenarios allowed us to survey a broad sample of participants, and indeed, we found framing effects for hypothetical vignettes, this approach is still relatively abstract and removed from lived experience. Going forward, it would be informative to ask comparable questions about real waterways to people living along those waterways, especially given the importance of engaging local stakeholders in climate adaptation and environmental management [78, 79]. Similar patterns of results would bolster the generalizability of our findings, whereas different results might highlight the place-based nature of such beliefs. Relatedly, our sample is a general national one of English-speaking US residents. Future work could target specific subgroups of stakeholders to examine how relations among these constructs might vary as a function of different goals and perceptions. Another way to extend this work would be to examine different ecosystems. We focus on urban waterways due to our own location in Boston, but our approach could be applied to a wide range of socio-ecological land-water systems, as well as other types of ecosystems. Again, such work would inform the degree to which the relations we discuss are ecosystem-specific or more general.

Finally, we demonstrate that although proximizing can “move the needle” on human exceptionalism, and that human exceptionalism is a predictor of investment, framing had no direct effect on investment or stewardship. Future work should explore the causal relations among these constructs, with an eye toward developing interventions aimed at effectively enhancing perceived ecological connectedness and/or reducing human exceptionalism. One way to do so might be to encourage stakeholders to explicitly include humans in their mental models of interrelations among components for a given environmental issue (e.g., [27, 28]). Another approach might involve the use of immersive art installations or experiences or to decrease psychological distance (e.g., [80, 81]).

5. Conclusions

These results suggest that beliefs like human exceptionalism and ecological connectedness are an important component of people’s understanding of human-land-water interactions in an urban context. They demonstrate that these beliefs are associated with both investment and stewardship. And they demonstrate that psychological distance is related to investment, and that proximizing (by emphasizing local implications) decreases exceptionalist thinking. More generally, these results underscore the need to understand the conceptual frameworks with which humans make sense of the world around them in order to facilitate stakeholder engagement in finding effective solutions to environmental challenges arising from the complex interactions of land, water, and human society.

6. References

1. Reed, M.S., et al., *A theory of participation: what makes stakeholder and public engagement in environmental management work?* Restoration Ecology, 2018. **26**: p. S7-S17.
2. Ferreira, V., et al., *Stakeholders' engagement on nature-based solutions: A systematic literature review*. Sustainability, 2020. **12**(2).
3. Brugger, A., T.A. Morton, and S. Dessai, "Proximising" climate change reconsidered: A construal level theory perspective. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 2016. **46**: p. 125-142.
4. Gray, M., et al., *Climate-wise habitat connectivity takes sustained stakeholder engagement*. Land, 2020. **9**(11).
5. Tompkins, E.L., R. Few, and K. Brown, *Scenario-based stakeholder engagement: Incorporating stakeholders preferences into coastal planning for climate change*. Journal of Environmental Management, 2008. **88**(4): p. 1580-1592.
6. Cutler, M.J., et al., *The influence of political ideology and socioeconomic vulnerability on perceived health risks of heat waves in the context of climate change*. Weather, Climate and Society, 2018. **10**(4): p. 731-746.
7. Jurjonas, M. and E. Seekamp, 'A commons before the sea:' climate justice considerations for coastal zone management. Climate and Development, 2020. **12**(3): p. 199-203.
8. Komatsu, H., J. Rappleye, and I. Silova, *Culture and the Independent Self: Obstacles to environmental sustainability?* Anthropocene, 2019. **26**: p. 100198.
9. Lee, T.M., et al., *Predictors of public climate change awareness and risk perception around the world*. Nature Climate Change, 2015. **5**: p. 1014-1020.
10. Meadows, D.H., *Thinking in systems: A Primer*. 2008: Chelsea Green Publishing.
11. Ban, N.C., C.R. Picard, and A.C.J. Vincent, *Comparing and integrating community-based and science-based approaches to prioritizing marine areas for protection*. Conservation Biology, 2009. **23**(4): p. 899-910.
12. Schultz, P.W., *Inclusion with nature: The psychology of human-nature relations*, in *Psychology of Sustainable Development*, P. Schmuck and P.W. Schultz, Editors. 2002, Springer. p. 61-78.
13. Davis, A., C.E. Taylor, and J.M. Martin, *Are pro-ecological values enough? Determining the drivers and extent of participation in citizen science programs*. Human Dimensions of Wildlife, 2017. **24**(6): p. 501-514.
14. McKinley, D.C., et al., *Citizen science can improve conservation science, natural resource management, and environmental protection*. Biological Conservation, 2017. **208**: p. 15-28.
15. Scyphers, S.B., et al., *Natural shorelines promote the stability of fish communities in an urbanized coastal system*. PLoS ONE, 2015. **10**(6): p. e0118580.
16. Biggs, D., et al., *The implementation crisis in conservation planning: Could "mental models" help?* Conservation Letters, 2011. **4**(3): p. 169-183.
17. Nielsen, K.S., et al., *How psychology can help limit climate change*. American Psychologist, 2021. **76**(1): p. 130-144.
18. Coley, J.D. and K. Tanner, *Relations between intuitive biological thinking and biological misconceptions in biology majors and nonmajors*. Cbe-Life Sciences Education, 2015. **14**(1).
19. Coley, J.D. and K.D. Tanner, *Common origins of diverse misconceptions: Cognitive principles and the development of biology thinking*. CBE-Life Sciences Education, 2012. **11**(3): p. 209-215.
20. Danielson, K.I. and K.D. Tanner, *Investigating undergraduate science students' conceptions and misconceptions of ocean acidification*. Cbe-Life Sciences Education, 2015. **14**(3): p. ar29.
21. Shtulman, A., *How lay cognition constrains scientific cognition*. Philosophy Compass, 2015. **10**(11): p. 785-798.
22. Cuzzolino, M.P., et al., *An agentive focus may limit learning about complex causality and systems dynamics: A study of seventh graders' explanations of ecosystems*. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 2019. **56**(8): p. 1083-1105.

23. Coley, J.D., *The human animal: Developmental changes in judgments of taxonomic and psychological similarity among humans and other animals*. Cognition, Brain, Behavior, 2007. **11**(4): p. 733-756.
24. Gee, H., *The Accidental Species: Misunderstandings of Human Evolution*. 2013: University of Chicago Press.
25. Shannon, L., *Chapter Seven. Invisible parts: Animals and the Renaissance anatomies of human exceptionalism*, in *Animal Encounters*, M. Rossini and T. Tyler, Editors. 2009. p. 135-157.
26. Fux, M., et al., *Demonstrating contingency between intuitive biological reasoning and persistent biological misconceptions across levels of academic expertise*, in *30th Annual Convention of the Association for Psychological Science*. 2018: San Francisco, CA.
27. Betz, N., *Anthropic thinking about global climate change*, in *Department of Psychology*. 2019, Northeastern University: Boston, MA.
28. Betz, N. and J.D. Coley, *Human exceptionalist thinking about climate change*. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, in review.
29. Mayer, F.S. and C.M. Frantz, *The connectedness to nature scale: A measure of individuals' feeling in community with nature*. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 2004. **24**(4): p. 503-515.
30. Mayer, F.S., et al., *Why Is nature beneficial? The role of connectedness to nature*. Environment and Behavior, 2009. **41**(5): p. 607-643.
31. Medin, D.L. and M. Bang, *The cultural side of science communication*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2014. **111**: p. 13621-13626.
32. Frantz, C.M. and F.S. Mayer, *The importance of connection to nature in assessing environmental education programs*. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 2014. **41**: p. 85-89.
33. Nisbet, E.K., J.M. Zelenski, and S.A. Murphy, *The nature relatedness scale: Linking individuals' connection with nature to environmental concern and behavior*. Environment and Behavior, 2009. **41**(5): p. 715-740.
34. Clayton, S., et al., *Connecting to nature at the zoo: implications for responding to climate change*. Environmental Education Research, 2014. **20**(4): p. 460-475.
35. Denton, H. and K. Aranda, *The wellbeing benefits of sea swimming. Is it time to revisit the sea cure?* Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 2020. **12**(5): p. 647-663.
36. Alcock, I., et al., *Associations between pro-environmental behaviour and neighbourhood nature, nature visit frequency and nature appreciation: Evidence from a nationally representative survey in England*. Environment International, 2020. **136**: p. 105441.
37. DeVille, N.V., et al., *Time spent in nature is associated with Increased pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors*. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2021. **18**: p. 7498.
38. Liberman, N., Y. Trope, and E. Stephan, *Psychological Distance*, in *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles* A.W. Kruglanski and E.T. Higgins, Editors. 2007, The Guilford Press: New York. p. 353-381.
39. McDonald, R.I., H.Y. Chai, and B.R. Newell, *Personal experience and the 'psychological distance' of climate change: An integrative review*. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 2015. **44**: p. 109-118.
40. Brügger, A., et al., *Psychological responses to the proximity of climate change*. Nature Climate Change, 2015. **5**: p. 1031-1037.
41. Duan, R., A. Zwickle, and B. Takahashi, *Refining the application of construal level theory: Egocentric and nonegocentric psychological distances in climate change visual communication*. Environmental Communication, 2021. **in press**.
42. Pong, V., *Global versus local framing of the issue of food waste: The role of Identification With All Humanity and the implications for climate change communication*. Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 2021. **24**: p. 221-231.

43. Levin, I.P., S. Schneider, and G.J. Gaeth, *All frames are not created equal: A typology and critical analysis of framing effects*. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 1998. **76**(2): p. 149-188.
44. Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman, *The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice*. Science, 1981. **211**: p. 453-458.
45. Hine, D.W., et al., *Preaching to different choirs: How to motivate dismissive, uncommitted, and alarmed audiences to adapt to climate change?* 2016. **Global Environmental Change**(36): p. 1-11.
46. Altinay, Z., *Visual communication of climate change: Local framing and place attachment*. Coastal Management, 2017. **45**(4): p. 293-309.
47. Evans, L., T.L. Milfont, and J. Lawrence, *Considering local adaptation increases willingness to mitigate*. Global Environmental Change, 2014. **25**: p. 69-75.
48. Schoenefeld, J.J. and M.R. McCauley, *Local is not always better: the impact of climate information on values, behavior and policy support*. Journal of Environmental Studies and Science, 2016. **6**: p. 724-732.
49. Spence, A. and N. Pidgeon, *Framing and communicating climate change: The effects of distance and outcome frame manipulations*. Global Environmental Change, 2010. **20**: p. 656-667.
50. Milfont, T.L., et al., *Proximity to coast is linked to climate change belief*. Plos One, 2014. **9**(7).
51. Larson, K.L. and M.V. Santelmann, *An analysis of the relationship between residents' proximity to water and attitudes about resource protection*. Professional Geographer, 2007. **59**(3): p. 316-333.
52. Wilkins, E.J., et al., *Does proximity to wetlands matter? A landscape-level analysis of the influence of local wetlands on the public's concern for ecosystem services and conservation involvement*. Wetlands, 2019. **39**: p. 1271-1280.
53. Zheng, H., et al., *Using ecosystem service trade-offs to inform water conservation policies and management practices*. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 2016. **14**(10): p. 527-532.
54. LaPointe, M., G.S. Cumming, and G. Gurney, *Comparing ecosystem service preferences between urban and rural dwellers*. Bioscience, 2019. **69**: p. 108-116.
55. Duarte, C.M., et al., *The charisma of coastal ecosystems: Addressing the imbalance*. Estuaries and Coasts: J CERF, 2008. **31**: p. 233-238.
56. Strain, E.M.A., et al., *Urban blue: A global analysis of the factors shaping people's perceptions of the marine environment and ecological engineering in harbours*. Science of the Total Environment, 2019. **658**: p. 1293-1305.
57. Kellert, S.R., et al., *The nature of Americans: disconnection and recommendations for reconnection*. 2017, Nature of Americans.
58. Firth, L.B., et al., *Greening of grey infrastructure should not be used as a Trojan horse to facilitate coastal development*. Journal of Applied Ecology, 2020. **57**: p. 1762-1768.
59. Kapetas, L. and R. Fenner, *Integrating blue-green and grey infrastructure through an adaptation pathways approach to surface water flooding*. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A, 2020. **378**: p. 20190204.
60. Tian, Y., et al., *Perceptions of ecosystem services, disservices and willingness-to-pay for urban green space conservation*. Journal of Environmental Management, 2020. **260**: p. 110140.
61. Venkataramanan, V., et al., *A systematic review of the human health and social well-being outcomes of green infrastructure for stormwater and flood management*. Journal of Environmental Management, 2019. **246**: p. 868-880.
62. Carson, R., *Silent Spring*. 1962, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
63. Carter, N.H., et al., *Coupled human and natural systems approach to wildlife research and conservation*. Ecology and Society, 2014. **19**(3): p. 43.
64. Liu, J., et al., *Coupled human and natural systems: The evolution and applications of an integrated framework*. Ambio, 2021. **50**: p. 1778-1783.
65. Díaz, S., et al., *Assessing nature's contributions to people*. Science, 2018. **359**(6373): p. 270-272.

66. Asah, S.T., et al., *Perception, acquisition and use of ecosystem services: Human behavior, and ecosystem management and policy implications*. Ecosystem Services, 2014. **10**: p. 180-186.
67. DeLorme, D.E., et al., *Communicating and understanding ecosystem services assessment with coastal stakeholders: Obstacles and opportunities*. Frontiers in Communication, 2021. **6**.
68. Karimi, A., H. Yazdandad, and N. Fagerholm, *Evaluating social perceptions of ecosystem services, biodiversity, and land management: Trade-offs, synergies and implications for landscape planning and management*. Ecosystem Services, 2020. **45**: p. 101188.
69. Ahn, S.J.G., et al., *Experiencing nature: Embodying animals in immersive virtual environments increases inclusion of nature in self and involvement with nature*. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 2016. **21**(6): p. 399-419.
70. Reddy, S.M.W., et al., *Advancing conservation by understanding and influencing human behavior*. Conservation Letters, 2017. **10**(2): p. 248-256.
71. Heberlein, T.A., *Attitudes and environmental management*. Journal of Social Issues, 1989. **45**: p. 37-57.
72. Stern, P.C., *New environmental theories: Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior*. Journal of Social Issues, 2000. **56**(3): p. 407-424.
73. Smith, J.W., et al., *Place meanings and desired management outcomes*. Landscape and Urban Planning, 2011. **101**(4): p. 359-370.
74. Chapin, F.S., et al., *Ecosystem stewardship: sustainability strategies for a rapidly changing planet*. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 2010. **25**(4): p. 241-249.
75. Krantz, S.A. and M.C. Monroe, *Message framing matters: Communicating climate change with forest landowners*. Journal of Forestry 2016. **114**(2): p. 108-115.
76. Stevenson, K.T., et al., *Framing climate change communication to prompt individual and collective action among adolescents from agricultural communities*. Environmental Education Research, 2018. **24**(3): p. 365-377.
77. Schultz, P.W., *The structure of environmental concern: Concern for self, other people, and the biosphere*. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 2001. **21**(4): p. 327-339.
78. Harlan, S.L., et al., *A survey-based assessment of perceived flood risk in urban areas of the United States*. Anthropocene, 2019. **28**: p. 100217.
79. Scyphers, S.B., et al., *Designing effective incentives for living shorelines as a habitat conservation strategy along residential coasts*. Conservation Letters, 2020. **13**: p. e12744.
80. Breves, P. and V. Heber, *Into the wild: The effects of 360° immersive nature videos on feelings of commitment to the environment*. Environmental Communication, 2020. **14**: p. 332-346.
81. Breves, P. and H. Schramm, *Bridging psychological distance: The impact of immersive media on distant and proximal environmental issues*. Computers in Human Behavior, 2021. **115**.

Funding. This research was funded by an internal Tier 1 grant from the Office of the Provost, Northeastern University.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Kyleigh Watson, Kelly Marchese, Daniela Ras, Finn Payne and Francis Choi for their valuable contributions to the research reported here.

Conflict of Interest. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Supplementary Materials
Beliefs about Human-Nature Relationships and Implications for Investment and
Stewardship surrounding Land-Water System Conservation

Table of Contents

1. Full Study Vignettes (pages 2-7)
 - a. Image included alongside vignettes (page 2)
 - b. Natural / Local Consequences (page 3)
 - c. Artificial / Local Consequences (page 4)
 - d. Natural / Global Consequences (page 5)
 - e. Artificial / Global Consequences (page 6)
 - f. Control (page 7)
2. Extended Participant Demographics (pages 8-9)
 - a. Descriptive Statistics (page 8)
 - b. Exploratory Correlations (page 9)
3. Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Investment and Stewardship Measures (page 10)

1. Full Study Vignettes

Below are full content of the five study vignettes, with attention checks. Target manipulated content is bolded and italicized for these materials, but was presented to participants without this formatting. Similarly, the correct answers to attention check questions are also bolded and italicized for these materials.

1a. Image of River Accompanying all Vignettes

Figure S1: Photograph of Urban River. This same photograph of the Muddy River in Boston (taken by author N.B.) accompanied all vignettes.

1b. Natural / Local Consequences

Today, there is a **natural** river flowing through a city. **The river was there long before people established the city.** In the 1880s, **the city was rapidly developing and began to connect its drainage systems to the river.**

So, the river is fed by run-off from the roads, parking lots, buildings, and private properties of the city. All this run-off brings chemical pollution and physical debris that hurt the water quality of the river. But, the river remains a **local** resource because the river **serves as a drainage system that takes run-off away from the city into the nearby lake.**

The river, along with its surrounding wetlands of diverse plants, helps to filter this runoff and **reduce much of the pollution that the city feeds into the river.** In this way, the river benefits the **local life of the city.**

In the past decade, increased pollution flowing from the city into the river **has damaged the plants and ecosystem along the river and the water is less filtered than it used to be.** As a result, **the quality of the water remaining in the city** is worse than it used to be, diminishing these **local** benefits.

The local, state, and federal government will all need to make significant investments in the river to restore the ecosystem and therefore fix this issue.

Attention Check/ Manipulation Check Questions (Correct answers marked in bold italics):

Where does the river flow into?

- A large river
- **A lake**
- The Ocean

What happened in the 1880s in this story?

- **the city was rapidly developing and connected its drainage to the river.**
- the river was turned into a tourist attraction
- the river was turned into a pond

1c. Artificial / Local Consequences

Today, there is a **manmade** river flowing through a city. The river was **built by people who established the city**. In the 1880s, **the city was rapidly developing and all the water from around the city was funneled to create this new river**.

So, the river is fed by run-off from the roads, parking lots, buildings, and private properties of the city. All this run-off brings chemical pollution and physical debris that hurt the water quality of the river. But, the river remains a local resource because the river serves as a drainage system that takes run-off away from the city into the nearby lake.

The river, along with its surrounding wetlands of diverse plants, helps to filter this runoff and **reduce much of the pollution that the city feeds into the river**. In this way, the river benefits the **local life of the city**.

In the past decade, increased pollution flowing from the city into the river has damaged the plants and ecosystem along the river and the water is less filtered than it used to be. As a result, **the quality of the water remaining in the city** is worse quality than it used to be, diminishing these **local** benefits.

The local, state, and federal government will all need to make significant investments in the river to restore the ecosystem and therefore fix this issue.

Where does the river flow into?

- A large river
- **A lake**
- The Ocean

What happened in the 1880s in this story?

- **the developing city funneled its waste water to create the river.**
- the river was turned into a tourist attraction
- the river was turned into a pond

1d. Natural / Global Consequences

Today, there is a **natural** river flowing through a city. The river was there long before people established the city. In the 1880s, the city was rapidly developing and began to connect its drainage systems to the river.

So, the river is fed by run-off from the roads, parking lots, buildings, and private properties of the city. All this run-off brings chemical pollution and physical debris that hurt the water quality of the river. But, the river remains a global resource because the river filters water run-off from the city before the water enters into the nearby ocean.

The river, along with its surrounding wetlands of diverse plants, **helps to filter this runoff and reduce much of the pollution that the city feeds into the river.** In this way, **the river benefits all areas connected to the ocean.**

In the past decade, increased pollution flowing from the city into the river **has damaged the plants and ecosystem along the river and the water is less filtered than it used to be.** As a result, the **quality of the water entering the ocean** is worse quality than it used to be, diminishing these **global** benefits.

The local, state, and federal government will all need to make significant investments in the river to restore the ecosystem and therefore fix this issue.

Where does the river flow into?

- a larger river
- a lake
- **the ocean**

What happened in the 1880s in this story?

- **the developing city connected its drainage system to the river**
- the river was turned into a tourist attraction
- the river was turned into a pond

1e. Artificial / Global Consequences

Today, there is a **manmade** river flowing through a city. ***The river was built by people who established the city. In the 1880s, the city was rapidly developing and all the water from around the city was funneled to create this new river.***

So, the river is fed by run-off from the roads, parking lots, buildings, and private properties of the city. All this run-off brings chemical pollution and physical debris that hurt the water quality of the river. But, the river remains a global resource because the river filters water run-off from the city before the water enters into the nearby ocean.

The river, along with its surrounding wetlands of diverse plants, helps to filter this runoff and reduce much of ***the pollution that the city feeds into the river.*** In this way, ***the river benefits all areas connected to the ocean.***

In the past decade, increased pollution flowing from the city into the river ***has damaged the plants and ecosystem along the river and the water is less filtered than it used to be.*** As a result, ***the quality of the water entering the ocean is worse quality than it used to be,*** diminishing these ***global*** benefits.

The local, state, and federal government will all need to make significant investments in the river to restore the ecosystem and therefore fix this issue.

Q18 Where does the river flow into?

- a larger river
- a lake
- ***the ocean***

Q19 What happened in the 1880s in this story?

- ***the developing city funneled its waste water to create a river***
- the river was turned into a tourist attraction
- the river was turned into a pond

1f. Control

Today, there is a river flowing through a city. This city was built in the 1880s. The river weaves through most of the city. It meanders past parking lots, buildings and private properties along the way.

Many people see the river while commuting to work. In the past decade, there has been damage to the plants and ecosystem along the river and the water is less filtered than it used to be.

As a result, the quality of the water in the river is worse than it used to be. The local, state, and federal government will all need to make significant investments in the river to restore the ecosystem and therefore fix this issue.

Where does the river flow through?

- a lake
- **a city**
- a forest

Q23 What happened in the 1880s in this story?

- **the city was built**
- the river was turned into a tourist attraction
- the river was turned into a pond

2. Extended Participant Demographics

2a. Descriptive Statistics

Age and Gender Breakdown, by Condition. As reported in Table S1, there were no differences in participant age across conditions: $F(4,374)=1.37$, $p=.24$. Similarly, the gender breakdown did not differ across groups: $X^2(4, 378)= 3.877$, $p=.21$. Thus, the condition-based differences reported in the main text can not be explained by group-level age or gender differences.

Political Affiliation, by Condition. Participants wrote in their political affiliation. The majority self-identified as democrat/liberal ($N=189$), followed by republican/conservative ($N=83$), independent ($N=64$), and no affiliation ($N=22$). In addition, small numbers of participants identified as moderate ($N=6$), libertarian ($N=3$), socialist ($N=3$), or wrote in content other than a political identity (e.g., voting, Christian, ($N=6$).

Participants also rated their political leanings in terms of both fiscal and social issues on a scale of 0 (very liberal) to 100 (very conservative). Overall, participants leaned liberal for both fiscal issues: ($M=46.18$, $SD=31.14$, Range 0-100) and social issues: ($M=41.56$, $SD=32.58$, Range 0-100). Political ratings did not differ across conditions: fiscal issues $F(4, 374)=.42$, $p=.80$; social issues $F(4, 374)=.089$, $p=.99$. Thus, the condition-based differences reported in the main text do not stem from political leanings.

Table S1. Extended summary of participant demographics, by vignette condition.

	Natural/Local ($N=80$)	Artificial/Local ($N=85$)	Natural/Global ($N=65$)	Artificial/Globa l ($N=67$)	Control ($N=84$)
Age $M(SD)$	39.32 (13.48)	39.38 (11.80)	36.82 (10.95)	35.15 (10.34)	36.64 (12.57)
Gender Counts	34 Female, 46 Male	38 Female, 45 Male	19 Female, 46 Male	32 Female, 35 Male	33 Female, 50 Male, 1 Undisclosed
Fiscal $M(SD)$	43.50 (30.63)	47.35 (30.67)	46.62 (34.65)	49.48 (30.17)	44.62 (30.40)
Social $M(SD)$	41.38 (30.81)	43.10 (33.00)	40.49 (35.39)	42.15 (31.15)	40.55 (33.40)

2b. Exploratory Correlations

To explore the relationships between political leanings and key variables, we ran a set of Spearman's correlations between the following: fiscal conservativeness, social conservativeness, ecological connectedness, human exceptionalism, proximity to water, investment, and stewardship. Rho

We found four significant negative relationships between conservativeness and key variables. As depicted in Table S2, both fiscal and social conservativeness inversely predicted both ecological connectedness and stewardship. This suggests that conservative and liberal individuals may differ both in their understanding of the connectedness of humans and the natural world, and their belief that humans may have a specific responsibility to protect surrounding ecosystems.

Interestingly, social but not fiscal conservativeness positively predicted investment in river clean-up initiatives, including both financial investment and investment of time spent volunteering to clean up. This suggests that social conservativeness may be a useful way to communicate with conservatives about environmental conservation initiatives. Future research should directly probe this, and whether this relationship differs between financial and time investments.

Table S2. Exploratory Correlations between Political Conservativeness and Key Variables.

Key Variable	Fiscal Conservativeness	Social Conservativeness
Ecological Connectedness	-.156**	-.213***
Human Exceptionalism	-.016	-.033
Investment	.068	.168***
Stewardship	-.229***	-.303***
Proximity to Water	.059	.047

Note: This table reports Spearman's Rho Correlation Coefficients. ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

3. Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Investment and Stewardship Measures

To confirm the reliability of the composite measures of stewardship and investment, we conducted a principal components analysis on the z-transformed component variables. *Ranked priority of river cleanup project* was reverse coded so that higher scores represent higher ranked priority. Results are presented in Table S3.

Table S3. Varimax-rotated loadings of stewardship and investment measures.

Variable	Loading on Factor 1 ("Stewardship")	Loading on Factor 2 ("Investment")
City Government	.028	.555
State Government	-.022	.793
Federal Government	-.127	.714
Volunteer Hours	-.041	.747
Ranked Priority of River Cleanup Project	.538	.200
Support for Protective Laws	.854	-.211
Support for Protective Community Initiatives	.815	-.300
Perceived Human Responsibility	.741	.032
Eigenvalue (Variance Explained)	2.63 (32.9%)	1.80 (22.5%)