



AgEcon SEARCH

RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

Crunch the Can or Throw the Bottle? Effect of “Bottle Deposit Laws” and Municipal Recycling Programs¹

Benjamin Campbell

Assistant Professor and Extension Economist, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, 1376 Storrs Road, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269; contact author: ben.campbell@uconn.edu

Hayk Khachatryan

Assistant Professor, Department of Food and Resource Economics Department and Mid-Florida Research and Education Center, University of Florida, Apopka, Florida, 32703

Bridget Behe

Professor, Department of Horticulture, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 48824

Charles Hall

Professor and Ellison Chair In International Floriculture, Department of Horticultural Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843

Jennifer Dennis

Associate Professor, Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture and Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, 47907

Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the Agricultural & Applied Economics Association’s 2014 AAEA Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, MN, July 27-29, 2014.

Copyright 2014 by Benjamin Campbell, Hayk Khachatryan, Bridget Behe, Charles Hall, and Jennifer Dennis. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

¹ State funds in Florida, Indiana, Michigan, and Texas were matched with Federal funds for this project under the Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program of the Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. The authors acknowledge the collaboration of Vineland Research and Innovation Centre.

Crunch the Can or Throw the Bottle? Effect of “Bottle deposit laws” and Municipal Recycling Programs

Abstract

Although there is growing public awareness and concern about environmental issues, incentive mechanisms leading individuals to engage in pro-environmental behaviors remain less investigated. This article examines the impact of bottle deposit laws, municipal recycling programs, and the ease of municipal recycling on recycling frequency for numerous products. Utilizing very specific treatment groups and propensity score matching to control for unobserved heterogeneity, we find that municipal recycling programs have a greater impact on recycling behaviors than bottle deposit laws, and that the perceived ease of municipality recycling program positively influences individual recycling behaviors. For bottle deposit laws without a municipal program being present, their effect is only for those products requiring the deposit.

Keywords: recycling behaviors, community recycling, bottle deposit laws, pro-environmental behaviors, propensity score matching

JEL codes: Q53

Over the last few decades, public and governmental policy makers have become increasingly aware of human impact on the environment. In part, this has been an effort led by private sources (concerned citizens/groups) with equal efforts coming from public sources (government and regulatory entities). Private, non-governmental groups cannot impose environmental policy; they can only influence policy decisions through rallies/protests or take a proactive role in cleanups, etc. Government entities, on the other hand, have the ability to influence and/or impose change through new laws and regulations. However, in many cases the different levels of government (i.e. local versus state/provincial) have taken different routes to obtain the desired change.

Perhaps the most notable change has been the introduction of various recycling programs. For instance, many local municipalities have instituted recycling programs not only to help the environment, but also to reduce landfill waste. However, several state/provincial governments have tried to accomplish the same objective by enacting regulations that require retailers to collect cash deposits on certain types of products such as glass and aluminum. As noted by Viscusi (2012), bottle deposits provide a direct monetary incentive to recycle. However, the initial deposit paid by the consumer at the time of purchase increases the cost of the good if it is not recycled. Thus deposits can reduce the primary demand for the good, whereas laws increasing the convenience of recycling might offset that reduction through lower recycling costs. Given that many local and state/provincial governments are under budgetary constraints, it is essential to understand if these programs are indeed working.

Curbside recycling programs are rather straightforward whereby a person places predefined recyclables on the curbside and they are collected by the municipality. In order to increase recycling rates, curbside recycling programs rely on ease of use to get people to recycle

more. Bottling deposit laws (BDL) work to increase recycling by mandating retailers to collect a deposit on predefined recyclables, notably glass and aluminum beverage bottles. The BDLs attempt to increase recycling by only returning the deposit once the empty recyclable is returned to a retailer. Each state with a BDL collects deposits on glass bottles and aluminum cans (Bottlebill.org 2009).

Of the two programs, the bottle deposit program has come under increasing scrutiny given many states have reported increasing monetary losses. As noted in the Los Angeles Times, California's recycling fund has a structural deficit of \$100 million dollars (Holland 2014). Contributing to California's deficit is recycling fraud, whereby, residents of states without bottle laws (i.e. Nevada and Arizona) take their recyclables to California where the deposit is redeemed (Garrison 2012). However, a recent study by Morris and Morawski (2011) showed that bottling laws have benefits, notably increased jobs and higher recycling rates. The cost/benefit debate surrounding these programs is ongoing as noted by articles in major newspapers, including The Baltimore Sun (Scarr 2013) and San Francisco Chronicle (Diaz 2013), among others.

This article examines the impact of BDL, municipal recycling (MRP) programs, and the ease of MRP on increasing the frequency of recycling. This study is not the first to examine these issues; however, this study differs from other studies in several important ways. First, we directly control for MRP (BDL) when examining the impact of BDL (MRP). Specifically, we establish groups of consumers that can definitively be placed in treatment groups based on whether their municipality has a recycling program and whether they live in an area with a BDL (Table 1). We hypothesize that

H1: BDLs (MRP) will increase recycling rates for aluminum cans and bottled glass when the MRP (BDL) are *not* present,

H2: BDLs (MRP) will increase recycling rates for aluminum cans and bottled glass when the MRP (BDL) are present,

H3: BDLs (MRP) will increase recycling rates for residual recyclables when the MRP (BDL) are *not* present,

H4: BDLs (MRP) will increase recycling rates for residual recyclables when the MRP (BDL) are present,

H5: Increasing ease of MRP will increase recycling rates for recyclables whether the BDL is present or not.

Second, we utilize propensity score matching (PSM) to control for unobserved heterogeneity caused by comparing groups with underlying differences that are not related to a municipal recycling program or bottle deposit law. Third, this article examines the impact of bottle deposit laws and municipal recycling programs on “residual” recyclable materials that are not included in any of the state mandated bottle deposit laws, such as cardboard, newspapers, and plant potting containers. Fourth, we utilize dataset collected through a national survey of the U.S. and Canada as opposed to city- or municipal-level data analyses (e.g., Laidley 2013).

Our findings indicate that MRPs have a greater impact on recycling than BDLs across all recyclables. With respect to the residual products, BDLs alone do little to generate recycling of residual products. Also, as expected, as the perceived ease of a MRP increases, the frequency of recycling increases across almost all materials regardless of whether a BDL is in place.

Literature Review

Individual recycling behaviors

Over the last several decades, pro-environmental behaviors have been investigated in a number of disciplines, including social psychology, marketing and consumer economics (Elgaaied 2012). Despite the growing public awareness and concerns about modern environmental issues, understanding of incentive mechanisms that lead individuals to engage in pro-environmental behaviors such as recycling remains less investigated (Elgaaied 2012; Ebreo and Vining 2001). Recycling behaviors can be considered as a form of social dilemma, which is characterized as a conflict between private and collective interests (Dawes 1980). As noted by Reschovsky and Stone (1994), the decision to recycle or not has implicit net costs associated with them, such as household's time valuation, monetary disposal costs, and inconvenience of waste disposal or recycling. Offering services that ease the inconvenience (e.g. curbside recycling) of waste disposal or recycling can lower the cost of associated with recycling, however, given the extra costs associated with sorting recyclables from non-recyclables, recycling is most likely always more costly than not recycling (Reschovsky and Stone 1994).

Existing research investigating individual recycling behavior can be characterized into two broad categories. The first category investigates the influence of individual-specific determinants, such as demographics, personality or attitudes of environmental concerns on

recycling behavior (Schultz et al. 1995; Lindsay and Strathman 1997). The second category focuses on the impact of situational variables such as providing rewards for recycling or convenience of recycling (Ebreo and Vining 2001; Schultz et al. 1995). In a similar fashion, Hornik et al. (1995) classified variables influencing recycling behavior into intrinsic/extrinsic incentives and internal/external facilitators. The authors reviewed 67 published and unpublished materials and ranked the strongest predictors of propensity to recycle the following way: 1) consumer knowledge and commitment to recycling (internal facilitators), 2) monetary awards, social influence (external incentives), and 3) frequency of collection (external incentives). In this vein, Elgaaied (2012) showed a positive relationship between anticipated guilt and intentions to recycle. Further, Ebreo and Vining (2001) found consideration of future consequences was positively correlated with self-reported recycling intentions.

Community Recycling

Empirical research on community recycling is multi-disciplinary in nature and focuses on estimating household participation in municipal recycling programs. Previous literature has found numerous demographic variables impact household participation rates in recycling programs including income (Saltzman et al. 1993; Feiock and West 1996), education (Tilikidou and Delistavrou 2008; DeYoung 1990), the convenience of the recycling program (Feiock and West 1996; Judge and Becker 1993; Jenkins et al. 2003), citizen involvement in program design (Folz 1991), attitudes, social and personal standards (Oom Do Valle et al. 2005; Schultz et al. 1995; Hopper and Neilson 1991), and a number of other socio-demographic variables (Meneses and Palacio 2005).

More recently, Nixon et al. (2009) explored how different sources of information (e.g. print, television, radio, family or friends, and others) influence the decision to start recycling.

Although print media is influential, face-to-face communication (through family/friends at work or school) appears to be the most effective medium to get people to start recycling. However, it is better to provide households with recycling information from multiple sources. Concerns about storage space, time and the safety of recycling were identified as the main obstacles to start recycling.

Previous studies have also linked household participation rates to bag/tag unit pricing for waste disposal (Reschovsky and Stone 1994; Hong et al. 1993; Miranda et al. 1994; Fullerton and Kinnaman 1996; Podolsky and Spiegel 1999; Kinnaman and Fullerton 2000; Folz and Giles 2002) and subscription-based volume pricing programs (Repetto et al. 1992; Reschovsky and Stone 1994; Callan and Thomas 1997; Podolsky and Spiegel 1999; Jenkins et al. 2003). Jakus et al. (1996) and Tiller et al. (1997) estimated the costs and benefits of drop-off recycling among rural households. The role of social norms in household recycling behavior was explored by Bruvoll and Nyborg (2004), Berglund (2006) and most recently by Halvorsen (2008).

Several studies have estimated the costs of collecting recyclable materials at the curb. Carroll (1995) initiated the literature by estimating recycling costs with 1992 data from 57 municipalities in Wisconsin, but found no economies of scale in the data. Callan and Thomas (2001) used 1996–1997 data on 101 municipalities in Massachusetts and are the first to estimate economies of scale in curbside recycling. Bohm et al. (2010) estimated the cost functions for both municipal solid waste collection and disposal services and curbside recycling programs. Results suggest that economies of scale for recycling disappear at high levels of recycling; that is, marginal and average cost curves for recycling are U-shaped. In a related body of literature, Criner et al. (1995), Steuteville (1996) and Renkow and Rubin (1998) estimated the costs of municipal composting programs. Criner et al. (1995) results indicated that composting is

worthwhile for landfill disposal fees between \$75 and \$115 per ton. Renkow and Rubin (1998) examined 19 cases to find composting is preferred to landfilling when disposal costs are high.

Further, the frequency of collection was also found to be a significant factor in predicting propensity to recycle in a study that compared household recycling activities across 10 OECD countries (Halvorsen 2012). The study found that increasing the presence of recycling programs positively influences household recycling behaviors. Specifically, the authors reported that door-to-door collection and drop-off centers are the two most effective methods in engaging consumers to recycle. Notably, the study discussed the importance of non-economic motivations, such as moral commitment, high expectations about the effectiveness of recycling practices in terms of contribution to environmental conservation.

Data

During the spring 2011 an online survey was initiated in order to better understand perceptions of various sustainable terminology, as well as to understand the recycling behavior of U.S. and Canadian consumers. Questions within the survey focused on demographic (i.e. household income, education, marital status, age, gender, household characteristics, and ethnicity), purchasing behavior (i.e. primary shopper in the household, the types of stores generally shopped in, and their purchasing of local and organic produce), their perceptions of local, organic, eco-friendly and sustainable labels, and their recycling habits.

An online survey was used due to several advantages to other survey techniques such as: faster to conduct, allows for more accurate information with less human error, and less expensive (McCullough, 1998; Cobanoglu, Warde, and Moreo 2001; Dillman, Smyth, and Christian, 2009). The use of online surveys can have disadvantages, especially if the sampling database is filled

with the same panelist under different accounts. To alleviate this concern, the researchers contracted with a company, Global Market Insite, Inc. (GMI), which has mechanisms in place to eliminate duplicate panelists. Online surveys have also been tagged with the negative connotation of a homogenous composition of “professional survey takers.” However, unless the sample is not representative of the population or has views that are inconsistent with the population as a whole, then the sample should be representative. Given there are millions of panelists in the GMI sample with invites being sent out randomly, the sample for this survey should be random and representative, especially compared to other collection techniques commonly used for surveys encompassing a wide geographical area.

The only prerequisite for qualifying to take the survey was that respondents had to be 18 years or older. We furtherer instituted criteria to oversample have consumers from every state/province represented with larger states/provinces have a larger share of respondents. The final dataset was made up of 68% U.S. and 32% Canadian consumers. Based on these percentages, we oversampled Canadian consumers compared to the population estimates, but this was done to obtain a large enough sample of Canadian consumers to better understand their behaviors.

In recruiting respondents, GMI randomly invited consumers within their database to follow a link to the survey. 2,700 invitations were sent out with 2,511 surveys completed. Each state and province was represented in the survey with larger population states and provinces receiving more responses. The representativeness of the sample with respect to commonly defined demographics indicated a fairly representative sample. The U.S. sample had an average age of 35.8 which was slightly less than the census average of 37.2. Within our sample, 78.1% of the U.S. sample was Caucasian which is in line with the average census percentage for

Caucasian, 78.1%. In regard to household income, our U.S. sample had a higher average income (\$65,273) compared to the average U.S. population (\$52,762). For the Canadian sample, average age (sample-42.7 vs. census-39.7) and average household income (sample-\$66,747 vs. census-\$69,860) were in line with Statistics Canada estimates. Given the U.S. and Canadian census questions based on ethnicity are not the same, direct comparisons are infeasible. For this survey we utilized the U.S. census terminology around ethnicity. However, using rough calculations indicates that the percent “Caucasian” in Canada is about 80% which is slightly less than our sample average of 86%, however, this is a rough estimate as no exact “Caucasian” category exists in the Canadian census.

Questions of interest to this study revolved around recycling behaviors specifically focusing on the following areas: 1) how often the respondent recycled several common recyclables (see table 1 for list of recyclables), 2) availability of municipal recycling collection for those recyclables, and 3) perceived ease of recycling via the MRP for each recyclable? For the “how often do you recycle?” question, respondents were asked to indicate whether they purchased the recyclable in question. Those purchasing were asked to indicate their frequency of purchase on a 1-4 scale where 1 = “never,” 2 = “sometimes,” 3 = “usually,” and 4 = “always” recycle. For the analysis, respondents indicating they had not purchased the recyclable were dropped from the analyses associated with that recyclable. Perceived ease of use was connotated by easy to use “yes”/“no.”

Empirical Model

In order to understand the impact of BDLs and MRPs on recycling rates, we need to compare respondents with and without exposure to each treatment. However, as noted by Rosenbaum and

Rubin (1984), differences between treatments may come from differences in underlying characteristics of the treatment groups, thereby, making comparisons invalid. For example, a person may have the financial ability to move to an area with recycling programs, whereas people with a more restricted financial situation may not be able to move and therefore recycle less. According to Foster (2003), this nonrandom nature associated with the treatment groups can lead to biased estimates (small samples) or inconsistent estimates (large samples).

Propensity score matching has been proposed as a mechanism to adjust for any non-randomization between treatment groups (Rosenbaum and Rubin 1983; Rosenbaum and Rubin 1984). Using a set of covariates to construct conditional probabilities for those receiving the treatment, the propensity scores are unbiased and consistent with the random nature of the data (Imbens 2000). The unbiasedness and consistency of PSM is assumed if the conditional mean independence assumption (CMIA) is satisfied. CMIA is satisfied if given a set of covariates, the pretreatment outcomes for the matched and treated groups are equal (Heckman, Ichimura, and Todd 1998). As noted by Smith and Todd (2005) there is no single test that guarantees the CMIA is satisfied. However, by satisfying the balancing condition we can feel more confident that the CMIA condition is satisfied (Dehejia and Wahba 1999). To check the balancing condition we compared the covariates for each treatment comparison while also utilizing the “hit-or-miss” criterion and pseudo- R^2 as a relative measure of satisfying the balancing condition (Heckman, Ichimura, and Todd 1997) as well as the pre-matching test specified by Becker and Inchino (2002). Results for the “hit-or-miss” and pseudo- R^2 can be found in Tables 3-5. The results for the pre-matching test are not presented for brevity,

Given we are interested in comparing multiple treatment groups (Table 1), a multinomial logit framework can be used. However, binary logit have been shown to provide similar results

compared to multinomial logit model (Lechner 2002). Therefore, we used a binary logit model which was represented as

$$(1) \quad Prob(Y = 1|X) = \frac{e^{\beta'X}}{1+e^{\beta'X}}$$

where x is a vector of explanatory variables (Greene 2003). Potential explanatory variables included demographic (e.g. age, income, gender, etc.), environmental attitudes, and purchasing behavior (e.g. local and organic purchasing) (Table 2). The final covariate list was balanced for each model.

In order to further test the balancing condition, we used the method described by Smith and Todd (2005), whereby we conditioned on the covariates and then compared the means of the treated and controls. Our results indicate that for most all matching algorithms used, we saw a bias-reduction which gives more confidence that the balancing hypothesis has been satisfied (Table 6). As can be seen in Table 6, several matching algorithms were used. The Radius with 0.1 caliper was chosen for final estimation given it consistently produced the highest biased reduction. As a robustness check, we estimated the results with several of the other algorithms but results and implications remained unchanged. The matched vs. unmatched t-tests for the Radius with 0.1 caliper can be found in (Appendix Tables 1-8).

Understanding the robustness of the results to unobserved heterogeneity/hidden bias is critical. Rosenbaum bounds provide a means to assess how hidden bias might impact the results and can be interpreted as the unobserved bias that must increase the odds of participation in the treatment, given the same covariates, by the value of the bound to change the statistical inference to insignificant at a specified level (Rosenbaum 2002). Rosenbaum bounds can only be calculated using a 1 x 1 matched pairs, so the bounds are constructed using the Nearest Neighbor

with replacement matching algorithm. The R-bounds indicate that most of our results are robust to unobserved heterogeneity.

A caveat to the results of the study is that all MRPs and BDLs are not exactly the same. For MRPs, numerous recyclables surveyed will be a part of all programs (e.g. aluminum cans, clear glass, paper, etc.); however, other recyclables may or may not be included in some MRPs (e.g. food/plant waste, potting containers, etc.). BDLs, on the other hand, collect deposits on similar items across the board, notably clear glass and aluminum cans. In some instance, different types of glass are part of the law, but by and large it is clear glass. So implications from our results should keep this in mind. Further, most states charge a \$0.05 deposit on items specified in the BDL. Two exceptions are Michigan and California. Michigan charges a \$0.10 deposit on all items and California has a split deposit system whereby \$0.05 is charged for under 24-ounces and \$0.10 for over 24-ounce containers (Bottlebill.org). In order to test the robustness of our results we ran the analyses with and without California and Michigan respondents in the analyses and found our results were robust to their inclusion. We therefore present the results with them included. Finally, given almost all but one Canadian province has a bottle deposit law in place and since there could be differences in U.S. and Canadian regulations etc., we analyzed U.S. and Canadian respondents separately.

Results and Discussion

Bottle deposit law impact: United States

In examining the impact of a BDL when holding municipality constant (Table 7), we see some interesting results. First, when there is no MRP the impact of the BDL is limited to glass (clear and brown) and aluminum cans. The average treatment effect for the treated (ATE) for clear glass is 0.36 or an increase of 17.2% in frequency from the treatment (BDL, no MRP) and

control (no BDL, no MRP). There is also a significant ATE of 0.27 (11.2% increase) and 0.30 (10.9% increase) for brown glass and aluminum cans, respectively. These results are expected given BDLs specifically target glass and aluminum cans. As noted earlier, understanding the sensitivity of our results to hidden bias/unobserved heterogeneity is important. The R-bounds of the significant variables are 1.29 (clear glass), 1.34 (brown glass), and 1.10 (aluminum cans), indicating some robustness to our results to unobserved heterogeneity.

When examining the BDLs impact in conjunction with a MRP, there are a couple of interesting results. First, when comparing with the earlier scenario where only a BDL was present, the means of the treated and control groups are quite different in the two comparisons. For instance, the treated and control recycling rate means for clear glass in the BDL/no MRP comparison are 2.46 and 2.10, respectively, while the treated and control means for the BDL/MRP comparison were 3.49 and 3.38. Second, we again see that the BDL impacts the recycling rates for only those recyclables specifically addressed in the deposit law. When a BDL and MRP are present, the BDL increases clear glass and aluminum can recycling rates by 3.2% and 3.0%, respectively.

Based on the above results, we fail to reject part of H1 and H2 that BDLs increase recycling rates for aluminum cans and bottled glass regardless of whether a MRP is present. However, we reject part of H3 and H4 that BDLs increase recycling rates for residual recyclables. From these results it is clear that BDLs have more of an impact when a MRP is not present as recycling rates are higher overall when MRPs are present. However, there is no spillover effect on recyclables outside those clearly set forth in the BDL.

Municipality Recycling Program: United States

Results from the MRP comparisons while holding BDL constant indicates that respondents with access to MRPs have higher recycling rates than respondents with no access (Table 8).

Examining the ATEs when BDLs are not in effect shows recycling rates increase for all recyclables surveyed. ATE increases ranged from 16.1% for food waste to 57% for plant tags. With respect to the scale used, plant waste recycling rates moved from the “never”/“sometimes” range of the scale to “sometimes” / “usually.” This may not seem like a large jump, however, small increases in recycling could have large benefits to the environment. With respect to the MRP with BDL comparison, we see a similar pattern to the MRP with no BDL results. Notably, all recyclables had significantly increased recycling rates. The largest increases were for plant tags, paper, and magazines.

Based on the above results, we fail to reject part of H1 and H2 that MRPs increase recycling rates for aluminum cans and bottled glass regardless of whether a BDL is present. Further, we fail to reject part of H3 and H4 that MRPs increase recycling rates for residual recyclables not specified in BDLs. This is not unexpected as MRPs are generally set up to collect varying types of recyclables and is not limited to glass bottles or aluminum cans. From these results it is clear that MRPs are almost as effective without a BDL as with a BDL. This can be observed by examining the treated group means of the treatment groups.

Ease of Municipality Recycling: United States

Table 9 shows the ATEs for recycling when the perception that recycling was easy in the absence and presence of a BDL. Findings were similar for the MRP/ BDL and MRP/ no BDL in that increased perception of ease of use provided significantly higher recycling rates than when recycling was perceived to be not easy. For example, recycling magazines in a MRP/ no BDL where recycling was perceived to be easy resulted in an ATE of 0.87 (32.5% increase), while

there was a 0.83 ATE gain (30.2% increase) for MRP/BDL. Based on these results, we fail to reject H5 that MRPs that are perceived to be easier to use increase recycling rates across all recyclables.

Municipality Recycling Program: Canada

Examining only the Canadian respondents we see that MRP/bottle law show a significant increase in recycling rates (Table 10). For instance, we see a 0.74 ATE gain (24.7%) for clear glass when a MRP is present. Interestingly, we see that plant waste and food waste recycling rates increase by 80.6% and 73.4%, respectively. This is most likely due to MRPs consistently offering plant and food waste recycling options. In contrast, the rates for recycling plant and food waste by U.S. respondents when a MRP was present or not is considerably lower, most likely implying that U.S. MRPs do not offer plant or food waste recycling (composting) options. With respect to perceived ease of use, we see similar results to the U.S. sample (Table 11). Notably as a MRP is perceived to be easy to use, recycling rates for all recyclables surveyed increased. Based on these results, we fail to reject H1-H5.

Summary and Conclusions

Findings in this study provide practical implications for state and local governments that are interested in encouraging household recycling and for researchers who are investigating the determinants of individual recycling behavior. We find evidence that BDLs are working for recyclables specified in the laws (bottle glass and aluminum cans). However, we do not find any spillover effect to residual recyclables not specified in BDLs. Further, we find that MRPs increase recycling rates for all recyclables surveyed. When MRPs are used in conjunction with BDLs we only see small gains, implying MRPs impact recycling rates more than BDLs. However, BDLs do provide significant increases for bottled glass and aluminum cans, especially when MRPs are not present.

With respect to policy implications, MRPs provide impact recycling rates more than BDLs. However, BDLs do increase recycling rates for regulated recyclables and do not negatively impact non-regulated recyclables. Given BDLs impact states which encompass respondents that do and do not have access to MRPs, BDLs can provide an incentive for respondents to increase their recycling rates of regulated recyclables. In this vein, BDLs can be improved by trying to not only increase recycling rates of prescribed recyclables, but also incorporate initiatives to increase recycling of residual recyclables. With respect to MRPs, recycling rates can be improved by increasing their ease of use. As our results demonstrate, as MRPs are perceived easier to use, recycling rates increase.

References

- Becker, S. O. and A. Inchino. 2002. Estimation of Average Treatment Effects Based on Propensity Scores. *Stata Journal* 2(4):358–377.
- Berglund C. 2006. The Assessment of Households' Recycling Costs: The Role of Personal Motives. *Ecological Economics* 56:560–569.
- Bohm, R.A., D.H. Folz, T.C. Kinnaman, and M. J. Podolsky. 2010. The Costs of Municipal Waste and Recycling Programs. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 54: 864–871.
- Bottlebill.org. 2009. Bottle Bill Resource Guide. Online: June 29. Accessed: May 10, 2014. Available at: > <http://www.bottlebill.org/legislation/usa/allstates.htm><.
- Bruvoll, A. and K. Nyborg. 2004. The Cold Shiver of Not Giving Enough: On the Social Cost of Recycling Campaigns. *Land Economics* 80(4):539–549.
- Callan, S. and J. Thomas. 1997. The Impact of State and Local Policies on the Recycling Effort. *Eastern Economic Journal* 23(4):411–423.
- Callan, S. and J. Thomas. 2001. Economies of Scale and Scope: A Cost Analysis of Municipal Solid Waste Services. *Land Economics* 77(4):548–560.
- Carroll, W. 1995. The Organization and Efficiency of Residential Recycling Services. *Eastern Economic Journal* 21(2):215–225.
- Cobanoglu, C., B. Warde, and P.J. Moreo. 2001. A Comparison of Mail, Fax and Web-Survey Methods. *International Journal of Marketing Research* 43(4):441-452.
- Criner, G., A. Kezis, and J. O'Connor. 1995. Regional Composting of Waste Paper and Food. *BioCycle* 36(1):66–67.
- Dawes, R.M. 1980. Social Dilemmas. *Annual Review of Psychology* 31:169-193.

- Dehejia, R. and S. Wahba. 1999. Causal Effects in Non-experimental Studies: Re-evaluating the Evaluations of Training Programs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 94: 1053–1062.
- DeYoung, R. 1990. Recycling as Appropriate Behavior, A Review of Survey Data from Selected Recycling Education Programs in Michigan. *Resources, Conservation, and Recycling* 3(4):253–266.
- Diaz, J. 2013. Time to Discard State’s Recycling Law? *San Francisco Chronicle*
Online: October 25. Accessed: May 10, 2014. Available at:
><http://www.sfgate.com/opinion/diaz/article/Time-to-discard-state-s-recycling-law-4926892.php><.
- Dillman, D., J. Smyth, L. Christian. 2009. *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ebreo, A. and J. Vining. 2001. How Similar are Recycling and Waste Reductions? Future Orientation and Reasons for Reducing Waste as Predictors of Self-Reported Behavior. *Environment and Behavior* 33:424-448.
- Elgaaied, L. 2012. Exploring the Role of Anticipated Guilt on Pro-Environmental Behavior – A Suggested Typology of Residents in France Based on Their Recycling Patterns. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 29:369-377.
- Feiock, R. and J. West. 1996. Municipal Recycling: An Assessment of Programmatic and Contextual Factors Affecting Program Success. *International Journal of Public Administration* 7:1065–1087.
- Folz, D.H. 1991. Recycling Program Design, Management, and Participation: A National Survey of Municipal Experience. *Public Administration Review* 51(3):222–231.

- Folz, D.H. and J. Giles. 2002. Municipal Experience with Pay as You Throw Policies: Findings from a National Survey. *State and Local Government Review* 34(2):105–115.
- Foster, E.M. 2003. Propensity Score Matching: An Illustrative Analysis of Dose Response. *Medical Care* 41(10):1183–1192.
- Imbens, G.W. 2000. The Role of the Propensity Score in Estimating Dose-Response Functions. *Biometrika* 87(3):706–710.
- Fullerton, D. and T.C. Kinnaman. 1996. Household Responses to Pricing Garbage by the Bag. *American Economic Review* 86(4):971–984.
- Garrison, J. 2012. Rampant Recycling Fraud is Draining California Cash. *Los Angeles Times*.
Online: October 7. Accessed: May 10, 2014. Available at:
><http://articles.latimes.com/2012/oct/07/local/la-me-can-fraud-20121007><
- Greene, W. *Econometric Analysis*, 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, 2003.
- Halvorsen, B. 2008. Effects of Norms and Opportunity Cost of Time on Household Recycling. *Land Economics* 84(3):501–516.
- Halvorsen, B. 2012. Effects of Norms and Policy Incentives on Household Recycling: An International Comparison. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 67:18-26.
- Heckman, J. J., H. Ichimura, and P. E. Todd. 1997. Matching as an Econometric Evaluation Estimator: Evidence from Evaluating a Job Training Programme. *Review of Economic Studies* 64(4):605–654.
- Holland, G. 2014. New Redemption Law Puts Squeeze on Bottle and Can Recyclers. *Los Angeles Times*. Online: January 18. Accessed: May 10, 2014. Available at:
><http://articles.latimes.com/2014/jan/18/local/la-me-homeless-recycle-20140119><.
- Hong, S., R. Adams, H.A. Love. 1993. An Economic Analysis of Household Recycling of Solid

- Wastes: The Case of Portland, Oregon. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 25(2):136–148.
- Hopper, J. and J. Neilson. 1991. Recycling as Altruistic Behavior: Normative and Behavioral Strategies to Expand Participation in a Community Recycling Program. *Environment and Behavior* 23(2):195–220.
- Hornik, J., J. Cherian, M. Madansky, and C. Narayana. 1995. Determinants of Recycling Behavior: A Synthesis of Research and Results. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 24(1):105-127.
- Jakus, P.M., K.H. Tiller, and W.M. Park. 1996. Generation of Recyclables by Rural Households. *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 21(1):96–108.
- Jenkins, R.R., S.A. Martinez, K. Palmer, and M.J. Poldolsky. 2003. The Determinants of Household Recycling: A Material-Specific Analysis of Recycling Program Features and Unit Pricing. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 45(2):294–318.
- Judge, R. and A. Becker. 1993. Motivating Recycling: A Marginal Cost Analysis. *Contemporary Policy Issues* 11(3):58–68.
- Kinnaman, T.C. and D. Fullerton. 2000. Garbage and Recycling with Endogenous Local Policy. *Journal of Urban Economics* 48(3):419–442.
- Laidley, M. 2013. The Influence of Social Class and Cultural Variables on Environmental Behaviors: Municipal-Level Evidence from Massachusetts. *Environment and Behavior* 45(2):170-197.
- Lechner, M. 2002. Program Heterogeneity and Propensity Score Matching: An Application to the Evaluation of Active Labor Market Policies. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 84(2):205-220.

- Lindsay, J.J. and A. Strathman. 1997. Predictors of Recycling Behavior: An Application of a Modified Health Belief Model. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 27:1799-1823.
- McCullough, D. 1998. Web-based market research: the dawning of a new age. *Direct Marketing* 61(8):36-38.
- Meneses, G.D. and A.B. Palacio. 2005. Recycling Behavior: A Multidimensional Approach. *Environment and Behavior* 37(6):837-860.
- Miranda, M.L., J.W. Everett, D. Blume, B.A. Roy Jr. 1994. Market-Based Incentives and Residential Municipal Solid Waste. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 13(4):681-698.
- Morris, J. and C. Morawski. 2011. Returning to Work: Understanding the Domestic Jobs Impacts from Different Methods of Recycling Beverage Containers. Container Recycling Institute. Accessed: April 15, 2014. Available at: ><http://www.container-recycling.org/assets/pdfs/reports/2011-ReturningToWork.pdf><.
- Nixon, H. and J.M. Saphores. 2009 Information and the Decision to Recycle: Results from a Survey of US Households. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 52(2):257-277.
- Oom Do Valle, P., E. Rebelo, R. Reis, and J. Menezes. 2005. Combining Behavioral Theories to Predict Recycling Involvement. *Environment and Behavior* 37(3):364-396.
- Podolsky, M and M.M. Spiegel. 1999. When Does Interstate Transportation of Municipal Solid Waste Make Sense and When Does it not? *Public Administration Review* 59(3):250-255.
- Renkow, M. and A.R. Rubin. 1998. Does Municipal Solid Waste Composting Make Economic Sense? *Journal of Environmental Management* 53(4):339-47.
- Repetto, R., W. Magrath, M. Wells, C. Beer, and F. Rossini. 1992. Wasting Assets: Natural

- Resources in National Income Accounts. In: Markandya, A. and J. Richardson, editors. *Environmental Economics: A Reader*. New York: St. Martin's Press; p. 364–88.
- Reschovsky, J. and S. Stone. 1994. Market Incentives to Encourage Household Waste Recycling: Paying for What You Throw Away. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 13(1):120–39.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. 2002. *Observational Studies*, 2nd ed. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Rosenbaum, P. R., and D. B. Rubin. 1983. The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects. *Biometrika* 70(1):41–55.
- Rosenbaum, P. R., and D. B. Rubin. 1984. Reducing Bias in Observational Studies Using Subclassification on the Propensity Score. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 79 387:516–524.
- Saltzman, C., V. Duggal, and M. Williams. 1993. Income and the Recycling Effort: A Maximization Problem. *Energy Economics* 15(1):33–38.
- Scarr, E. 2013. Bottle Bill Would Boost Recycling in Maryland. *The Baltimore Sun*.
Online: July 31. Accessed: May 10, 2014. Available at: >
<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/oped/bs-ed-bottle-bill-20130731%2C0%2C1592424.story><.
- Schultz, P.W., S. Oskamp, and T. Mainieri, T. 1995. Who Recycles and When? A Review of Personal and Situational Factors. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 15:105-121.
- Smith, J., and P. Todd. 2005. Does Matching Overcome LaLonde's Critique of Nonexperimental Estimators? Rejoinder. *Journal of Econometrics* 125(1-2):365–375.
- Steuteville, R. 1996. How Much Does it Cost to Compost Yard Trimmings? *BioCycle* 37(9):39–43.

Tiller, K., P. Jakus, and W. Park. 1997. Household Willingness to Pay for Drop-Off Recycling.

Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics 22(2):310–320.

Tilikidou, I. and A. Delistavrou. 2008. Types and Influential Factors of Consumers' Non-

Purchasing Ecological Behaviors. *Business Strategy and the Environment* 18:61-76.

Viscusi, W.K., J. Hubery, and J. Bell. 2012. Alternative Policies to Increase Recycling of

Plastic Water Bottles in the United States. *Review of Environmental Economics and*

Policy 6(2):190–211

Table 1. Definitions and Frequencies Associated with the Treatments within the Analyses

United States ^a			Recyclable Material										
Treatment	Bottle Law	Municipal	Clear	Brown	Green	News- papers	Maga- zines	Card- board	Alumi- num	Plant	Plant	Plant	Food
			Glass	Glass	Glass			Boxes		Container	Tags	Waste	Waste
1	No	No	272	284	288	238	251	262	225	306	301	736	926
	Yes	No	94	104	105	90	87	98	83	117	118	309	432
2	No	Yes	633	561	562	706	669	677	731	403	362	353	163
	Yes	Yes	353	322	320	381	380	370	390	231	201	239	116
3	No	No	272	284	288	238	251	262	225	306	301	736	926
	No	Yes	633	561	562	706	669	677	731	403	362	353	163
4	Yes	No	94	104	105	90	87	98	83	117	118	309	432
	Yes	Yes	353	322	320	381	380	370	390	231	201	239	116
5	No	Yes; <i>hard</i>	98	76	76	76	76	91	80	56	52	166	80
	No	Yes; <i>easy</i>	502	451	451	585	556	553	616	323	282	135	67
6	Yes	Yes; <i>hard</i>	37	34	36	40	42	41	35	34	30	122	60
	Yes	Yes; <i>easy</i>	303	273	271	325	324	314	337	183	154	85	42
Canada													
4A	Yes	No	75	87	91	56	64	62	67	97	100	323	452
	Yes	Yes	627	553	555	682	674	677	670	449	422	442	313
6A	Yes	Yes; <i>hard</i>	46	41	38	31	30	37	46	48	46	134	99

Yes Yes; *easy* 560 495 498 631 625 623 606 381 354 243 175

^a Only one Canadian province, Nunavit, has not implemented a bottle deposit law. Therefore, we separated the analyses into U.S. and Canadian consumers. This will also help to control for potential recycling differences between countries.

Table 2. Means of Variables Used in the Propensity Score Calculations

	Total	U.S.	Canada
Number	2,525	1,716	809
Age	38.0	35.8	42.7
# Adults	2.6	2.6	2.5
# Children	1.7	1.7	1.6
Income	\$65,745	\$65,273	\$66,747
Gender: 1 = male	0.55	0.59	0.49
Urban	0.27	0.21	0.40
Suburb	0.53	0.59	0.40
Rural	0.20	0.20	0.20
Education			
High school or less	0.20	0.20	0.20
Between high school and 4-yr	0.42	0.43	0.41
4-yr degree	0.27	0.26	0.28
Greater than 4-yr	0.11	0.11	0.11
Caucasian: 1 = yes	0.79	0.77	0.84
Purchased plants in last year: 1 = yes	0.69	0.67	0.73
Heard of term eco-friendly: 1 = yes	0.93	0.92	0.95
Heard of term sustainability: 1 = yes	0.74	0.73	0.76
How often purchase local ^a	3.3	3.2	3.5
For buying local, importance of: ^b			
Carbon footprint	3.3	3.3	3.5
Environmentally friendly	3.7	3.7	3.8
Freshness	4.5	4.5	4.5
Price	4.1	4.0	4.1
Safe to eat	4.4	4.4	4.4
Support local economy	4.0	4.0	4.1
Other	3.0	3.0	3.0
How often purchase organic	2.8	2.8	2.7
For buying organic, importance of: ^b			
Carbon footprint	3.4	3.3	3.4
Environmentally friendly	3.8	3.7	3.9
Freshness	4.3	4.2	4.3
Price	4.1	4.1	4.2
Safe to eat	4.3	4.3	4.3
Support local economy	3.7	3.7	3.7
Other	3.0	3.0	3.0
How often use re-usable shopping bags ^a	3.5	3.2	4.2
How often use low flow water devices in home ^a	3.4	3.3	3.5

^a Evaluated on a 5-point scale where 1=never, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=most times, and 5=always. Transformed to a 5-point continuous scale for analyses.

^b Measured on a 5-point scale where 1=not important, 3=somewhat important, and 5=very important.

Table 3. Results of the Propensity Score Analyses for Bottle Law Models

	United States									
	Bottle law comparison with no municipal recycling ^{ab}					Bottle law comparison with municipal recycling ^{ab}				
	Log likelihood	LR Chi2	Prob. > chi2	Pseudo R ²	Classified	Log likelihood	LR Chi2	Prob. > chi2	Pseudo R ²	Classified
Clear Glass	-182.48	52.08	0.014	12.5%	68.6%	-622.85	40.56	0.059	3.2%	58.7%
Brown Glass	-200.26	50.56	0.020	11.2%	68.8%	-555.94	46.71	0.035	4.0%	60.4%
Green Glass	-203.98	48.25	0.033	10.6%	67.2%	-556.62	42.22	0.107	3.7%	60.3%
Paper	-166.52	52.41	0.005	13.6%	68.3%	-686.73	34.77	0.212	2.5%	58.2%
Magazines	-161.48	62.58	0.001	16.2%	72.5%	-669.70	34.16	0.162	2.5%	59.6%
Boxes	-182.82	55.89	0.006	13.3%	68.6%	-662.60	34.89	0.114	2.6%	58.5%
Aluminum	-158.98	41.02	0.087	11.4%	65.9%	-705.52	37.60	0.020	2.6%	57.5%
Potting Containers	-221.79	55.32	0.006	11.1%	67.4%	-394.25	43.16	0.090	5.2%	60.3%
Plant Tags	-216.75	64.68	0.001	13.0%	66.6%	-343.38	47.03	0.042	6.4%	62.0%
Plant Waste	-601.62	65.75	0.000	5.2%	60.5%	-370.74	57.12	0.003	7.2%	63.9%
Food Waste	-812.25	74.19	0.000	4.4%	58.5%	-170.61	37.59	0.193	9.9%	66.3%

^a Michigan and California have a different deposit amount compared to the other states with bottle laws, so we estimated the ATT with both Michigan included and excluded and the signs, magnitudes and significance did not change.

^b Analyses for U.S. and Canadian respondents was separate given all but all but one Canadian province has bottle laws.

Table 4. Results of the Propensity Score Analyses for Municipal Recycling Models

	United States										Canada				
	Municipal recycling comparison with no bottle law ^b					Municipal recycling comparison with bottle law ^{ab}					Municipal recycling comparison with bottle law ^{ab}				
	Log likelihood	LR Chi2	Prob. > chi2	Pseudo R ²	Corr. Classified	Log likelihood	LR Chi2	Prob. > chi2	Pseudo R ²	Corr. Classified	Log likelihood	LR Chi2	Prob. > chi2	Pseudo R ²	Corr. Classified
Clear Glass	-511.3	84.0	0.000	7.6%	65.4%	-196.5	66.8	0.000	14.5%	69.1%	-216.9	43.3	0.055	9.1%	89.3%
Brown Glass	-492.5	93.9	0.000	8.7%	65.7%	-209.5	54.6	0.008	11.5%	66.9%	-224.6	59.6	0.002	11.7%	86.4%
Green Glass	-493.1	102.2	0.000	9.4%	70.4%	-214.1	47.0	0.014	9.9%	68.0%	-237.5	50.3	0.006	9.6%	85.9%
Newspaper	-471.7	122.6	0.000	11.5%	68.8%	-197.9	63.6	0.000	13.9%	68.8%	-169.3	57.9	0.001	14.6%	92.4%
Magazines	-478.8	120.7	0.000	11.2%	68.5%	-193.7	61.8	0.001	13.8%	67.9%	-183.7	67.9	0.000	15.6%	91.3%
Cardboard															
Boxes	-502.6	106.5	0.000	9.6%	67.2%	-212.0	56.4	0.005	11.7%	66.0%	-174.4	77.1	0.000	18.1%	91.6%
Aluminum	-463.8	115.7	0.000	11.1%	68.6%	-191.9	55.7	0.003	12.7%	70.2%	-193.2	62.7	0.000	14.0%	90.9%
Potting Containers	-429.9	109.9	0.000	11.3%	67.7%	-203.3	37.9	0.080	8.5%	64.9%	-224.0	62.9	0.001	12.3%	82.2%
Plant Tags	-401.1	111.2	0.000	12.2%	68.5%	-186.5	47.4	0.039	11.3%	67.4%	-222.1	65.8	0.000	12.9%	80.8%
Plant Waste	-605.4	161.4	0.000	11.8%	65.1%	-331.2	88.4	0.000	11.8%	68.4%	-468.6	104.8	0.000	10.1%	66.0%
Food Waste	-392.3	134.9	0.000	14.7%	68.5%	-259.1	47.6	0.029	8.4%	63.3%	-486.8	61.5	0.001	6.0%	62.2%

^a Michigan and California have a different deposit amount compared to the other states with bottle laws, so we estimated the ATT with both Michigan included and excluded and the signs, magnitudes and significance did not change.

^b Analyses for U.S. and Canadian respondents was separate given all but all but one Canadian province has bottle laws.

Table 5. Results of the Propensity Score Analyses for Ease of Municipal Recycling Models

	United States										Canada				
	Ease of municipal recycling with no bottle law ^b					Ease of municipal recycling with bottle law ^{ab}					Ease of municipal recycling with bottle law ^{ab}				
	Log likelihood	LR Chi2	Prob. > chi2	Pseudo R ²	Corr. Classified	Log likelihood	LR Chi2	Prob. > chi2	Pseudo R ²	Corr. Classified	Log likelihood	LR Chi2	Prob. > chi2	Pseudo R ²	Corr. Classified
Clear Glass	-239.1	55.9	0.004	10.5%	83.7%	-90.1	53.8	0.009	23.0%	89.1%	-135.9	53.9	0.009	16.6%	92.4%
Brown Glass	-194.1	46.7	0.035	10.7%	85.6%	-81.4	50.9	0.005	23.8%	89.3%	-120.2	49.2	0.011	17.0%	92.4%
Green Glass	-189.7	55.4	0.005	12.7%	85.6%	-85.8	50.3	0.008	22.7%	88.6%	-111.0	52.4	0.003	19.1%	92.9%
Paper	-215.8	40.1	0.082	8.5%	88.5%	-103.7	45.0	0.050	17.8%	89.0%	-98.2	53.9	0.007	21.5%	95.3%
Magazines	-208.2	48.1	0.014	10.4%	88.0%	-108.6	43.7	0.030	16.8%	88.5%	-100.4	42.9	0.036	17.6%	95.4%
Boxes	-239.6	45.5	0.045	8.7%	85.9%	-96.1	61.9	0.001	24.4%	89.0%	-118.6	47.9	0.027	16.8%	94.4%
Aluminum Potting Containers	-223.8	48.9	0.016	9.9%	88.5%	-88.0	56.0	0.005	24.2%	90.6%	-137.0	58.6	0.003	17.6%	92.9%
Plant Tags	-140.7	36.0	0.092	11.3%	85.2%	-68.8	50.8	0.014	27.0%	84.3%	-126.6	47.6	0.029	15.8%	88.8%
Plant Waste	-127.2	34.5	0.097	12.0%	84.4%	-57.6	48.5	0.023	29.7%	85.9%	-122.6	40.2	0.081	14.1%	88.5%
Food Waste	-182.0	50.1	0.016	12.1%	68.8%	-114.0	52.3	0.003	18.6%	73.4%	-227.6	35.4	0.129	7.2%	65.5%
Waste	-77.3	48.1	0.019	23.8%	72.8%	-45.4	47.4	0.023	34.3%	76.5%	-160.8	36.9	0.148	10.3%	66.8%

^a Michigan and California have a different deposit amount compared to the other states with bottle laws, so we estimated the ATT with both Michigan included and excluded and the signs, magnitudes and significance did not change.

^b Analyses for U.S. and Canadian respondents was separate given all but all but one Canadian province has bottle laws.

Table 6. Covariate Balancing Statistics Utilized in Matching Algorithm Selection for Bottle Deposit Law with No Municipality Recycling Treatment

Matching Algorithm ^a	Bias Reduction (%)										
T1: Bottle law comparison with no municipal recycling: United States respondents only ^{a,b}											
	Clear glass	Brown glass	Green glass	News-papers	Maga-zines	Cardboard boxes	Aluminum cans	Plant containers	Plant tags	Plant waste	Food waste
Kernel - Epanechnikov	-4%	-13%	-19%	-35%	-16%	-5%	-27%	-13%	-8%	-9%	-11%
Kernel - Gaussian	-4%	-13%	-19%	-35%	-16%	-5%	-27%	-13%	-8%	-9%	-11%
Radius .1	-68%	-62%	-58%	-74%	-71%	-74%	-83%	-75%	-67%	-77%	-75%
Radius .01	-67%	-78%	-56%	-65%	-45%	-68%	-73%	-74%	-62%	-81%	-63%
Radius .05	-73%	-63%	-60%	-69%	-71%	-75%	-90%	-73%	-65%	-81%	-85%
K-nearest w repl. - no caliper	-53%	-37%	-54%	-44%	6%	-36%	-63%	-57%	-45%	-34%	-47%
K-nearest without repl. - no caliper	-56%	-50%	-30%	-49%	-51%	-62%	-58%	-32%	-42%	12%	5%
Local Linear Regression	-53%	-37%	-54%	-44%	6%	-36%	-63%	-57%	-45%	-34%	-47%
T2: Bottle law comparison with municipal recycling: United States respondents only ^{a,b}											
	Clear glass	Brown glass	Green glass	News-papers	Maga-zines	Cardboard boxes	Aluminum cans	Plant containers	Plant tags	Plant waste	Food waste
Kernel - Epanechnikov	-7%	-8%	-6%	-7%	-14%	-7%	-7%	-9%	-3%	-10%	-40%
Kernel - Gaussian	-7%	-8%	-6%	-7%	-14%	-7%	-7%	-9%	-3%	-10%	-40%
Radius .1	-73%	-80%	-77%	-66%	-56%	-64%	-71%	-58%	-60%	-69%	-62%
Radius .01	-83%	-83%	-81%	-74%	-55%	-70%	-84%	-57%	-47%	-64%	-34%
Radius .05	-88%	-85%	-84%	-75%	-61%	-77%	-84%	-49%	-59%	-79%	-52%
K-nearest w repl. - no caliper	-53%	-44%	-23%	-21%	8%	-4%	-60%	2%	-1%	-17%	-13%
K-nearest without repl. - no caliper	4%	-8%	0%	69%	94%	86%	39%	10%	-23%	-56%	-37%
Local Linear Regression	-53%	-44%	-23%	-21%	8%	-4%	-60%	2%	-1%	-17%	-13%
T3: Municipal recycling comparison with no bottle law: United States respondents only ^b											
	Clear glass	Brown glass	Green glass	News-papers	Maga-zines	Cardboard boxes	Aluminum cans	Plant containers	Plant tags	Plant waste	Food waste

Kernel - Epanechnikov	1%	0%	2%	-3%	-6%	0%	-2%	-13%	-8%	-6%	-34%
Kernel - Gaussian	1%	0%	2%	-3%	-6%	0%	-2%	-13%	-8%	-6%	-34%
Radius .1	-70%	-77%	-71%	-63%	-71%	-70%	-62%	-75%	-74%	-90%	-84%
Radius .01	-59%	-64%	-63%	-57%	-69%	-73%	-53%	-54%	-70%	-88%	-88%
Radius .05	-70%	-79%	-70%	-66%	-76%	-75%	-64%	-72%	-71%	-92%	-90%
K-nearest w repl. - no caliper	-34%	-58%	-44%	-40%	-57%	-50%	-39%	-45%	-61%	-80%	-77%
K-nearest without repl. - no caliper	144%	111%	121%	134%	116%	132%	139%	56%	36%	-67%	-40%
Local Linear Regression	-34%	-58%	-44%	-40%	-57%	-50%	-39%	-45%	-61%	-80%	-77%

T4: Municipal recycling comparison with bottle law: U.S. respondents only ^{a,b}

	Clear glass	Brown glass	Green glass	News-papers	Maga-zines	Cardboard boxes	Aluminum cans	Plant containers	Plant tags	Plant waste	Food waste
Kernel - Epanechnikov	-11%	-35%	-20%	-31%	-27%	-30%	-27%	-22%	-40%	-19%	-6%
Kernel - Gaussian	-11%	-35%	-20%	-31%	-27%	-30%	-27%	-22%	-40%	-19%	-6%
Radius .1	-75%	-75%	-80%	-80%	-79%	-71%	-78%	-76%	-71%	-86%	-79%
Radius .01	-64%	-65%	-66%	-67%	-65%	-53%	-64%	-61%	-50%	-80%	-72%
Radius .05	-74%	-77%	-76%	-78%	-77%	-66%	-77%	-75%	-67%	-82%	-88%
K-nearest w repl. - no caliper	-57%	-57%	-54%	-67%	-59%	-12%	-51%	-37%	-53%	-43%	-31%
K-nearest without repl. - no caliper	94%	72%	120%	80%	100%	76%	87%	96%	35%	-73%	-13%
Local Linear Regression	-57%	-57%	-54%	-67%	-59%	0%	-51%	-37%	-53%	-43%	-31%

T4A: Municipal recycling comparison with bottle law: Canadian respondents only ^{a,b}

	Clear glass	Brown glass	Green glass	News-papers	Maga-zines	Cardboard boxes	Aluminum cans	Plant containers	Plant tags	Plant waste	Food waste
Kernel - Epanechnikov	-2%	-13%	-6%	-20%	-17%	-38%	-38%	-12%	-19%	0%	-6%
Kernel - Gaussian	-2%	-13%	-6%	-20%	-17%	-38%	-38%	-12%	-19%	0%	0%
Radius .1	-51%	-64%	-68%	-68%	-73%	-69%	-62%	-54%	-59%	-77%	-79%
Radius .01	-42%	-27%	-55%	-55%	-66%	-54%	-54%	-34%	-37%	-68%	-64%
Radius .05	-48%	-60%	-69%	-67%	-73%	-61%	-61%	-46%	-53%	-77%	-80%
K-nearest w repl. - no caliper	8%	-11%	-47%	-51%	-57%	-48%	-46%	-23%	-21%	-52%	18%

K-nearest without repl. - no caliper	134%	66%	85%	67%	55%	55%	63%	110%	83%	57%	-64%
Local Linear Regression	8%	-11%	-47%	-51%	-57%	-48%	-46%	-23%	-21%	-52%	18%

T5: Ease of municipal recycling with no bottle law: United States respondents only ^b

	Clear glass	Brown glass	Green glass	News-papers	Maga-zines	Cardboard boxes	Aluminum cans	Plant containers	Plant tags	Plant waste	Food waste
Kernel - Epanechnikov	-4%	-17%	-7%	-11%	-22%	-21%	-13%	-22%	-32%	-17%	-36%
Kernel - Gaussian	-4%	-17%	-7%	-11%	-22%	-21%	-13%	-22%	-32%	-17%	-36%
Radius .1	-50%	-43%	-52%	-43%	-46%	-58%	-21%	-31%	-51%	-75%	-59%
Radius .01	-51%	-44%	-32%	-37%	-33%	-34%	-25%	-16%	-43%	-52%	-52%
Radius .05	-57%	-36%	-51%	-43%	-42%	-58%	-8%	-33%	-54%	-72%	-64%
K-nearest w repl. - no caliper	-23%	-21%	-20%	-21%	-35%	-8%	9%	-14%	-37%	-33%	-47%
K-nearest without repl. - no caliper	159%	103%	105%	154%	133%	115%	208%	131%	99%	-57%	-42%
Local Linear Regression	-23%	-21%	-20%	-21%	-35%	-8%	9%	-14%	-37%	-33%	-47%

T6: Ease of municipal recycling with bottle law: United States respondents only ^{a,b}

	Clear glass	Brown glass	Green glass	News-papers	Maga-zines	Cardboard boxes	Aluminum cans	Plant containers	Plant tags	Plant waste	Food waste
Kernel - Epanechnikov	-57%	-57%	-29%	-35%	-49%	-46%	-37%	-44%	-50%	-21%	-56%
Kernel - Gaussian	-57%	-57%	-29%	-35%	-49%	-46%	-37%	-44%	-50%	-21%	-56%
Radius .1	-52%	-67%	-52%	-45%	-54%	-68%	-49%	-56%	-27%	-70%	-77%
Radius .01	17%	-36%	-7%	30%	-6%	-51%	-40%	-29%	-9%	-55%	-40%
Radius .05	-52%	-65%	-50%	-49%	-55%	-67%	-48%	-38%	-22%	-67%	-81%
K-nearest w repl. - no caliper	4%	-25%	4%	15%	-10%	-42%	-43%	-26%	-14%	-50%	-61%
K-nearest without repl. - no caliper	13%	38%	48%	55%	24%	26%	0%	35%	21%	-54%	-64%
Local Linear Regression	4%	-25%	4%	15%	-10%	0%	-43%	-26%	-14%	-50%	-61%

T6A: Ease of municipal recycling with bottle law: Canadian respondents only ^b

	Clear glass	Brown glass	Green glass	News-papers	Maga-zines	Cardboard boxes	Aluminum cans	Plant containers	Plant tags	Plant waste	Food waste
--	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------	------------	-------------	------------

Kernel - Epanechnikov	-16%	-27%	-26%	-15%	-37%	-41%	-28%	-25%	-39%	-25%	-10%
Kernel - Gaussian	-16%	-27%	-26%	-15%	-35%	-41%	-28%	-25%	-39%	-25%	-10%
Radius .1	-55%	-47%	-43%	-56%	-13%	-77%	-51%	-52%	-65%	-79%	-65%
Radius .01	-27%	-32%	-5%	-42%	10%	-47%	-60%	-45%	-44%	-68%	-34%
Radius .05	-55%	-47%	-33%	-57%	8%	-63%	-63%	-52%	-56%	-78%	-58%
K-nearest w repl. - no caliper	-2%	-25%	-12%	-32%	28%	-23%	-49%	-43%	-22%	-48%	-15%
K-nearest without repl. - no caliper	57%	60%	33%	63%	33%	41%	62%	66%	53%	62%	81%
Local Linear Regression	-2%	-25%	-12%	-32%	28%	-23%	-49%	-43%	-22%	-48%	-15%

^a Michigan and California have a different deposit amount compared to the other states with bottle laws, so we estimated the ATT with both Michigan included and excluded and the signs, magnitudes and significance did not change.

^b Analyses for U.S. and Canadian respondents was separate given all but all but one Canadian province has bottle laws.

Table 7. Comparing the Impact of Bottle Laws on Recycling of Different Recyclable Materials with Varying Municipal Recycling Availability

	United States Respondents											
	Bottle law comparison with no municipal recycling ^{a,b}						Bottle law comparison with municipal recycling ^{a,b}					
	Treated	Control	ATT ^c	p-value	% change	R-Bounds ^d	Treated	Control	ATT ^c	p-value	% change	R-Bounds ^d
Clear Glass	2.46	2.10	0.36	0.021	17.2%	1.29	3.49	3.38	0.11	0.067	3.2%	1.50
Brown Glass	2.69	2.42	0.27	0.039	11.2%	1.34	3.36	3.31	0.05	0.306	1.6%	1.32
Green Glass	2.36	2.18	0.18	0.252	8.3%	1.12	3.45	3.36	0.09	0.166	2.6%	1.33
Paper	2.34	2.51	-0.17	0.289	-6.8%	1.04	3.51	3.46	0.06	0.274	1.6%	1.15
Magazines	2.28	2.39	-0.11	0.518	-4.6%	1.13	3.47	3.45	0.02	0.775	0.4%	1.51
Boxes	2.51	2.48	0.03	0.826	1.4%	1.48	3.49	3.46	0.04	0.512	1.0%	1.19
Aluminum	3.03	2.73	0.30	0.055	10.9%	1.1	3.61	3.51	0.11	0.039	3.0%	1.59
Potting Containers	2.28	2.14	0.14	0.279	6.6%	1.14	3.24	3.24	0.01	0.943	0.2%	1.46
Plant Tags	2.01	1.86	0.14	0.302	7.8%	1.21	3.00	3.00	0.00	0.990	0.0%	1.39
Plant Waste	1.67	1.61	0.06	0.407	3.6%	1.63	2.05	2.02	0.03	0.767	1.5%	1.14
Food Waste	1.54	1.52	0.02	0.685	1.3%	1.78	2.18	2.24	-0.05	0.706	-2.4%	1.24

^a Michigan and California have a different deposit amount compared to the other states with bottle laws, so we estimated the ATT with both Michigan included and excluded and the signs, magnitudes and significance did not change.

^b Analyses for U.S. and Canadian respondents was separate given all but all but one Canadian province has bottle laws.

^c ATT = Average Treatment Effect on Treated; calculated as treated minus control.

^d Rosenbaum bounds (R-bounds) measures the unobserved bias needed to increase the odds of participation in the treatment so that the bounds becomes insignificant at the 0.05 level, given the same covariates.

Table 8. Comparing the Impact of Municipal Recycling Programs on Recycling of Different Recyclable Materials with Varying Bottle Law Availability

	United States Respondents											
	Municipal recycling comparison with no bottle law ^b						Municipal recycling comparison with bottle law ^{a,b}					
	Treated	Control	ATT ^c	p-value	% change	R-Bounds ^d	Treated	Control	ATT ^c	p-value	% change	R-Bounds ^d
Clear Glass	3.34	2.14	1.20	0.000	55.9%	7.00	3.49	2.66	0.83	0.000	31.0%	5.22
Brown Glass	3.26	2.43	0.83	0.000	34.1%	5.80	3.35	2.79	0.56	0.000	20.0%	4.44
Green Glass	3.34	2.21	1.13	0.000	51.1%	7.00	3.44	2.51	0.93	0.000	36.9%	4.57
Paper	3.42	2.45	0.97	0.000	39.6%	7.00	3.46	2.50	0.96	0.000	38.5%	4.62
Magazines	3.42	2.40	1.01	0.000	42.1%	7.00	3.45	2.49	0.96	0.000	38.3%	4.63
Boxes	3.42	2.43	0.99	0.000	40.7%	7.00	3.48	2.63	0.85	0.000	32.3%	3.70
Aluminum	3.47	2.76	0.72	0.000	25.9%	3.23	3.60	3.19	0.41	0.003	12.8%	1.91
Potting Containers	3.19	2.23	0.96	0.000	43.0%	6.00	3.25	2.49	0.77	0.000	30.8%	4.03
Plant Tags	2.94	1.87	1.07	0.000	57.0%	5.44	2.98	2.13	0.84	0.000	39.5%	3.93
Plant Waste	1.98	1.70	0.27	0.000	16.1%	1.24	2.03	1.82	0.22	0.045	11.9%	1.09
Food Waste	2.23	1.65	0.58	0.000	35.1%	2.21	2.14	1.67	0.47	0.000	28.5%	1.47

^a Michigan and California have a different deposit amount compared to the other states with bottle laws, so we estimated the ATT with both Michigan included and excluded and the signs, magnitudes and significance did not change.

^b Analyses for U.S. and Canadian respondents was separate given all but all but one Canadian province has bottle laws.

^c ATT = Average Treatment Effect on Treated; calculated as treated minus control.

^d Rosenbaum bounds (R-bounds) measures the unobserved bias needed to increase the odds of participation in the treatment so that the bounds becomes insignificant at the 0.05 level, given the same covariates.

Table 9. Comparing the Perceived Ease of Municipal Recycling Programs on Recycling of Different Recyclable Materials with Varying Bottle Law Availability

	United States Respondents											
	Ease of municipal recycling with no bottle law ^b						Ease of municipal recycling with bottle law ^{a,b}					
	Treated	Control	ATT ^c	p-value	% change	R-Bounds ^d	Treated	Control	ATT ^c	p-value	% change	R-Bounds ^d
Clear Glass	3.59	2.49	1.09	0.000	43.8%	7.00	3.67	2.56	1.11	0.000	43.4%	3.54
Brown Glass	3.44	2.47	0.97	0.000	39.4%	7.00	3.48	2.61	0.88	0.000	33.6%	5.18
Green Glass	3.55	2.26	1.30	0.000	57.4%	7.00	3.61	2.47	1.13	0.000	45.8%	3.70
Paper	3.59	2.39	1.20	0.000	50.1%	6.83	3.64	2.77	0.87	0.000	31.4%	5.18
Magazines	3.54	2.67	0.87	0.000	32.5%	4.39	3.59	2.76	0.83	0.000	30.2%	3.86
Boxes	3.59	2.59	1.00	0.000	38.5%	7.00	3.64	2.73	0.91	0.000	33.2%	4.35
Aluminum	3.63	2.64	0.99	0.000	37.5%	5.99	3.70	3.08	0.61	0.001	19.9%	2.49
Potting Containers	3.36	2.49	0.86	0.000	34.6%	3.30	3.40	2.74	0.66	0.017	24.2%	2.39
Plant Tags	3.07	2.39	0.68	0.000	28.3%	2.25	3.17	2.36	0.82	0.006	34.6%	3.24
Plant Waste	2.81	1.65	1.17	0.000	70.7%	7.00	3.09	1.48	1.60	0.000	107.9%	1.26
Food Waste	2.89	1.83	1.06	0.000	57.8%	4.29	3.06	1.56	1.50	0.000	96.4%	1.22

^a Michigan and California have a different deposit amount compared to the other states with bottle laws, so we estimated the ATT with both Michigan included and excluded and the signs, magnitudes and significance did not change.

^b Analyses for U.S. and Canadian respondents was separate given all but all but one Canadian province has bottle laws.

^c ATT = Average Treatment Effect on Treated; calculated as treated minus control.

^d Rosenbaum bounds (R-bounds) measures the unobserved bias needed to increase the odds of participation in the treatment so that the bounds becomes insignificant at the 0.05 level, given the same covariates.

Table 10. Comparing the Impact of Municipal Recycling Programs and Bottle Law Availability for Canadian Residents

	United States Respondents											
	Ease of municipal recycling with no bottle law ^a						Ease of municipal recycling with bottle law ^a					
	Treated	Control	ATT ^b	p-value	% change	R-Bounds ^c	Treated	Control	ATT ^b	p-value	% change	R-Bounds ^c
Clear Glass	3.68	2.88	0.79	0.000	27.5%	3.72	3.75	3.01	0.74	0.000	24.7%	3.77
Brown Glass	3.66	2.89	0.77	0.000	26.6%	5.47	3.73	2.94	0.80	0.000	27.1%	2.40
Green Glass	3.69	2.92	0.77	0.000	26.2%	5.96	3.75	2.99	0.76	0.000	25.4%	2.30
Paper	3.75	2.68	1.07	0.000	39.8%	7.00	3.81	2.73	1.08	0.000	39.5%	3.80
Magazines	3.74	2.73	1.01	0.000	37.0%	5.68	3.78	2.94	0.84	0.000	28.6%	2.37
Boxes	3.72	2.82	0.91	0.000	32.1%	6.31	3.77	3.05	0.72	0.000	23.6%	2.32
Aluminum	3.75	3.44	0.31	0.021	9.1%	2.80	3.81	3.03	0.78	0.000	25.9%	3.82
Potting Containers	3.54	2.53	1.01	0.000	39.9%	7.00	3.66	2.84	0.82	0.000	29.0%	4.12
Plant Tags	3.38	1.99	1.39	0.000	69.9%	7.00	3.55	2.48	1.06	0.000	42.9%	2.05
Plant Waste	2.52	2.00	0.53	0.000	26.3%	1.99	3.26	1.80	1.45	0.000	80.6%	1.42
Food Waste	2.68	1.86	0.82	0.000	43.8%	3.14	3.38	1.95	1.43	0.000	73.4%	1.20

^a Analyses for U.S. and Canadian respondents was separate given all but all but one Canadian province has bottle laws.

^b ATT = Average Treatment Effect on Treated; calculated as treated minus control.

^c Rosenbaum bounds (R-bounds) measures the unobserved bias needed to increase the odds of participation in the treatment so that the bounds becomes insignificant at the 0.05 level, given the same covariates.

Table 11. Comparing the Perceived Ease of Municipal Recycling Programs on Recycling of Different Recyclable Materials with Varying Bottle Law Availability

Canada						
Municipal recycling comparison with bottle law ^a						
	Treated	Control	ATT ^b	p-value	% change	R-Bounds ^c
Clear Glass	3.75	3.01	0.74	0.000	24.7%	3.77
Brown Glass	3.73	2.94	0.80	0.000	27.1%	2.40
Green Glass	3.75	2.99	0.76	0.000	25.4%	2.30
Paper	3.81	2.73	1.08	0.000	39.5%	3.80
Magazines	3.78	2.94	0.84	0.000	28.6%	2.37
Boxes	3.77	3.05	0.72	0.000	23.6%	2.32
Aluminum	3.81	3.03	0.78	0.000	25.9%	3.82
Potting Containers	3.66	2.84	0.82	0.000	29.0%	4.12
Plant Tags	3.55	2.48	1.06	0.000	42.9%	2.05
Plant Waste	3.26	1.80	1.45	0.000	80.6%	1.42
Food Waste	3.38	1.95	1.43	0.000	73.4%	1.20

^a Analyses for U.S. and Canadian respondents was separate given all but all but one Canadian province has bottle laws.

^b ATT = Average Treatment Effect on Treated; calculated as treated minus control.

^c Rosenbaum bounds (R-bounds) measures the unobserved bias needed to increase the odds of participation in the treatment so that the bounds becomes insignificant at the 0.05 level, given the same covariates.

Appendix table 1. Statistics for Balancing Tests for Pre- and Post-Matching Comparisons for Treatment 1 Using Radius Matching with a 0.1 Caliper

		Clear glass		Brown glass		Green glass		Newspaper		Magazines		Cardboard boxes		Aluminum cans		Plant containers		Plant tags		Plant waste		Food waste	
		t- val ue	p- valu e	t- val ue	p- valu e	t- val ue	p- valu e	t- val ue	p- valu e	t- val ue	p- valu e	t- val ue	p- valu e	t- val ue	p- valu e	t- val ue	p- valu e	t- val ue	p- valu e	t- val ue	p- valu e	t- val ue	p- valu e
Age	U	-2.2	0.03	-1.4	0.17	-1.7	0.10	-2.3	0.02	-2.5	0.01	-2.8	0.01	-2.1	0.03	-2.2	0.03	-2.2	0.03	-2.0	0.05	0.0	0.97
	M	1.3	0.20	0.7	0.51	0.1	0.91	1.2	0.25	1.6	0.12	2.3	0.03	0.7	0.46	1.5	0.13	1.8	0.08	0.8	0.40	-0.3	0.79
# Adults	U	1.4	0.16	1.3	0.19	1.4	0.16	1.1	0.27	0.9	0.37	1.9	0.06	1.4	0.18	0.8	0.43	0.4	0.73	3.0	0.00	1.8	0.07
	M	-0.7	0.48	-0.1	0.93	-0.3	0.79	-0.8	0.45	-0.6	0.54	-1.2	0.22	-1.0	0.30	-1.1	0.27	-1.2	0.25	-1.6	0.10	-0.7	0.46
# Children	U	-0.6	0.53	-0.5	0.62	-0.9	0.39	0.1	0.91	-0.6	0.58	-0.2	0.85	-0.4	0.69	-0.9	0.36	-1.5	0.14	-0.8	0.45	-0.9	0.38
	M	-0.7	0.50	-0.4	0.68	-0.7	0.50	-0.6	0.54	-1.9	0.06	-0.7	0.48	-0.3	0.79	-0.6	0.56	-0.4	0.68	0.2	0.83	0.5	0.63
Income	U	2.0	0.04	2.8	0.01	1.8	0.08	2.1	0.04	2.0	0.05	2.4	0.02	2.0	0.05	2.4	0.02	1.6	0.10	2.7	0.01	2.9	0.00
	M	-2.2	0.03	-2.2	0.03	-2.3	0.02	-2.1	0.04	-2.9	0.00	-2.9	0.00	-2.0	0.04	-2.7	0.01	-2.5	0.01	-1.8	0.08	-1.4	0.16
Gender: male	U	0.9	0.37	1.0	0.30	0.8	0.43	1.8	0.07	1.2	0.22	2.6	0.01	1.1	0.25	1.7	0.09	1.6	0.12	0.2	0.81	1.4	0.18
	M	0.1	0.91	-0.2	0.82	-0.2	0.83	-0.6	0.53	-0.9	0.38	-2.3	0.02	-0.7	0.47	-1.8	0.07	-1.1	0.28	-0.3	0.80	-0.8	0.41
Suburb	U	0.8	0.43	1.3	0.20	1.3	0.19	1.0	0.34	1.2	0.25	1.7	0.10	1.0	0.30	1.9	0.06	1.9	0.05	0.5	0.62	1.1	0.28
	M	-1.1	0.28	-1.2	0.24	-1.0	0.31	0.0	0.98	-0.2	0.84	-1.0	0.30	-0.2	0.84	-0.9	0.39	-1.8	0.08	0.1	0.93	-0.6	0.56
Rural	U	-2.0	0.05	-2.3	0.03	-2.7	0.01	-2.2	0.03	-2.1	0.03	-2.5	0.02	-2.4	0.02	-2.1	0.03	-2.5	0.01	-2.2	0.03	-3.4	0.00
	M	1.3	0.19	0.9	0.38	0.8	0.43	1.0	0.33	0.3	0.73	1.8	0.08	1.2	0.25	2.1	0.03	2.1	0.04	0.9	0.38	1.4	0.16
Education																							
High school or less	U	-0.3	0.79	-0.6	0.54	-0.8	0.44	-1.2	0.23	-0.6	0.55	-0.5	0.65	-1.1	0.29	-0.2	0.85	-0.3	0.80	-2.5	0.01	-3.6	0.00
	M	0.2	0.88	0.8	0.44	0.7	0.51	0.8	0.45	0.6	0.54	0.7	0.50	0.8	0.46	0.3	0.80	-0.2	0.87	1.0	0.30	1.2	0.23
Between high school and 4-yr	U	0.1	0.95	-1.1	0.30	-0.7	0.51	1.2	0.25	0.7	0.47	0.0	0.97	-0.1	0.94	0.6	0.56	1.1	0.30	0.0	1.00	0.5	0.61
	M	0.6	0.53	0.0	0.98	0.1	0.92	0.7	0.52	1.4	0.17	0.9	0.36	0.7	0.49	0.4	0.73	0.3	0.79	0.2	0.86	0.3	0.80
Greater than 4-yr	U	-0.8	0.43	0.0	0.98	0.4	0.71	1.2	0.22	0.8	0.42	1.1	0.26	0.0	0.99	-0.2	0.84	-1.2	0.23	0.3	0.76	0.2	0.83
	M	0.6	0.52	-1.0	0.34	-0.7	0.49	-1.3	0.19	-0.8	0.40	-1.1	0.29	-0.3	0.73	0.6	0.56	0.5	0.60	-0.1	0.90	-0.2	0.83
Caucasian	U	-1.1	0.26	-1.4	0.18	-1.9	0.05	-2.8	0.01	-2.6	0.01	-2.8	0.01	-1.3	0.18	-2.3	0.02	-2.6	0.01	-0.9	0.38	-3.2	0.00
	M	0.6	0.52	0.4	0.68	-0.1	0.93	-0.3	0.76	1.1	0.29	0.8	0.45	0.5	0.60	1.0	0.32	1.4	0.17	0.5	0.60	1.6	0.12
Purchased plants	U	0.0	1.00	0.0	1.00	0.0	0.97	1.3	0.20	1.1	0.26	1.2	0.23	-0.5	0.64	1.3	0.19	1.0	0.31	2.1	0.04	1.6	0.11
	M	0.6	0.55	-0.6	0.53	0.0	0.99	-0.7	0.50	0.1	0.95	1.0	0.34	0.3	0.74	0.1	0.91	-1.8	0.08	-1.1	0.29	-0.7	0.46
Heard of term eco-friendly	U	-1.8	0.08	-1.4	0.18	0.3	0.79	-1.2	0.22	-1.0	0.30	-0.8	0.46	-1.2	0.25	-0.8	0.45	-0.8	0.43	-1.6	0.11	-1.4	0.18
	M	2.5	0.01	0.1	0.90	1.3	0.18	1.3	0.19	1.1	0.28	0.9	0.37	-0.1	0.96	0.9	0.39	0.2	0.86	0.2	0.81	0.4	0.70
Heard of term sustainability	U	-1.1	0.29	-0.1	0.92	0.2	0.82	-0.6	0.56	-0.6	0.53	-0.7	0.51	-1.3	0.20	-0.8	0.40	-0.9	0.35	-0.2	0.83	0.3	0.73
	M	1.2	0.23	0.4	0.68	0.7	0.48	-0.2	0.83	0.4	0.68	0.0	0.98	-0.1	0.89	0.2	0.84	-0.7	0.51	-0.3	0.76	-0.3	0.80
How often purchase local	U	-1.5	0.15	-1.7	0.08	-2.6	0.01	-0.8	0.44	-1.4	0.17	-0.9	0.36	-1.4	0.17	-1.2	0.24	-1.4	0.15	1.4	0.17	1.7	0.09
	M	0.7	0.49	0.7	0.50	0.5	0.62	1.4	0.16	1.3	0.19	2.2	0.03	0.7	0.52	0.3	0.76	-0.5	0.60	-0.7	0.48	-1.1	0.29
For buying local, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	-1.2	0.22	-3.0	0.00	-1.9	0.05	-0.6	0.58	-0.7	0.47	-0.3	0.80	-1.2	0.23	-0.9	0.39	-0.5	0.59	0.6	0.56	0.5	0.59
	M	1.0	0.32	1.4	0.16	1.4	0.18	1.1	0.28	0.8	0.46	0.6	0.58	0.5	0.61	-0.3	0.75	0.4	0.71	-0.5	0.62	-0.2	0.86
Environmentally friendly	U	-2.1	0.03	-2.4	0.02	-2.3	0.02	-1.3	0.18	-0.7	0.47	-0.5	0.59	-1.6	0.12	-1.1	0.26	-0.9	0.36	-0.6	0.57	-0.6	0.57

Freshness	M	1.3	0.19	1.4	0.17	1.2	0.25	0.8	0.44	1.0	0.32	1.3	0.21	0.2	0.83	0.5	0.63	0.6	0.57	0.4	0.70	0.0	0.99
	U	-3.5	0.00	-3.4	0.00	-3.0	0.00	-1.5	0.15	-2.3	0.02	-2.0	0.05	-3.2	0.00	-1.2	0.22	-2.3	0.03	-0.2	0.82	-0.5	0.60
Price	M	0.8	0.42	1.1	0.29	0.3	0.73	1.6	0.12	1.9	0.06	2.1	0.03	0.6	0.53	1.1	0.29	0.6	0.58	-0.3	0.80	-0.3	0.73
	U	-1.9	0.05	-2.5	0.01	-1.4	0.18	-1.5	0.12	-1.7	0.09	-2.8	0.01	-3.3	0.00	-2.8	0.01	-2.6	0.01	-2.3	0.02	-0.7	0.47
Safe to eat	M	0.4	0.69	1.0	0.30	0.8	0.40	1.5	0.13	1.9	0.06	1.1	0.26	1.0	0.32	0.1	0.94	-1.1	0.28	0.7	0.48	0.1	0.91
	U	-3.3	0.00	-3.8	0.00	-3.0	0.00	-1.9	0.06	-1.8	0.08	-2.2	0.03	-3.3	0.00	-2.2	0.03	-2.3	0.02	-0.4	0.67	-0.6	0.55
Support local economy	M	0.9	0.39	0.9	0.36	0.4	0.72	1.4	0.16	1.3	0.18	1.6	0.12	1.0	0.34	0.7	0.51	0.7	0.50	-0.2	0.87	-0.3	0.79
	U	-3.4	0.00	-3.5	0.00	-3.7	0.00	-2.2	0.03	-2.8	0.01	-2.2	0.03	-3.6	0.00	-2.2	0.03	-2.2	0.03	-1.8	0.08	-1.7	0.09
Other	M	0.9	0.35	1.8	0.07	0.8	0.46	1.3	0.19	2.0	0.05	1.7	0.09	1.5	0.13	1.5	0.13	0.7	0.48	1.0	0.31	0.7	0.48
	U	-1.7	0.09	-1.5	0.14	-1.6	0.12	--	--	-0.2	0.86	0.3	0.80	-1.4	0.17	-0.5	0.66	-0.7	0.50	-0.6	0.58	-0.2	0.81
How often purchase organic	M	1.8	0.08	1.6	0.10	1.5	0.13	--	--	2.5	0.01	1.2	0.24	0.4	0.66	1.0	0.33	-0.2	0.84	0.7	0.51	0.4	0.70
	U	0.7	0.48	0.3	0.73	-0.1	0.95	2.1	0.04	2.2	0.03	2.0	0.04	1.2	0.23	1.4	0.17	1.7	0.09	2.9	0.00	2.7	0.01
For buying organic, importance of:	M	0.4	0.71	-0.6	0.57	-0.3	0.75	-0.3	0.79	-0.6	0.57	-0.4	0.72	-0.6	0.58	-1.0	0.30	-2.7	0.01	-1.3	0.20	-1.3	0.19
	U	-1.3	0.19	-2.3	0.02	-1.8	0.08	-0.6	0.58	-0.3	0.79	0.0	0.98	-1.0	0.32	-0.4	0.72	0.1	0.89	0.5	0.64	--	--
Carbon footprint	M	0.2	0.87	0.9	0.37	0.5	0.60	0.3	0.79	0.5	0.59	0.9	0.40	0.3	0.80	-0.3	0.78	-1.0	0.33	-0.4	0.66	--	--
	U	-1.4	0.16	-1.5	0.15	-2.2	0.03	-0.6	0.57	-0.3	0.76	-0.3	0.76	-1.2	0.24	-0.4	0.72	0.3	0.74	0.7	0.50	-0.1	0.96
Environmentally friendly	M	0.1	0.94	-0.2	0.88	-0.2	0.83	0.1	0.90	0.0	0.99	0.8	0.44	0.0	0.98	-0.3	0.79	-0.9	0.35	-0.2	0.81	-0.2	0.88
	U	-3.2	0.00	-2.5	0.01	-2.6	0.01	-1.8	0.07	-1.3	0.20	-1.3	0.21	-2.2	0.03	-1.8	0.07	-2.0	0.05	0.1	0.92	-0.6	0.56
Freshness	M	1.9	0.06	0.9	0.36	0.7	0.51	1.0	0.32	1.5	0.13	1.6	0.12	0.9	0.35	0.4	0.72	-0.4	0.72	0.0	0.99	0.0	0.98
	U	-3.0	0.00	-2.3	0.02	-2.0	0.05	-2.6	0.01	-2.4	0.02	-2.4	0.02	-2.8	0.01	-2.7	0.01	-2.9	0.00	-0.9	0.35	-0.7	0.51
Price	M	1.4	0.17	0.6	0.54	0.5	0.60	1.6	0.12	1.7	0.09	2.0	0.04	1.1	0.26	0.4	0.68	-0.8	0.44	0.2	0.82	0.3	0.80
	U	-2.8	0.01	-2.8	0.01	-2.3	0.02	-2.5	0.01	-2.1	0.04	-2.0	0.05	-3.2	0.00	-2.3	0.02	-2.3	0.03	-0.3	0.74	-0.8	0.43
Safe to eat	M	1.2	0.24	0.9	0.38	0.6	0.58	1.2	0.22	1.4	0.16	1.9	0.07	0.9	0.35	0.4	0.66	-0.5	0.59	0.3	0.80	0.0	0.98
	U	-2.0	0.05	-2.0	0.04	-2.5	0.01	--	--	-0.8	0.43	-0.4	0.70	-1.9	0.06	-1.0	0.33	-0.9	0.39	-0.8	0.41	-0.9	0.36
Support local economy	M	0.2	0.84	0.8	0.43	-0.1	0.92	--	--	1.4	0.17	1.2	0.22	0.8	0.46	0.5	0.63	-0.3	0.78	0.6	0.53	0.1	0.89
	U	-1.9	0.07	-0.9	0.36	-1.7	0.09	-0.8	0.43	-0.2	0.84	-0.1	0.95	-1.9	0.06	-0.8	0.43	-0.9	0.37	-1.7	0.08	-1.0	0.34
Other	M	1.6	0.12	1.6	0.12	1.4	0.17	0.5	0.59	2.3	0.02	1.2	0.22	0.8	0.43	1.2	0.22	-0.5	0.61	0.9	0.38	0.3	0.76
	U	1.2	0.22	1.1	0.27	0.9	0.35	1.7	0.10	2.1	0.03	2.1	0.04	--	--	1.8	0.07	2.2	0.03	--	--	3.5	0.00
How often use re-usable shopping bags	M	-1.2	0.22	-1.2	0.24	-1.1	0.25	-0.9	0.39	-1.0	0.33	-1.6	0.12	--	--	-0.6	0.56	-1.3	0.20	--	--	-1.6	0.12
	U	0.6	0.54	0.3	0.73	0.1	0.92	--	--	1.2	0.25	1.2	0.23	--	--	0.2	0.83	0.1	0.95	2.5	0.01	3.0	0.00
How often use low flow water devices in home	M	-0.7	0.46	-0.7	0.50	-0.8	0.40	--	--	-0.6	0.54	-0.5	0.62	--	--	-0.5	0.62	-0.4	0.67	-0.7	0.47	-1.6	0.11
	U	0.6	0.54	0.3	0.73	0.1	0.92	--	--	1.2	0.25	1.2	0.23	--	--	0.2	0.83	0.1	0.95	2.5	0.01	3.0	0.00

Appendix table 2. Statistics for Balancing Tests for Pre- and Post-Matching Comparisons for Treatment 2 Using Radius Matching with a 0.1 Caliper

		Clear glass		Brown glass		Green glass		Newspaper		Magazines		Cardboard boxes		Aluminum cans		Plant containers		Plant tags		Plant waste		Food waste	
		t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value
Age	U	0.4	0.66	-0.4	0.72	-0.3	0.74	0.4	0.69	0.5	0.60	0.9	0.35	0.4	0.72	0.0	1.00	0.4	0.69	2.2	0.03	0.3	0.78
	M	0.4	0.72	0.2	0.81	0.0	0.99	0.0	0.98	-0.3	0.75	-0.5	0.64	0.2	0.81	-0.5	0.63	-1.6	0.11	-1.5	0.14	-0.3	0.76
# Adults	U	1.6	0.11	1.2	0.22	1.4	0.17	1.4	0.16	--	--	--	--	0.9	0.37	2.0	0.04	1.9	0.06	-1.2	0.25	--	--
	M	-0.9	0.36	-0.3	0.77	0.1	0.96	-0.3	0.74	--	--	--	--	-0.4	0.67	-0.5	0.61	-0.2	0.83	0.4	0.70	--	--
# Children	U	0.2	0.83	0.6	0.56	0.5	0.63	-0.4	0.69	-0.2	0.85	--	--	-0.2	0.81	0.4	0.68	0.8	0.45	-0.4	0.67	0.0	0.99
	M	-0.2	0.82	0.1	0.93	0.1	0.94	-0.6	0.58	-0.1	0.93	--	--	-0.1	0.93	-0.4	0.73	-0.5	0.62	0.2	0.81	-0.4	0.72
Income	U	2.1	0.04	1.8	0.08	1.7	0.09	2.1	0.04	1.5	0.12	1.9	0.05	2.4	0.02	1.8	0.07	2.5	0.01	1.0	0.32	1.8	0.08
	M	-1.3	0.18	-0.6	0.58	-0.4	0.66	-0.4	0.67	-0.7	0.52	-0.7	0.52	-0.9	0.38	-1.0	0.34	-1.3	0.20	-0.9	0.35	-1.2	0.23
Gender: male	U	1.0	0.33	0.5	0.64	0.8	0.44	0.7	0.46	0.8	0.41	0.1	0.92	1.0	0.33	-0.1	0.94	-0.3	0.79	0.8	0.45	-1.5	0.13
	M	-0.7	0.51	-0.6	0.53	-0.5	0.65	-0.5	0.65	-0.2	0.86	-0.2	0.87	-0.4	0.72	0.1	0.95	-0.5	0.65	-0.5	0.61	1.5	0.15
Suburb	U	-0.6	0.54	-0.6	0.56	-0.6	0.53	-0.6	0.54	-0.7	0.49	-0.8	0.42	-0.6	0.52	-2.5	0.01	-2.6	0.01	0.1	0.90	-0.9	0.35
	M	0.6	0.54	0.9	0.35	0.9	0.37	0.2	0.81	0.1	0.89	0.3	0.77	0.4	0.68	0.5	0.61	1.2	0.23	0.2	0.87	0.5	0.61
Rural	U	-1.4	0.15	-2.0	0.05	-1.3	0.20	-1.6	0.12	-1.6	0.10	-1.4	0.17	-1.5	0.13	-0.7	0.50	-0.9	0.37	-2.3	0.03	-0.5	0.59
	M	0.5	0.61	0.7	0.48	0.8	0.42	0.6	0.57	0.4	0.67	0.4	0.66	0.3	0.79	0.2	0.82	0.2	0.82	1.3	0.19	0.4	0.71
Education																							
High school or less	U	--	--	-1.9	0.06	-1.9	0.05	--	--	--	--	-2.4	0.02	-2.3	0.02	-2.5	0.02	-3.0	0.00	-1.5	0.13	-0.7	0.46
	M	--	--	0.6	0.53	0.5	0.63	--	--	--	--	0.8	0.45	0.8	0.45	1.2	0.23	2.2	0.03	1.1	0.27	-0.1	0.93
Between high school and 4-yr	U	0.4	0.69	0.7	0.49	1.0	0.35	-0.7	0.49	-0.3	0.80	0.0	0.97	0.1	0.91	1.3	0.19	1.5	0.13	0.4	0.67	-0.1	0.92
	M	0.3	0.78	0.2	0.81	0.4	0.71	0.4	0.68	0.6	0.57	0.4	0.67	0.2	0.81	0.1	0.92	0.2	0.88	0.0	0.98	0.4	0.71
Greater than 4-yr	U	-0.2	0.86	-0.3	0.79	-0.7	0.50	0.8	0.43	--	--	0.1	0.93	0.7	0.51	0.7	0.48	1.1	0.27	0.4	0.66	1.2	0.25
	M	-0.2	0.87	-0.5	0.63	-0.5	0.62	-0.1	0.91	--	--	-0.1	0.94	-0.2	0.83	-0.8	0.43	-1.4	0.18	-0.3	0.79	-0.9	0.38
Caucasian	U	-2.8	0.01	-3.3	0.00	-2.9	0.00	-2.6	0.01	-2.4	0.02	-2.3	0.02	-2.9	0.00	-1.4	0.18	-1.3	0.20	-2.8	0.01	1.0	0.32
	M	1.1	0.26	1.9	0.06	1.3	0.19	0.8	0.42	0.4	0.68	0.7	0.50	0.8	0.46	0.2	0.86	-0.2	0.86	1.7	0.09	-0.6	0.58
Purchased plants	U	1.7	0.08	1.6	0.12	1.5	0.13	1.1	0.28	0.6	0.55	1.1	0.26	2.0	0.05	1.0	0.32	1.4	0.17	-1.7	0.09	-0.2	0.82
	M	-0.3	0.77	-0.7	0.48	-0.7	0.47	-0.1	0.92	-0.4	0.72	-0.4	0.66	-0.9	0.37	-1.0	0.31	-1.7	0.09	0.6	0.58	-0.3	0.79
Heard of term eco-friendly	U	1.3	0.18	--	--	-0.8	0.43	-1.0	0.34	-1.5	0.15	--	--	--	--	-1.0	0.34	-0.7	0.46	-1.3	0.19	-0.1	0.91
	M	-0.2	0.86	--	--	-0.3	0.73	-0.1	0.89	-0.6	0.56	--	--	--	--	-0.5	0.62	-0.7	0.47	0.2	0.85	0.0	0.97
Heard of term sustainability	U	2.7	0.01	0.9	0.37	0.5	0.64	0.7	0.47	0.4	0.70	1.2	0.25	0.8	0.41	0.2	0.81	0.7	0.48	0.4	0.67	1.5	0.14
	M	-0.7	0.51	0.0	0.98	-0.3	0.75	-0.2	0.87	-0.3	0.77	-0.1	0.93	-0.5	0.59	-0.4	0.67	-0.6	0.53	-0.9	0.37	-0.7	0.47
How often purchase local	U	--	--	2.4	0.02	2.7	0.01	2.6	0.01	2.5	0.01	2.6	0.01	--	--	1.0	0.32	1.3	0.20	-0.1	0.95	-0.8	0.42
	M	--	--	-1.3	0.20	-1.2	0.22	-0.2	0.87	-0.4	0.70	-0.7	0.51	--	--	-1.1	0.27	-1.8	0.08	-0.7	0.51	0.0	0.98
For buying local, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	--	--	2.2	0.03	1.9	0.06	0.8	0.40	--	--	0.5	0.65	1.3	0.21	1.3	0.21	1.2	0.25	-0.3	0.80	0.1	0.92
	M	--	--	-1.3	0.19	-1.2	0.22	0.1	0.92	--	--	-0.3	0.80	0.0	0.99	-1.2	0.25	-0.7	0.50	0.0	0.99	-0.2	0.87

Environmentally friendly	U	--	--	1.5	0.12	1.5	0.13	--	--	-0.8	0.41	-0.8	0.43	-0.2	0.85	0.3	0.75	0.3	0.79	-0.7	0.52	-0.7	0.49
	M	--	--	-0.9	0.37	-1.1	0.27	--	--	-0.5	0.59	-0.3	0.76	0.0	0.99	-0.5	0.59	0.0	0.99	0.1	0.91	0.1	0.89
Freshness	U	2.3	0.02	2.3	0.02	1.6	0.10	0.8	0.42	0.9	0.36	0.9	0.37	--	--	0.9	0.35	1.3	0.19	0.1	0.94	1.7	0.09
	M	-0.4	0.67	-1.4	0.16	-1.3	0.21	-0.8	0.43	-1.2	0.22	-0.7	0.48	--	--	-1.0	0.33	-1.9	0.06	-0.2	0.83	-1.2	0.23
Price	U	1.5	0.14	2.5	0.01	1.9	0.06	1.3	0.21	1.3	0.21	--	--	--	--	2.0	0.05	2.1	0.04	3.2	0.00	2.6	0.01
	M	-0.4	0.73	-1.3	0.21	-1.0	0.31	-0.9	0.35	-0.7	0.46	--	--	--	--	-1.5	0.14	-1.6	0.11	-1.7	0.09	-1.3	0.21
Safe to eat	U	1.5	0.13	1.7	0.10	1.4	0.16	--	--	0.0	0.97	0.0	0.98	0.5	0.60	0.1	0.92	0.4	0.67	-0.3	0.77	0.6	0.57
	M	0.3	0.76	-0.8	0.45	-0.7	0.49	--	--	-0.4	0.70	-0.2	0.81	-0.2	0.87	-0.7	0.52	-1.2	0.24	0.2	0.86	-0.7	0.52
Support local economy	U	1.0	0.30	2.0	0.05	1.8	0.08	0.0	0.97	0.1	0.95	-0.2	0.87	0.7	0.50	1.3	0.19	1.4	0.16	0.5	0.61	1.9	0.05
	M	0.3	0.73	-0.5	0.62	-0.5	0.62	0.1	0.95	-0.3	0.79	0.0	0.99	0.3	0.79	-0.9	0.37	-1.7	0.09	-0.7	0.50	-0.7	0.47
Other	U	0.7	0.50	1.2	0.24	1.3	0.20	0.7	0.50	--	--	0.3	0.76	--	--	1.0	0.35	0.5	0.61	0.6	0.55	0.7	0.48
	M	-0.6	0.53	-0.5	0.59	-0.6	0.53	-0.6	0.55	--	--	-0.4	0.71	--	--	-1.0	0.33	-0.3	0.75	-0.7	0.49	-0.1	0.95
How often purchase organic	U	3.0	0.00	3.3	0.00	3.1	0.00	2.1	0.04	1.6	0.11	--	--	2.4	0.02	1.6	0.12	1.5	0.14	0.7	0.51	0.7	0.48
	M	-1.2	0.22	-1.8	0.08	-1.9	0.06	-0.7	0.51	-0.7	0.49	--	--	-0.7	0.49	-1.6	0.11	-2.0	0.05	-0.6	0.52	-0.6	0.56
For buying organic, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	0.8	0.43	1.3	0.21	1.1	0.26	-0.2	0.87	-0.5	0.63	--	--	--	--	0.3	0.76	0.2	0.81	-1.2	0.25	0.2	0.83
	M	-0.2	0.88	-1.3	0.20	-1.3	0.18	0.0	0.97	0.1	0.92	--	--	--	--	-0.9	0.40	-0.6	0.54	0.7	0.51	-0.3	0.76
Environmentally friendly	U	1.2	0.23	1.8	0.08	1.7	0.10	0.1	0.95	-0.2	0.82	0.0	0.98	0.6	0.56	0.4	0.70	0.4	0.68	-0.9	0.36	0.3	0.74
	M	-0.3	0.74	-1.3	0.21	-1.3	0.19	0.0	0.99	0.0	0.99	-0.3	0.76	-0.2	0.85	-0.8	0.45	-0.4	0.68	0.4	0.70	-0.3	0.74
Freshness	U	2.4	0.02	2.5	0.02	2.1	0.04	0.6	0.57	0.3	0.81	0.4	0.73	1.1	0.27	-0.5	0.63	0.1	0.89	-1.2	0.22	0.4	0.72
	M	-0.3	0.77	-0.8	0.43	-0.8	0.44	-0.2	0.81	-0.3	0.74	-0.2	0.86	-0.2	0.81	0.0	0.98	-0.5	0.61	0.6	0.53	-0.6	0.58
Price	U	1.1	0.29	1.3	0.20	1.1	0.29	0.7	0.49	0.6	0.54	0.7	0.48	--	--	-0.3	0.74	0.4	0.71	0.0	1.00	0.3	0.76
	M	0.2	0.81	-0.4	0.68	-0.3	0.76	-0.3	0.80	-0.2	0.87	-0.2	0.82	--	--	0.0	0.97	-0.9	0.39	0.1	0.91	0.3	0.75
Safe to eat	U	1.6	0.11	2.3	0.02	2.0	0.05	0.8	0.44	0.7	0.49	0.4	0.69	1.2	0.23	0.3	0.79	0.9	0.37	-0.3	0.75	1.1	0.27
	M	-0.2	0.87	-1.3	0.21	-1.1	0.27	-0.3	0.79	-0.3	0.81	-0.2	0.82	-0.5	0.65	-0.7	0.48	-1.3	0.19	0.0	0.98	-1.0	0.34
Support local economy	U	1.5	0.15	2.3	0.02	1.9	0.06	-0.2	0.83	0.1	0.92	-0.2	0.87	--	--	0.4	0.73	0.7	0.50	-0.4	0.69	-0.2	0.85
	M	-0.1	0.96	-0.7	0.50	-0.6	0.57	0.3	0.79	0.1	0.89	0.1	0.94	--	--	-0.9	0.37	-1.3	0.21	0.4	0.70	-0.3	0.74
Other	U	0.4	0.69	0.3	0.80	0.4	0.67	0.1	0.90	0.1	0.93	-0.5	0.62	--	--	-0.3	0.75	-0.9	0.35	0.4	0.73	0.1	0.95
	M	-0.5	0.59	-0.3	0.80	-0.5	0.64	-0.2	0.83	0.0	0.99	-0.1	0.91	--	--	-0.4	0.69	0.3	0.80	-0.7	0.48	0.4	0.70
How often use re-usable shopping bags	U	1.7	0.09	2.0	0.05	1.8	0.07	1.8	0.07	1.0	0.30	1.4	0.16	2.1	0.04	0.6	0.52	0.9	0.35	--	--	0.8	0.45
	M	-0.6	0.53	-1.0	0.31	-1.2	0.23	-1.0	0.32	-0.7	0.47	-0.6	0.58	-0.9	0.37	-0.8	0.43	-0.6	0.56	--	--	-0.5	0.62
How often use low flow water devices in home	U	1.7	0.10	1.6	0.10	1.9	0.06	1.3	0.21	1.2	0.24	1.7	0.10	--	--	0.2	0.81	-0.4	0.72	1.3	0.18	0.1	0.89
	M	-0.2	0.82	-1.2	0.24	-0.9	0.37	-1.0	0.32	-0.7	0.46	-0.7	0.49	--	--	-0.9	0.38	-1.3	0.21	-1.1	0.29	-0.1	0.92

Appendix table 3. Statistics for Balancing Tests for Pre- and Post-Matching Comparisons for Treatment 3 Using Radius Matching with a 0.1 Caliper

		Clear glass		Brown glass		Green glass		Newspaper		Magazines		Cardboard boxes		Aluminum cans		Plant containers		Plant tags		Plant waste		Food waste	
		t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value
Age	U	-1.2	0.25	-0.6	0.52	-1.4	0.17	-0.1	0.91	-0.8	0.41	-0.3	0.77	-0.2	0.83	-1.5	0.14	-1.7	0.08	-1.3	0.21	-2.7	0.01
	M	-0.1	0.92	0.5	0.63	-0.5	0.60	0.5	0.65	1.2	0.25	0.3	0.80	-0.4	0.69	1.3	0.19	1.9	0.06	0.8	0.45	0.9	0.38
# Adults	U	0.7	0.49	1.1	0.27	--	--	1.1	0.29	1.0	0.30	1.9	0.07	1.3	0.21	0.5	0.60	0.3	0.79	3.9	0.00	2.7	0.01
	M	-0.5	0.63	-1.4	0.16	--	--	-0.8	0.43	-1.1	0.29	-0.8	0.40	-1.0	0.34	-1.7	0.09	-2.4	0.02	-2.6	0.01	-0.7	0.47
# Children	U	-1.1	0.27	-0.3	0.73	-0.8	0.41	0.9	0.39	0.8	0.42	1.0	0.33	0.2	0.87	0.0	0.99	-0.5	0.60	1.4	0.16	1.5	0.15
	M	0.6	0.56	0.9	0.39	1.1	0.26	-0.7	0.47	-0.8	0.41	-0.4	0.69	0.1	0.90	-0.2	0.86	-0.7	0.46	-1.3	0.19	-0.7	0.47
Income	U	3.4	0.00	4.5	0.00	3.2	0.00	4.0	0.00	4.2	0.00	4.4	0.00	3.6	0.00	2.9	0.00	2.5	0.01	5.6	0.00	0.9	0.36
	M	-2.1	0.03	-3.0	0.00	-3.3	0.00	-3.2	0.00	-2.8	0.01	-2.3	0.02	-2.0	0.05	-3.2	0.00	-3.7	0.00	-3.8	0.00	-0.5	0.59
Gender: male	U	0.3	0.75	1.9	0.06	1.4	0.18	-0.7	0.52	-0.6	0.54	-0.2	0.83	-0.8	0.44	1.1	0.25	1.6	0.11	1.4	0.17	4.5	0.00
	M	-0.3	0.74	-1.1	0.30	-0.4	0.71	-0.3	0.76	0.0	0.97	-0.6	0.57	-0.2	0.86	-0.7	0.47	-0.7	0.51	-1.5	0.15	-2.2	0.03
Suburb	U	3.9	0.00	4.8	0.00	4.2	0.00	5.1	0.00	5.2	0.00	5.1	0.00	6.0	0.00	5.8	0.00	6.0	0.00	3.5	0.00	2.0	0.04
	M	-3.8	0.00	-3.5	0.00	-3.6	0.00	-4.6	0.00	-4.4	0.00	-3.8	0.00	-4.1	0.00	-4.0	0.00	-5.3	0.00	-1.5	0.13	-0.6	0.55
Rural	U	-5.7	0.00	-6.0	0.00	-5.9	0.00	-6.8	0.00	-7.0	0.00	-7.3	0.00	-7.8	0.00	-6.3	0.00	-6.5	0.00	-3.6	0.00	-2.6	0.01
	M	4.9	0.00	5.0	0.00	5.0	0.00	5.9	0.00	5.8	0.00	5.8	0.00	5.4	0.00	5.0	0.00	6.0	0.00	1.7	0.08	0.5	0.61
Education																							
High school or less	U	-1.5	0.15	-1.8	0.07	-1.8	0.07	-2.5	0.01	-1.9	0.06	-1.4	0.16	-1.8	0.07	-0.1	0.96	-0.6	0.53	-3.1	0.00	-1.1	0.29
	M	1.3	0.21	1.1	0.28	1.4	0.16	2.1	0.04	1.7	0.10	1.6	0.12	0.8	0.45	1.8	0.08	2.0	0.05	1.7	0.08	0.7	0.47
Between high school and 4-yr	U	0.1	0.90	-0.7	0.50	-0.2	0.86	1.0	0.31	-0.1	0.94	-0.6	0.57	-1.0	0.31	-0.3	0.81	-0.2	0.85	0.4	0.66	0.3	0.78
	M	0.7	0.46	0.6	0.58	0.1	0.90	-0.1	0.91	-0.2	0.85	-0.6	0.53	0.6	0.59	-0.6	0.58	-0.3	0.78	-0.5	0.59	-0.4	0.68
Greater than 4-yr	U	0.2	0.82	1.5	0.14	1.3	0.19	1.6	0.12	2.3	0.02	1.8	0.08	1.4	0.15	-0.1	0.89	0.0	0.97	1.4	0.15	-0.6	0.57
	M	-1.1	0.27	-1.4	0.16	-1.0	0.35	-0.9	0.36	-0.5	0.60	-0.6	0.57	-0.8	0.44	-0.8	0.43	-1.0	0.34	-0.7	0.48	-0.4	0.72
Caucasian	U	0.3	0.74	--	--	0.0	0.97	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1.1	0.27	-1.0	0.33	0.9	0.38	1.0	0.31	3.4	0.00
	M	0.3	0.77	--	--	-0.6	0.54	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.4	0.67	1.0	0.31	-2.1	0.04	-0.6	0.55	-1.1	0.28
Purchased plants	U	0.0	1.00	0.0	0.98	-0.5	0.61	--	--	1.2	0.24	0.6	0.54	0.3	0.74	1.0	0.31	1.7	0.08	7.6	0.00	-1.2	0.23
	M	-0.5	0.64	0.0	0.98	-0.5	0.61	--	--	-0.5	0.63	-1.0	0.31	0.2	0.84	-1.7	0.10	-1.0	0.31	-5.4	0.00	0.5	0.60
Heard of term eco-friendly	U	1.4	0.16	1.7	0.09	2.9	0.00	2.1	0.04	2.1	0.04	2.6	0.01	3.2	0.00	1.9	0.06	0.1	0.89	2.7	0.01	0.1	0.89
	M	-0.9	0.39	-1.9	0.06	-1.4	0.17	-0.2	0.85	-0.8	0.45	-2.1	0.04	-1.9	0.06	-0.7	0.51	-1.1	0.28	-1.9	0.06	-1.1	0.26
Heard of term sustainability	U	0.8	0.41	2.2	0.03	2.0	0.05	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.4	0.67	0.0	0.98	-1.4	0.17	3.7	0.00	4.3	0.00
	M	-1.9	0.06	-1.4	0.15	-1.6	0.12	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1.2	0.23	-0.6	0.56	-1.3	0.19	-3.6	0.00	-2.5	0.01
How often purchase local	U	-1.8	0.07	-0.5	0.59	-2.9	0.00	-0.9	0.38	-0.7	0.52	-1.1	0.27	-1.7	0.08	-1.0	0.31	1.6	0.12	4.9	0.00	3.9	0.00
	M	0.5	0.65	0.3	0.76	-0.2	0.87	0.2	0.84	-0.1	0.96	0.2	0.87	0.5	0.61	-1.3	0.20	-0.4	0.68	-3.3	0.00	-0.8	0.43
For buying local, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	1.2	0.22	0.2	0.83	0.3	0.77	1.3	0.21	1.8	0.07	1.4	0.15	0.4	0.66	1.6	0.11	1.3	0.19	3.9	0.00	2.5	0.01
	M	-0.3	0.78	-0.4	0.70	0.0	0.97	-0.4	0.68	-0.5	0.63	-0.2	0.87	-0.3	0.80	-0.9	0.39	-1.3	0.21	-2.2	0.03	-0.3	0.79

Environmentally friendly	U	0.4	0.69	0.0	0.97	-0.5	0.60	2.0	0.05	3.0	0.00	2.3	0.02	1.0	0.32	1.6	0.11	-1.3	0.19	4.0	0.00	-2.5	0.01
	M	0.2	0.87	-0.1	0.93	0.4	0.71	-0.2	0.84	-0.3	0.78	-1.0	0.35	-0.9	0.39	-1.2	0.22	-0.4	0.70	-2.5	0.01	2.0	0.04
Freshness	U	-0.6	0.58	-1.4	0.17	-0.9	0.35	2.4	0.02	0.7	0.49	0.4	0.73	-0.4	0.68	0.0	0.97	-3.2	0.00	2.8	0.01	-4.3	0.00
	M	0.7	0.47	0.2	0.81	0.0	0.99	0.5	0.60	0.3	0.74	-0.4	0.73	0.0	0.97	-0.1	0.93	0.4	0.67	-2.4	0.02	1.8	0.07
Price	U	-1.2	0.23	--	--	-1.2	0.25	-0.6	0.53	-1.3	0.20	-1.6	0.11	-1.5	0.13	--	--	-1.2	0.24	-3.3	0.00	-2.1	0.04
	M	1.4	0.16	--	--	0.9	0.36	1.1	0.28	1.3	0.18	1.1	0.29	1.0	0.34	--	--	-0.6	0.54	1.8	0.07	1.7	0.09
Safe to eat	U	-1.5	0.14	-2.3	0.02	-1.7	0.09	0.8	0.42	-0.3	0.74	-0.5	0.61	-1.1	0.26	--	--	-0.2	0.87	0.8	0.42	-1.1	0.26
	M	1.4	0.18	0.5	0.62	1.0	0.32	1.1	0.26	0.8	0.43	0.1	0.94	0.7	0.51	--	--	0.0	0.98	-1.0	0.33	0.7	0.46
Support local economy	U	-0.1	0.95	-0.8	0.44	--	--	1.7	0.09	0.8	0.41	0.7	0.47	-0.7	0.51	-0.1	0.96	-0.9	0.38	2.1	0.04	0.8	0.44
	M	0.7	0.50	0.4	0.68	--	--	0.4	0.73	0.4	0.72	0.5	0.64	0.1	0.94	0.1	0.96	-0.1	0.90	-1.2	0.23	-0.2	0.84
Other	U	-0.9	0.39	-0.9	0.37	-1.8	0.08	-1.1	0.28	-0.5	0.65	-0.9	0.39	-1.7	0.09	-0.7	0.47	1.7	0.10	-0.2	0.84	6.0	0.00
	M	1.0	0.31	0.6	0.58	0.7	0.50	1.0	0.32	1.1	0.29	0.7	0.52	0.4	0.68	0.1	0.92	-2.7	0.01	0.7	0.50	-0.7	0.46
How often purchase organic	U	0.6	0.58	1.2	0.23	-0.4	0.70	1.7	0.10	2.7	0.01	2.0	0.05	1.6	0.10	1.7	0.09	2.4	0.02	6.6	0.00	3.7	0.00
	M	-1.1	0.26	-1.3	0.19	-1.4	0.15	-0.7	0.47	-1.5	0.15	-1.6	0.10	-0.6	0.52	-2.5	0.01	-1.7	0.10	-4.2	0.00	-0.9	0.37
For buying organic, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	1.5	0.15	1.3	0.20	0.4	0.69	1.9	0.06	2.8	0.01	--	--	1.6	0.12	2.7	0.01	1.6	0.11	4.4	0.00	2.2	0.03
	M	-0.8	0.41	-0.9	0.39	-0.6	0.55	-1.4	0.17	-1.7	0.10	--	--	-0.9	0.37	-1.8	0.08	-1.7	0.10	-2.9	0.00	-0.1	0.89
Environmentally friendly	U	0.1	0.96	0.2	0.84	-0.6	0.56	1.3	0.19	2.1	0.04	2.0	0.05	0.6	0.52	0.9	0.39	0.0	0.99	3.9	0.00	0.1	0.90
	M	-0.6	0.55	-0.3	0.75	-0.3	0.75	-0.5	0.63	-0.6	0.54	-0.3	0.75	-0.5	0.61	-1.8	0.07	-2.2	0.03	-2.3	0.02	0.9	0.39
Freshness	U	-0.8	0.41	-1.9	0.06	-1.4	0.16	1.0	0.32	1.0	0.31	0.9	0.35	0.4	0.73	-0.7	0.46	--	--	3.5	0.00	-1.7	0.10
	M	0.1	0.89	0.1	0.95	0.1	0.89	0.9	0.38	0.4	0.67	0.0	1.00	0.9	0.39	-0.4	0.70	--	--	-2.8	0.01	0.6	0.54
Price	U	-0.6	0.56	-1.2	0.23	-1.1	0.29	-1.3	0.19	-1.6	0.12	-1.4	0.17	-0.6	0.52	--	--	-1.1	0.25	0.4	0.71	-1.3	0.18
	M	0.8	0.45	0.4	0.68	0.3	0.76	1.3	0.20	0.8	0.41	0.3	0.77	1.2	0.22	--	--	0.0	1.00	-1.2	0.24	1.3	0.20
Safe to eat	U	-1.2	0.23	-2.0	0.04	-1.4	0.17	-0.3	0.78	-0.5	0.64	-0.4	0.67	-0.7	0.48	-0.7	0.48	-1.8	0.08	2.1	0.04	1.8	0.08
	M	0.2	0.85	0.1	0.90	0.4	0.69	1.1	0.29	0.8	0.41	0.3	0.77	1.1	0.30	-0.2	0.87	-0.6	0.56	-2.1	0.04	-0.3	0.80
Support local economy	U	-0.6	0.57	-1.2	0.25	-1.4	0.16	0.2	0.83	0.1	0.96	0.9	0.38	-0.1	0.92	1.8	0.08	1.2	0.24	1.7	0.09	1.1	0.26
	M	0.7	0.52	0.5	0.59	0.2	0.85	0.2	0.88	0.1	0.92	0.0	0.98	0.3	0.79	-1.7	0.09	-1.0	0.31	-1.4	0.17	-0.4	0.70
Other	U	0.1	0.92	0.8	0.41	--	--	-0.2	0.85	-0.1	0.90	-0.5	0.60	-0.8	0.44	1.8	0.07	1.6	0.12	0.7	0.50	2.3	0.02
	M	0.5	0.65	-0.2	0.84	--	--	0.6	0.53	0.7	0.48	0.3	0.79	-0.1	0.94	-1.1	0.30	-1.1	0.28	-0.1	0.93	-1.0	0.30
How often use re-usable shopping bags	U	3.8	0.00	3.3	0.00	2.4	0.02	4.1	0.00	4.7	0.00	4.3	0.00	4.2	0.00	4.3	0.00	3.4	0.00	--	--	--	--
	M	-2.6	0.01	-3.5	0.00	-3.2	0.00	-2.6	0.01	-3.4	0.00	-3.7	0.00	-2.7	0.01	-3.3	0.00	-3.6	0.00	--	--	--	--
How often use low flow water devices in home	U	1.5	0.14	1.7	0.08	0.6	0.57	2.5	0.01	2.8	0.01	2.0	0.05	2.1	0.03	2.5	0.01	2.6	0.01	5.2	0.00	4.1	0.00
	M	-1.1	0.26	-1.2	0.23	-1.6	0.11	-0.8	0.43	-1.3	0.18	-2.6	0.01	-1.6	0.11	-2.6	0.01	-1.9	0.06	-3.7	0.00	-2.1	0.03

Appendix table 4. Statistics for Balancing Tests for Pre- and Post-Matching Comparisons for Treatment 4 Using Radius Matching with a 0.1 Caliper

		Clear glass		Brown glass		Green glass		Newspaper		Magazines		Cardboard boxes		Aluminum cans		Plant containers		Plant tags		Plant waste		Food waste	
		t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value
Age	U	1.8	0.07	0.8	0.43	0.7	0.52	2.6	0.01	2.5	0.01	3.2	0.00	--	--	1.1	0.26	1.3	0.21	2.7	0.01	-1.9	0.06
	M	-0.2	0.82	-0.4	0.67	-0.5	0.62	-1.1	0.27	-1.2	0.25	-1.2	0.24	--	--	-1.3	0.20	-1.0	0.33	-2.4	0.02	0.8	0.45
# Adults	U	-0.2	0.82	0.2	0.88	-0.2	0.82	0.2	0.84	0.4	0.71	-0.3	0.79	-0.2	0.83	1.0	0.33	1.3	0.21	-0.5	0.59	1.2	0.22
	M	0.5	0.65	-0.4	0.66	-0.3	0.79	0.1	0.91	0.5	0.66	-0.1	0.90	-0.8	0.43	0.4	0.69	-0.3	0.79	0.5	0.64	-0.8	0.45
# Children	U	0.2	0.88	0.7	0.50	0.7	0.47	0.3	0.80	1.1	0.26	0.7	0.47	0.5	0.63	1.3	0.20	1.8	0.08	1.4	0.17	1.8	0.07
	M	0.6	0.56	-0.4	0.71	0.3	0.80	0.0	1.00	0.3	0.78	-0.3	0.73	0.1	0.89	0.6	0.57	-0.5	0.61	-1.0	0.31	-1.4	0.16
Income	U	1.1	0.29	1.1	0.29	1.2	0.24	1.5	0.14	1.2	0.23	1.3	0.19	1.4	0.15	0.8	0.44	1.9	0.06	2.7	0.01	1.1	0.26
	M	-2.0	0.05	-0.5	0.62	-0.8	0.45	-0.7	0.52	-0.4	0.71	-0.4	0.68	-1.4	0.17	-0.8	0.44	-1.1	0.26	-2.0	0.04	-1.4	0.17
Gender: male	U	-0.2	0.83	0.5	0.65	0.5	0.59	-2.0	0.05	-1.3	0.21	-2.8	0.01	-1.2	0.23	-1.0	0.34	-0.6	0.54	1.6	0.11	1.2	0.22
	M	-0.5	0.59	-0.4	0.72	0.0	0.99	0.4	0.68	0.5	0.63	1.3	0.20	1.1	0.26	0.8	0.42	0.1	0.95	-1.3	0.18	-0.4	0.67
Suburb	U	1.2	0.22	1.4	0.16	1.0	0.32	1.9	0.06	1.6	0.10	1.1	0.29	2.4	0.02	0.3	0.80	0.3	0.76	2.4	0.02	0.0	1.00
	M	-0.1	0.96	-0.5	0.66	-0.2	0.83	-0.8	0.45	-0.9	0.35	-0.2	0.86	-0.6	0.57	-0.9	0.37	-0.2	0.87	-1.6	0.11	0.4	0.69
Rural	U	-2.1	0.03	-2.8	0.01	-1.7	0.09	-2.7	0.01	-2.9	0.00	-2.7	0.01	-3.0	0.00	-2.6	0.01	-2.8	0.01	-3.2	0.00	-0.9	0.37
	M	0.6	0.54	0.7	0.51	0.6	0.56	0.6	0.57	0.9	0.39	0.2	0.81	0.8	0.42	1.3	0.21	0.5	0.62	2.1	0.03	0.3	0.78
Education																							
High school or less	U	-1.6	0.11	-1.8	0.07	-1.6	0.11	-1.3	0.20	-1.8	0.08	-1.9	0.06	-0.5	0.61	-1.7	0.09	-2.7	0.01	-1.9	0.06	0.3	0.75
	M	1.0	0.33	0.8	0.44	0.7	0.49	-0.4	0.71	0.2	0.82	0.0	0.97	0.2	0.81	1.0	0.33	0.9	0.38	1.5	0.14	0.1	0.93
Between high school and 4-yr	U	0.2	0.82	1.1	0.29	--	--	-0.9	0.35	-1.0	0.34	-0.4	0.67	1.2	0.23	0.2	0.85	0.0	1.00	0.8	0.45	-0.2	0.87
	M	0.3	0.76	-0.1	0.94	--	--	0.5	0.65	0.1	0.94	-0.4	0.68	-0.6	0.54	-0.1	0.94	0.8	0.40	-0.8	0.45	0.3	0.80
Greater than 4-yr	U	0.9	0.39	0.8	0.41	--	--	0.2	0.82	0.7	0.50	0.1	0.93	--	--	0.6	0.56	1.9	0.06	1.3	0.21	0.8	0.44
	M	-1.1	0.29	-0.8	0.43	--	--	-0.5	0.61	-0.9	0.35	-0.1	0.95	--	--	-0.5	0.59	-0.5	0.62	-1.4	0.16	-0.8	0.42
Caucasian	U	-0.1	0.89	-0.6	0.54	0.2	0.83	0.8	0.43	0.7	0.46	1.1	0.28	-0.8	0.43	0.5	0.59	1.1	0.28	-1.2	0.23	0.2	0.83
	M	0.4	0.67	-0.1	0.96	0.3	0.76	-0.4	0.66	-0.4	0.71	-0.4	0.66	0.1	0.95	-0.2	0.85	-0.7	0.46	0.9	0.37	-0.1	0.92
Purchased plants	U	1.0	0.33	1.0	0.34	0.7	0.52	0.0	0.98	-0.2	0.87	-0.2	0.81	1.8	0.07	--	--	0.7	0.48	2.6	0.01	1.7	0.09
	M	-1.9	0.07	0.0	1.00	-0.5	0.62	-0.8	0.45	-0.5	0.65	-0.6	0.54	-1.9	0.06	--	--	-1.0	0.31	-2.0	0.05	-0.7	0.50
Heard of term eco-friendly	U	3.0	0.00	2.3	0.02	--	--	2.3	0.02	1.7	0.09	1.9	0.06	2.3	0.02	1.4	0.18	1.4	0.16	2.1	0.04	-0.3	0.74
	M	-3.3	0.00	-1.1	0.29	--	--	-1.5	0.13	-1.0	0.33	-1.4	0.16	-1.4	0.16	-1.5	0.13	-1.0	0.31	-0.4	0.67	0.7	0.50
Heard of term sustainability	U	2.5	0.01	2.2	0.03	1.4	0.18	1.6	0.11	1.7	0.10	1.9	0.06	2.2	0.03	1.0	0.33	1.5	0.12	3.4	0.00	1.6	0.11
	M	-2.2	0.03	-0.4	0.70	-1.2	0.22	-0.6	0.56	-0.7	0.49	-0.2	0.84	-1.7	0.09	-0.6	0.52	-0.9	0.36	-2.1	0.03	-0.7	0.50
How often purchase local	U	2.0	0.05	3.1	0.00	2.5	0.01	1.7	0.08	2.6	0.01	1.9	0.06	1.7	0.09	--	--	1.4	0.17	2.7	0.01	1.8	0.07
	M	-1.9	0.06	-0.7	0.50	-1.3	0.21	-1.2	0.24	-1.4	0.16	-1.7	0.10	-1.0	0.33	--	--	-1.2	0.24	-2.0	0.04	-1.0	0.33
For buying local, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	2.8	0.01	4.6	0.00	3.4	0.00	1.9	0.06	2.1	0.04	1.4	0.15	2.2	0.03	--	--	2.5	0.02	2.3	0.02	3.0	0.00
	M	-2.4	0.02	-1.7	0.10	-1.8	0.07	-0.9	0.36	-0.9	0.37	-1.1	0.29	-1.8	0.07	--	--	-1.3	0.21	-1.4	0.17	-1.2	0.24

Environmentally friendly	U	2.9	0.00	3.5	0.00	3.0	0.00	2.4	0.02	2.2	0.03	1.6	0.11	2.2	0.03	2.5	0.01	2.0	0.04	2.9	0.01	1.6	0.10
	M	-2.4	0.02	-1.8	0.08	-2.1	0.04	-0.7	0.47	-1.3	0.21	-1.2	0.23	-1.3	0.18	-1.8	0.08	-1.9	0.06	-2.1	0.03	-0.5	0.62
Freshness	U	5.1	0.00	4.2	0.00	3.7	0.00	3.8	0.00	3.6	0.00	2.9	0.00	4.2	0.00	1.9	0.05	2.2	0.03	2.3	0.02	0.3	0.77
	M	-3.5	0.00	-1.9	0.05	-1.5	0.13	-2.0	0.04	-1.9	0.06	-2.6	0.01	-2.6	0.01	-2.5	0.01	-2.4	0.02	-1.6	0.12	0.3	0.80
Price	U	2.2	0.03	2.8	0.01	1.9	0.06	2.0	0.04	1.7	0.10	3.0	0.00	3.9	0.00	2.7	0.01	1.7	0.09	2.5	0.01	0.0	0.98
	M	-0.7	0.51	-1.3	0.21	-1.0	0.34	-1.6	0.12	-1.8	0.07	-2.3	0.03	-2.7	0.01	-1.6	0.10	-0.5	0.65	-2.1	0.04	-0.3	0.79
Safe to eat	U	3.5	0.00	3.4	0.00	2.9	0.00	2.9	0.00	1.8	0.07	2.0	0.04	3.3	0.00	2.0	0.05	1.6	0.10	0.6	0.53	-0.7	0.50
	M	-1.8	0.07	-1.2	0.23	-1.2	0.25	-1.0	0.31	-1.1	0.29	-1.7	0.09	-1.7	0.09	-1.7	0.09	-1.2	0.22	-0.1	0.94	0.9	0.39
Support local economy	U	4.3	0.00	4.7	0.00	4.3	0.00	3.6	0.00	3.8	0.00	2.8	0.01	4.0	0.00	3.3	0.00	3.3	0.00	3.4	0.00	2.2	0.03
	M	-2.5	0.01	-1.3	0.21	-1.0	0.30	-1.3	0.21	-1.5	0.13	-1.5	0.13	-1.7	0.09	-2.2	0.03	-1.8	0.08	-2.7	0.01	-0.9	0.37
Other	U	1.8	0.08	1.7	0.09	1.3	0.20	--	--	--	--	-0.7	0.49	1.2	0.23	0.6	0.54	0.4	0.67	0.9	0.39	1.6	0.11
	M	-2.6	0.01	-1.9	0.05	-1.9	0.06	--	--	--	--	-0.7	0.46	-1.5	0.14	-1.5	0.14	-1.3	0.20	-0.6	0.54	-0.8	0.40
How often purchase organic	U	1.3	0.20	2.5	0.01	1.7	0.09	-0.1	0.91	0.1	0.93	0.0	0.98	1.0	0.33	0.9	0.37	0.6	0.56	3.4	0.00	4.4	0.00
	M	-2.0	0.04	-1.5	0.13	-1.5	0.13	-0.6	0.52	-0.7	0.48	-0.7	0.52	-0.8	0.40	-0.5	0.60	-0.7	0.47	-2.3	0.02	-2.4	0.02
For buying organic, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	2.8	0.01	4.0	0.00	2.8	0.01	1.8	0.07	1.8	0.07	1.6	0.11	2.3	0.02	2.4	0.02	1.7	0.10	1.8	0.07	3.5	0.00
	M	-1.7	0.09	-1.5	0.14	-1.6	0.12	-0.9	0.37	-1.5	0.14	-1.3	0.20	-1.4	0.16	-1.2	0.24	-1.2	0.24	-1.3	0.20	-1.4	0.18
Environmentally friendly	U	2.2	0.03	2.7	0.01	2.9	0.00	1.5	0.13	1.5	0.13	1.6	0.11	2.0	0.04	1.9	0.06	1.1	0.27	1.6	0.12	2.3	0.02
	M	-1.7	0.09	-0.4	0.72	-0.7	0.48	-0.3	0.78	-0.6	0.54	-0.6	0.52	-1.0	0.33	-0.4	0.71	-1.0	0.33	-1.3	0.20	-0.7	0.51
Freshness	U	4.4	0.00	2.9	0.00	3.1	0.00	3.0	0.00	2.2	0.03	2.1	0.03	3.4	0.00	1.9	0.05	1.9	0.06	1.3	0.19	0.8	0.43
	M	-3.1	0.00	-1.6	0.12	-1.8	0.07	-0.9	0.37	-1.3	0.18	-1.2	0.25	-2.3	0.02	-0.7	0.47	-1.5	0.14	-1.2	0.24	0.1	0.95
Price	U	3.5	0.00	2.4	0.02	2.1	0.03	2.4	0.02	2.0	0.05	2.1	0.04	3.2	0.00	1.9	0.06	2.3	0.02	1.1	0.29	-0.7	0.51
	M	-1.8	0.07	-1.0	0.34	-1.0	0.31	-1.2	0.23	-1.5	0.15	-1.2	0.24	-2.0	0.04	-0.6	0.57	-1.0	0.34	-0.6	0.53	0.8	0.41
Safe to eat	U	3.1	0.00	3.1	0.00	2.8	0.01	3.1	0.00	2.4	0.02	2.0	0.04	3.8	0.00	1.9	0.06	--	--	1.5	0.14	0.6	0.54
	M	-2.6	0.01	-1.6	0.11	-1.7	0.09	-1.0	0.32	-1.3	0.19	-1.3	0.19	-2.2	0.03	-0.6	0.55	--	--	-1.2	0.24	0.2	0.88
Support local economy	U	2.6	0.01	2.9	0.00	2.9	0.00	0.9	0.36	1.0	0.34	0.9	0.38	2.4	0.02	2.4	0.02	--	--	1.6	0.12	1.8	0.08
	M	-1.9	0.06	-0.8	0.44	-0.7	0.51	-0.3	0.80	-1.3	0.20	-0.8	0.45	-1.4	0.16	-1.3	0.20	--	--	-1.5	0.14	-0.8	0.45
Other	U	2.4	0.02	1.7	0.08	2.0	0.05	--	--	--	--	-0.6	0.58	1.8	0.07	1.8	0.08	--	--	2.3	0.02	1.6	0.11
	M	-2.1	0.04	-1.3	0.20	-1.3	0.18	--	--	--	--	-0.4	0.71	-1.2	0.23	-1.6	0.11	--	--	-1.7	0.09	-0.6	0.56
How often use re-usable shopping bags	U	--	--	2.3	0.02	--	--	2.0	0.05	1.3	0.20	1.4	0.17	3.0	0.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	M	--	--	-0.6	0.55	--	--	-1.3	0.21	-0.7	0.49	-0.7	0.48	-1.6	0.11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
How often use low flow water devices in home	U	1.2	0.22	1.9	0.06	1.5	0.14	0.9	0.35	1.2	0.25	0.9	0.35	2.7	0.01	--	--	--	--	3.2	0.00	1.9	0.06
	M	-1.3	0.20	-0.8	0.45	-0.7	0.49	-1.1	0.25	-1.3	0.19	-1.1	0.27	-1.4	0.16	--	--	--	--	-2.3	0.02	-0.5	0.65

Appendix table 5. Statistics for Balancing Tests for Pre- and Post-Matching Comparisons for Treatment 5 Using Radius Matching with a 0.1 Caliper

		Clear glass		Brown glass		Green glass		Newspaper		Magazines		Cardboard boxes		Aluminum cans		Plant containers		Plant tags		Plant waste		Food waste	
		t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value
Age	U	--	--	3.2	0.00	3.2	0.00	2.3	0.02	2.7	0.01	1.6	0.12	2.0	0.04	2.1	0.04	2.7	0.01	-0.1	0.89	0.8	0.44
	M	--	--	-0.1	0.89	-0.3	0.77	-0.6	0.56	-1.2	0.23	-0.9	0.36	-0.3	0.77	-0.7	0.47	-1.2	0.22	-0.3	0.77	-0.8	0.41
# Adults	U	0.6	0.57	0.2	0.83	-0.5	0.62	-0.3	0.79	0.5	0.64	-0.6	0.56	-0.8	0.44	0.5	0.60	-1.2	0.23	-0.3	0.76	0.1	0.90
	M	0.3	0.77	0.9	0.39	0.8	0.41	-0.1	0.90	0.2	0.82	0.5	0.63	-0.4	0.67	-0.1	0.92	0.4	0.66	0.5	0.59	1.5	0.15
# Children	U	-1.2	0.22	-0.7	0.46	-1.1	0.27	-0.5	0.61	-1.0	0.34	-1.1	0.27	-2.0	0.05	-0.1	0.93	-0.2	0.81	-1.1	0.26	-0.1	0.95
	M	0.8	0.43	0.2	0.86	0.4	0.69	-0.2	0.83	-0.5	0.65	0.8	0.40	0.6	0.58	0.7	0.48	0.1	0.94	1.0	0.31	0.4	0.73
Income	U	2.3	0.02	1.6	0.11	1.2	0.22	2.9	0.00	2.1	0.03	2.0	0.05	-0.1	0.95	-0.2	0.81	-1.3	0.20	-1.3	0.20	-2.3	0.03
	M	-0.8	0.43	-0.2	0.82	-0.3	0.78	-0.4	0.69	-0.5	0.61	-0.8	0.41	0.3	0.79	0.6	0.57	0.8	0.41	1.5	0.13	1.4	0.17
Gender: male	U	-0.3	0.75	-0.5	0.61	-0.2	0.85	0.7	0.47	-0.5	0.62	-0.4	0.72	2.0	0.05	0.2	0.87	-0.2	0.85	2.7	0.01	0.6	0.55
	M	0.6	0.54	-0.4	0.72	-0.5	0.66	0.7	0.51	0.0	0.99	-0.1	0.93	-1.1	0.26	-0.5	0.63	-0.2	0.85	-1.7	0.08	-0.6	0.59
Suburb	U	2.3	0.02	1.8	0.07	1.2	0.25	1.5	0.13	0.7	0.48	0.4	0.66	0.1	0.96	0.1	0.90	0.6	0.56	-0.7	0.49	-0.6	0.56
	M	-1.7	0.09	-0.1	0.92	-1.1	0.26	-0.1	0.95	-0.7	0.51	0.8	0.43	0.2	0.81	0.1	0.94	-0.3	0.80	1.2	0.23	0.0	0.98
Rural	U	-0.7	0.52	-0.9	0.36	0.1	0.90	-1.3	0.18	--	--	0.0	0.97	0.0	0.99	-0.5	0.64	-0.7	0.46	0.1	0.93	0.8	0.46
	M	0.7	0.51	0.2	0.85	0.4	0.71	0.0	0.98	--	--	-0.9	0.36	-0.3	0.80	-0.1	0.90	0.5	0.61	-0.7	0.51	-0.7	0.51
Education																							
High school or less	U	-0.4	0.73	0.4	0.72	--	--	0.7	0.48	--	--	1.4	0.15	1.1	0.29	0.3	0.76	0.6	0.56	0.9	0.35	--	--
	M	0.8	0.41	-0.2	0.84	--	--	-0.3	0.76	--	--	-0.4	0.66	0.4	0.73	0.3	0.77	0.7	0.46	-1.2	0.22	--	--
Between high school and 4-yr	U	0.2	0.85	-0.3	0.76	0.3	0.79	-1.1	0.26	-0.9	0.38	-0.6	0.58	-0.1	0.90	0.1	0.90	0.3	0.75	0.3	0.76	1.8	0.08
	M	-0.7	0.46	-0.3	0.77	-0.3	0.75	0.0	0.99	-0.9	0.38	-0.5	0.62	-0.8	0.40	-0.6	0.53	-0.7	0.51	0.0	0.98	-0.8	0.42
Greater than 4-yr	U	0.4	0.72	-0.1	0.90	0.8	0.42	2.2	0.03	1.6	0.11	1.7	0.10	0.5	0.60	-0.2	0.87	-0.2	0.88	-0.4	0.73	-0.4	0.69
	M	-0.2	0.88	-0.4	0.70	-0.8	0.42	0.1	0.90	-0.2	0.83	-0.6	0.55	0.6	0.58	-0.2	0.81	0.3	0.79	0.4	0.73	0.0	0.98
Caucasian	U	2.7	0.01	3.2	0.00	3.3	0.00	1.0	0.34	1.2	0.21	0.0	0.97	0.8	0.42	1.1	0.27	1.0	0.32	1.1	0.26	-1.4	0.16
	M	-1.7	0.10	-1.2	0.23	-1.5	0.13	0.7	0.49	0.3	0.73	0.5	0.66	-0.1	0.95	-0.5	0.64	0.4	0.66	-0.8	0.43	0.9	0.38
Purchased plants	U	0.4	0.70	-0.3	0.80	-0.5	0.61	--	--	0.6	0.58	0.2	0.83	-1.1	0.27	-0.4	0.72	-1.4	0.16	3.1	0.00	1.8	0.07
	M	-0.3	0.75	-1.2	0.24	-0.4	0.66	--	--	0.3	0.75	0.2	0.87	-0.4	0.72	-0.2	0.86	0.8	0.42	-1.0	0.33	-1.1	0.29
Heard of term eco-friendly	U	0.5	0.61	0.7	0.49	0.7	0.50	1.9	0.06	--	--	0.9	0.35	-0.1	0.91	-0.1	0.90	-0.1	0.93	-1.8	0.07	0.7	0.47
	M	-1.1	0.29	0.9	0.35	-0.6	0.56	-0.4	0.67	--	--	-0.3	0.81	-0.1	0.93	-0.3	0.79	-0.5	0.66	0.6	0.55	0.3	0.75
Heard of term sustainability	U	1.5	0.13	-1.8	0.07	0.4	0.71	0.6	0.56	0.8	0.42	--	--	-0.5	0.65	-0.8	0.44	--	--	1.6	0.10	0.6	0.58
	M	-0.5	0.59	-0.2	0.81	-0.4	0.67	-0.5	0.61	-0.4	0.71	--	--	0.0	0.99	0.2	0.88	--	--	-1.2	0.22	0.3	0.77
How often purchase local	U	-0.2	0.83	--	--	-1.8	0.08	-0.4	0.70	-0.6	0.55	-0.3	0.76	-0.6	0.58	--	--	-1.3	0.20	2.7	0.01	1.5	0.13
	M	-1.0	0.31	--	--	0.4	0.68	-0.3	0.74	-0.2	0.84	-0.1	0.96	-0.5	0.62	--	--	0.0	0.97	-1.3	0.19	-0.6	0.56
For buying local, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	-1.1	0.28	-0.6	0.52	-1.5	0.12	0.3	0.77	-1.3	0.20	-0.1	0.91	-0.5	0.60	-0.4	0.68	1.2	0.24	1.0	0.33	2.4	0.02
	M	0.6	0.52	0.9	0.36	1.7	0.09	0.1	0.96	0.1	0.90	-0.1	0.95	0.0	0.99	0.8	0.43	-0.9	0.39	-0.5	0.65	-1.4	0.16

Environmentally friendly	U	0.4	0.73	0.4	0.72	-0.2	0.85	0.6	0.55	0.0	1.00	0.8	0.43	1.0	0.33	1.3	0.21	--	--	1.6	0.12	2.7	0.01
	M	0.3	0.78	0.5	0.59	1.0	0.35	-0.3	0.76	-0.1	0.94	-0.7	0.47	-1.0	0.33	-0.3	0.77	--	--	-0.6	0.53	-1.6	0.12
Freshness	U	1.9	0.06	1.1	0.26	0.2	0.84	0.6	0.53	1.7	0.08	1.8	0.07	0.1	0.90	1.0	0.33	1.6	0.11	0.5	0.62	2.9	0.00
	M	-1.1	0.28	0.3	0.74	1.6	0.11	0.1	0.91	-0.6	0.55	-1.0	0.34	-0.2	0.83	-0.8	0.41	-2.3	0.02	-0.1	0.93	-1.2	0.22
Price	U	-1.3	0.19	-1.1	0.28	-1.9	0.06	-1.2	0.24	-1.1	0.29	-0.8	0.40	-1.2	0.21	--	--	0.4	0.72	1.9	0.06	2.4	0.02
	M	-0.1	0.92	0.3	0.78	1.6	0.10	-0.3	0.75	-0.8	0.45	0.0	0.97	-0.5	0.64	--	--	-0.7	0.46	-1.3	0.19	-0.5	0.59
Safe to eat	U	0.6	0.57	0.3	0.80	-0.2	0.88	0.7	0.52	1.1	0.27	0.9	0.39	0.2	0.85	1.2	0.23	1.6	0.12	1.0	0.33	2.9	0.00
	M	-0.7	0.50	-0.5	0.62	0.8	0.42	-0.1	0.96	-0.9	0.37	-0.5	0.64	-0.7	0.52	-1.7	0.10	-2.3	0.03	-0.5	0.62	-1.6	0.11
Support local economy	U	0.0	0.97	-0.6	0.55	-0.2	0.82	0.5	0.64	0.6	0.55	0.8	0.42	-0.4	0.69	-0.5	0.65	-0.5	0.63	0.9	0.38	3.4	0.00
	M	-0.7	0.51	0.2	0.82	1.6	0.12	-0.5	0.63	-0.7	0.49	-0.6	0.57	-0.7	0.46	-0.1	0.93	-1.5	0.13	-1.1	0.29	-1.3	0.21
Other	U	-2.3	0.02	-2.2	0.03	-3.5	0.00	-1.0	0.32	-2.9	0.00	-1.1	0.29	-1.8	0.07	-2.2	0.03	-1.0	0.31	2.0	0.04	0.9	0.39
	M	1.7	0.09	0.8	0.45	1.2	0.23	0.2	0.81	0.4	0.67	-0.1	0.96	0.2	0.86	1.9	0.06	0.7	0.46	-1.6	0.11	-0.4	0.67
How often purchase organic	U	-0.8	0.44	-1.9	0.05	-2.5	0.01	--	--	-0.7	0.47	-0.2	0.86	-1.0	0.34	-0.5	0.63	-2.0	0.05	1.9	0.07	--	--
	M	-0.1	0.91	0.3	0.78	0.8	0.41	--	--	-0.4	0.67	-0.9	0.36	-0.5	0.64	-0.1	0.92	0.7	0.49	-1.5	0.12	--	--
For buying organic, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	-1.2	0.24	-1.3	0.18	-1.9	0.05	0.6	0.54	-0.9	0.36	0.2	0.81	-0.3	0.80	0.2	0.87	0.2	0.88	2.2	0.03	2.2	0.03
	M	1.0	0.31	0.4	0.68	0.8	0.42	-0.3	0.74	-0.4	0.70	-0.3	0.79	0.2	0.87	0.5	0.62	0.5	0.62	-1.6	0.10	-0.5	0.59
Environmentally friendly	U	-0.1	0.92	-0.4	0.67	-0.6	0.57	1.3	0.21	0.9	0.39	2.2	0.03	0.8	0.42	1.8	0.08	1.1	0.28	2.1	0.03	3.1	0.00
	M	0.0	1.00	-0.2	0.86	0.6	0.53	-0.8	0.40	-0.7	0.52	-1.1	0.27	-0.2	0.85	-0.4	0.73	-0.4	0.70	-1.8	0.07	-1.8	0.08
Freshness	U	1.1	0.29	-0.1	0.93	-0.3	0.78	1.5	0.14	2.4	0.02	2.7	0.01	0.5	0.59	0.7	0.50	1.2	0.23	2.5	0.02	4.7	0.00
	M	-0.2	0.82	0.8	0.42	1.1	0.27	-0.9	0.39	-1.3	0.19	-1.8	0.07	0.3	0.79	-0.7	0.49	-1.0	0.33	-1.4	0.18	-2.1	0.04
Price	U	-0.5	0.65	-1.1	0.28	-1.5	0.15	-0.1	0.95	-0.1	0.89	-0.2	0.88	-0.7	0.50	--	--	--	--	1.3	0.21	3.0	0.00
	M	-0.4	0.69	0.2	0.88	0.6	0.56	-1.3	0.18	-1.3	0.19	-0.7	0.49	-0.5	0.65	--	--	--	--	-0.8	0.42	-1.0	0.33
Safe to eat	U	-0.9	0.35	-0.8	0.45	-0.8	0.43	1.3	0.18	2.1	0.04	2.3	0.02	-0.6	0.55	--	--	--	--	0.9	0.35	3.6	0.00
	M	-0.2	0.87	0.3	0.76	1.3	0.20	-0.6	0.53	-2.1	0.04	-1.4	0.18	-0.1	0.91	--	--	--	--	-0.3	0.77	-2.2	0.03
Support local economy	U	-0.8	0.43	-2.0	0.05	-2.5	0.01	-0.2	0.84	-0.7	0.50	-0.5	0.66	-1.9	0.06	-0.3	0.79	-0.5	0.65	2.2	0.03	3.8	0.00
	M	0.4	0.68	1.5	0.14	2.3	0.02	-0.5	0.60	-0.9	0.40	-0.5	0.64	0.5	0.60	0.5	0.59	-1.0	0.34	-1.9	0.06	-2.1	0.04
Other	U	--	--	-2.1	0.04	-3.0	0.00	--	--	-1.6	0.11	0.2	0.82	--	--	--	--	--	--	2.8	0.01	1.2	0.22
	M	--	--	0.2	0.83	0.7	0.47	--	--	0.0	0.97	-0.9	0.38	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2.1	0.04	-0.5	0.63
How often use re-usable shopping bags	U	0.8	0.41	-0.2	0.88	-0.5	0.63	1.1	0.28	0.8	0.42	1.6	0.10	--	--	1.2	0.25	--	--	--	--	1.4	0.17
	M	-0.2	0.85	-0.8	0.45	0.4	0.73	-0.8	0.45	0.0	0.97	-1.1	0.28	--	--	0.3	0.81	--	--	--	--	-0.9	0.40
How often use low flow water devices in home	U	1.2	0.24	0.5	0.63	-0.3	0.80	2.0	0.05	0.7	0.48	--	--	0.5	0.60	--	--	--	--	1.3	0.19	1.7	0.10
	M	-0.4	0.70	-1.3	0.20	-0.5	0.64	-0.4	0.69	0.3	0.79	--	--	-0.6	0.54	--	--	--	--	-1.2	0.24	-1.3	0.19

Appendix table 6. Statistics for Balancing Tests for Pre- and Post-Matching Comparisons for Treatment 6 Using Radius Matching with a 0.1 Caliper

		Clear glass		Brown glass		Green glass		Newspaper		Magazines		Cardboard boxes		Aluminum cans		Plant containers		Plant tags		Plant waste		Food waste	
		t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value
Age	U	2.6	0.01	2.6	0.01	2.3	0.02	1.8	0.07	3.0	0.00	1.8	0.07	1.3	0.18	2.1	0.04	1.8	0.08	2.7	0.01	1.3	0.21
	M	-0.2	0.84	-0.2	0.88	-0.1	0.95	-0.5	0.60	0.3	0.77	-1.1	0.29	0.1	0.95	-1.1	0.30	0.2	0.84	-1.5	0.14	-0.3	0.78
# Adults	U	-1.3	0.20	-1.6	0.11	-0.6	0.53	0.8	0.40	0.1	0.90	-1.0	0.31	0.1	0.93	0.2	0.86	0.0	0.97	-1.6	0.11	-1.1	0.27
	M	0.0	1.00	-0.7	0.48	-0.4	0.71	-0.2	0.84	-0.3	0.77	0.9	0.35	0.2	0.81	-0.9	0.36	-2.9	0.01	1.0	0.31	0.3	0.76
# Children	U	-2.5	0.01	-1.8	0.08	0.1	0.94	-2.0	0.04	-2.7	0.01	-2.5	0.01	-2.0	0.05	-1.2	0.25	-1.7	0.08	-0.1	0.90	-0.3	0.76
	M	0.8	0.41	1.0	0.33	0.2	0.81	0.2	0.82	0.7	0.52	0.3	0.80	1.1	0.26	0.3	0.80	-0.1	0.96	-0.2	0.88	-0.2	0.83
Income	U	0.6	0.58	0.3	0.73	-1.5	0.15	-2.5	0.01	0.3	0.77	-1.2	0.22	-1.4	0.17	-2.1	0.04	-0.5	0.62	-0.1	0.95	-0.6	0.57
	M	0.4	0.68	0.3	0.74	0.1	0.96	0.5	0.61	0.7	0.50	1.3	0.19	1.6	0.12	1.5	0.14	0.8	0.41	1.4	0.17	0.4	0.72
Gender: male	U	-2.1	0.04	-1.8	0.07	2.0	0.05	1.1	0.30	-2.8	0.01	-2.8	0.01	-2.4	0.02	-3.2	0.00	-2.2	0.03	-0.2	0.86	0.3	0.79
	M	0.4	0.72	-0.4	0.71	-1.1	0.29	0.1	0.92	-0.4	0.68	0.6	0.57	0.3	0.80	1.5	0.13	0.1	0.91	0.0	1.00	-1.0	0.31
Suburb	U	1.7	0.10	1.8	0.08	-0.7	0.49	0.1	0.89	1.0	0.33	1.4	0.17	1.1	0.29	0.3	0.77	1.0	0.33	-0.4	0.66	0.4	0.72
	M	-0.5	0.65	-0.2	0.88	1.0	0.33	-0.7	0.49	0.6	0.55	0.0	0.98	0.7	0.50	0.7	0.52	-0.4	0.67	1.2	0.25	0.0	0.97
Rural	U	-1.3	0.19	0.3	0.77	--	--	--	--	-0.5	0.59	-0.7	0.46	0.8	0.41	0.1	0.93	-1.0	0.33	-0.9	0.38	-2.5	0.01
	M	0.2	0.83	0.0	0.98	--	--	--	--	-0.4	0.71	-0.2	0.84	-0.6	0.56	-0.6	0.52	-0.6	0.58	0.8	0.43	1.0	0.32
Education																							
High school or less	U	0.4	0.67	0.7	0.52	1.2	0.23	-0.1	0.94	0.6	0.53	1.1	0.29	0.8	0.41	0.3	0.80	1.4	0.17	0.0	0.97	--	--
	M	-0.3	0.76	-0.3	0.81	-0.8	0.44	-1.1	0.28	-0.8	0.43	-0.2	0.82	-0.4	0.69	0.1	0.91	-0.3	0.79	-0.4	0.70	--	--
Between high school and 4-yr	U	0.7	0.50	0.4	0.66	0.0	0.99	1.6	0.11	0.6	0.56	1.5	0.12	2.2	0.03	0.3	0.80	-0.2	0.83	0.8	0.42	-0.1	0.96
	M	-0.2	0.86	-0.6	0.57	-0.3	0.80	0.8	0.43	-0.1	0.92	-0.3	0.75	-0.4	0.70	-0.6	0.52	-0.5	0.61	-0.9	0.38	-0.3	0.76
Greater than 4-yr	U	0.7	0.51	0.0	0.98	-0.1	0.91	-1.2	0.22	-0.5	0.64	-0.6	0.57	-2.3	0.02	0.3	0.73	0.8	0.46	0.9	0.40	0.1	0.89
	M	1.3	0.21	0.5	0.61	0.4	0.69	0.5	0.62	0.1	0.92	1.1	0.26	1.2	0.22	0.9	0.35	0.6	0.55	0.4	0.70	-0.3	0.73
Caucasian	U	-0.1	0.96	0.8	0.44	1.1	0.29	1.4	0.15	1.3	0.19	0.2	0.81	1.0	0.34	0.6	0.56	1.6	0.12	1.7	0.09	-2.0	0.04
	M	-0.2	0.86	-0.3	0.73	-0.5	0.65	-0.1	0.92	-0.2	0.84	0.0	0.98	1.1	0.29	-0.5	0.60	-0.9	0.40	-1.0	0.32	0.9	0.38
Purchased plants	U	-1.1	0.28	-0.8	0.44			-1.9	0.06	-1.9	0.05	-1.7	0.09	-1.4	0.16	-1.5	0.14	-1.1	0.28	1.5	0.15	1.2	0.24
	M	1.0	0.32	0.6	0.52			0.7	0.47	0.2	0.84	0.7	0.51	0.5	0.60	1.1	0.27	0.9	0.39	-1.5	0.13	-0.4	0.73
Heard of term eco-friendly	U	1.9	0.06			1.4	0.16	1.5	0.13	2.3	0.02	2.4	0.02	3.5	0.00	0.7	0.47	0.7	0.46	0.2	0.84	1.2	0.23
	M	-0.5	0.62			-1.2	0.23	-1.3	0.19	-2.0	0.05	-2.6	0.01	-2.6	0.01	-1.9	0.06	-1.5	0.15	-0.2	0.84	-0.5	0.61
Heard of term sustainability	U	1.8	0.07	3.0	0.00	2.3	0.02	1.6	0.12	1.8	0.08	2.3	0.02	3.2	0.00	1.3	0.18	1.6	0.12	0.5	0.60	1.3	0.19
	M	-0.8	0.40	-0.9	0.39	-1.6	0.12	-0.9	0.38	-1.5	0.15	-0.9	0.39	-2.3	0.02	-0.5	0.64	-1.7	0.10	-0.2	0.82	-0.3	0.74
How often purchase local	U	0.2	0.88	0.6	0.53	-0.1	0.93	-0.2	0.82	-1.0	0.34	0.5	0.63	0.5	0.62	0.6	0.57	--	--	3.1	0.00	0.9	0.37
	M	0.4	0.69	-0.3	0.77	-0.4	0.70	0.6	0.59	-0.8	0.40	-0.7	0.47	0.0	0.99	0.0	1.00	--	--	-1.9	0.05	-0.6	0.57
For buying local, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	0.3	0.81	0.7	0.48	0.2	0.87	-0.4	0.69	-0.8	0.40	0.7	0.47	0.6	0.54	0.4	0.70	0.0	0.99	--	--	2.8	0.01
	M	-0.2	0.87	-0.4	0.71	-0.3	0.78	0.1	0.93	-0.5	0.59	0.0	1.00	-0.9	0.39	-0.4	0.70	1.1	0.28	--	--	-1.0	0.35

Environmentally friendly	U	0.2	0.85	0.6	0.58	0.1	0.93	-0.4	0.72	-0.8	0.43	0.3	0.80	0.0	0.99	0.8	0.42	-0.1	0.94	--	--	3.8	0.00
	M	0.4	0.71	0.0	0.99	-0.4	0.72	0.2	0.88	-0.1	0.89	0.0	0.98	0.5	0.61	-0.5	0.60	1.5	0.14	--	--	-1.4	0.17
Freshness	U	3.1	0.00	1.2	0.23	2.4	0.02	1.1	0.27	2.3	0.02	1.5	0.13	2.1	0.04	1.3	0.20	2.4	0.02	2.3	0.03	1.9	0.06
	M	0.0	0.98	-0.2	0.87	-0.4	0.67	-0.4	0.70	-0.9	0.35	-1.5	0.13	-0.5	0.64	-0.3	0.76	-0.4	0.68	-0.8	0.45	-0.6	0.55
Price	U	0.1	0.94	--	--	0.1	0.96	-0.7	0.50	0.0	0.99	0.8	0.42	0.0	0.97	-1.2	0.23	-0.6	0.57	1.3	0.21	-0.3	0.76
	M	-0.1	0.93	--	--	-0.1	0.96	0.4	0.72	0.1	0.92	-0.2	0.86	0.2	0.86	-1.2	0.25	-0.3	0.73	-0.8	0.46	-0.4	0.67
Safe to eat	U	1.9	0.06	2.7	0.01	1.2	0.22	-0.1	0.89	1.1	0.28	1.2	0.25	1.8	0.07	1.4	0.17	0.7	0.49	1.9	0.06	3.1	0.00
	M	0.7	0.50	0.1	0.92	0.3	0.78	-1.0	0.33	-1.2	0.22	-1.0	0.33	-0.6	0.53	-1.2	0.22	-0.2	0.82	-1.2	0.22	-1.5	0.13
Support local economy	U	-0.2	0.81	1.4	0.17	--	--	-0.6	0.54	-0.5	0.65	-0.3	0.80	1.2	0.24	0.8	0.45	1.3	0.20	--	--	2.1	0.04
	M	0.1	0.94	0.0	1.00	--	--	0.0	0.97	-0.2	0.84	-0.9	0.36	-0.1	0.94	0.0	0.97	-0.8	0.41	--	--	-0.7	0.50
Other	U	-0.8	0.43	-0.8	0.42	-0.5	0.60	-1.4	0.17	-1.0	0.30	--	--	-2.1	0.04	-0.9	0.38	-1.4	0.18	0.4	0.72	1.8	0.07
	M	0.4	0.66	0.2	0.85	0.2	0.82	-0.5	0.62	-0.5	0.61	--	--	0.2	0.86	0.4	0.68	1.6	0.12	-1.2	0.23	-0.6	0.54
How often purchase organic	U	-0.2	0.84	--	--	-0.1	0.92	0.6	0.58	--	--	--	--	-0.3	0.73	0.0	0.98	0.5	0.60	--	--	--	--
	M	0.5	0.62	--	--	-0.2	0.83	-0.3	0.77	--	--	--	--	0.6	0.55	0.9	0.36	-0.1	0.91	--	--	--	--
For buying organic, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	0.2	0.82	0.8	0.41	-0.4	0.70	-0.5	0.61	-0.9	0.35	0.0	0.97	0.5	0.63	-0.1	0.90	-0.6	0.59	3.5	0.00	2.9	0.01
	M	0.4	0.66	-0.7	0.52	0.2	0.85	0.7	0.47	-0.3	0.78	0.9	0.39	-0.3	0.79	-0.6	0.57	0.4	0.72	-2.7	0.01	-1.4	0.17
Environmentally friendly	U	0.5	0.64	0.4	0.66	-0.5	0.59	0.0	0.98	-0.1	0.95	1.3	0.21	1.6	0.12	1.0	0.34	1.2	0.22	4.2	0.00	2.5	0.01
	M	0.0	0.97	0.0	0.98	0.0	0.99	-0.3	0.78	-1.4	0.17	0.6	0.56	-1.0	0.32	-0.6	0.53	0.2	0.85	-2.9	0.00	-0.9	0.37
Freshness	U	1.9	0.06	--	--	2.2	0.03	0.9	0.39	1.6	0.11	2.7	0.01	2.2	0.03	1.5	0.14	1.2	0.23	2.9	0.01	2.0	0.05
	M	0.1	0.89	--	--	-0.5	0.61	0.1	0.90	-0.9	0.39	-0.7	0.49	-1.0	0.33	-0.8	0.43	-0.6	0.58	-1.5	0.13	-0.1	0.94
Price	U	1.4	0.15	2.5	0.01	0.9	0.35	1.5	0.13	2.1	0.04	3.6	0.00	1.8	0.08	1.4	0.17	0.7	0.48	2.2	0.03	1.9	0.07
	M	-0.3	0.73	-0.2	0.83	0.2	0.85	-1.3	0.20	-0.8	0.42	-1.5	0.14	-1.1	0.29	-1.8	0.08	-1.1	0.27	-0.9	0.36	0.0	0.97
Safe to eat	U	2.7	0.01	3.2	0.00	2.1	0.04	0.5	0.64	0.2	0.81	2.8	0.01	1.9	0.07	1.0	0.35	1.7	0.09	3.5	0.00	1.9	0.06
	M	0.4	0.72	-0.5	0.60	-0.2	0.81	0.0	0.98	-0.2	0.81	-1.2	0.22	-1.7	0.10	-0.4	0.67	-0.6	0.53	-1.6	0.12	-0.1	0.91
Support local economy	U	0.4	0.73	1.2	0.24	0.3	0.81	0.6	0.58	0.4	0.68	1.2	0.24	1.2	0.25	0.7	0.50	-0.1	0.93	3.2	0.00	3.1	0.00
	M	0.5	0.62	-0.1	0.91	-0.8	0.42	0.0	0.99	-1.2	0.22	-0.3	0.75	-0.5	0.65	-1.6	0.12	-1.3	0.20	-2.3	0.02	-1.6	0.11
Other	U	-0.7	0.48	-0.3	0.80	-0.9	0.38	-1.5	0.13	--	--	--	--	-0.9	0.37	-1.0	0.33	-1.6	0.12	-0.1	0.92	1.5	0.14
	M	0.3	0.77	0.2	0.84	0.6	0.57	-1.1	0.29	--	--	--	--	-1.3	0.19	-0.1	0.94	0.1	0.95	-0.4	0.67	-0.3	0.76
How often use re-usable shopping bags	U	1.7	0.09	0.6	0.54	0.8	0.44	-0.1	0.90	--	--	--	--	0.9	0.39	--	--	1.8	0.07	1.3	0.20	2.6	0.01
	M	-0.2	0.87	-0.5	0.60	-0.3	0.77	-0.8	0.44	--	--	--	--	-0.1	0.93	--	--	0.5	0.61	-1.5	0.13	-0.2	0.82
How often use low flow water devices in home	U	0.2	0.85	0.4	0.71	0.7	0.52	-0.6	0.58	-0.5	0.62	0.6	0.53	0.3	0.77	0.5	0.59	0.6	0.57	--	--	2.9	0.00
	M	0.0	0.99	-0.5	0.64	-0.8	0.44	0.0	0.97	0.2	0.81	-0.5	0.64	-0.5	0.63	0.5	0.61	-0.4	0.71	--	--	-1.4	0.16

Appendix table 7. Statistics for Balancing Tests for Pre- and Post-Matching Comparisons for Treatment 4A Using Radius Matching with a 0.1 Caliper

		Clear glass		Brown glass		Green glass		Newspaper		Magazines		Cardboard boxes		Aluminum cans		Plant containers		Plant tags		Plant waste		Food waste	
		t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value
Age	U	0.3	0.77	0.7	0.47	1.0	0.32	1.6	0.10	2.4	0.02	1.7	0.08	--	--	-2.2	0.03	-2.1	0.03	2.5	0.01	1.0	0.31
	M	-0.7	0.48	-1.0	0.31	-0.6	0.54	-0.2	0.84	-1.5	0.13	0.8	0.42	--	--	-0.3	0.77	-0.9	0.39	-1.7	0.10	-0.7	0.46
# Adults	U	-0.2	0.81	0.0	0.99	-1.1	0.28	-1.4	0.16	-2.2	0.03	-2.6	0.01	-1.8	0.08	-0.4	0.70	-0.4	0.69	2.8	0.01	2.3	0.02
	M	1.6	0.12	1.0	0.34	0.8	0.45	0.1	0.91	-0.1	0.96	-1.2	0.24	1.4	0.17	0.2	0.88	0.5	0.62	-1.6	0.12	-0.7	0.48
# Children	U	-0.7	0.47	-0.7	0.49	-0.9	0.35	-1.7	0.08	-1.1	0.29	-1.9	0.06	-1.7	0.09	1.2	0.25	1.2	0.23	0.7	0.47	1.8	0.07
	M	0.7	0.50	0.7	0.50	1.5	0.14	0.8	0.40	0.7	0.49	-0.3	0.75	0.9	0.36	0.5	0.60	0.6	0.58	-0.8	0.45	-0.5	0.61
Income	U	0.6	0.55	-0.4	0.72	-0.4	0.70	-0.5	0.59	-0.8	0.43	-0.5	0.66	-0.3	0.77	1.2	0.25	1.3	0.21	5.1	0.00	3.8	0.00
	M	-0.9	0.35	-0.4	0.71	-1.0	0.32	-0.2	0.85	0.2	0.86	-0.3	0.74	-0.5	0.59	-0.5	0.65	-0.7	0.48	-4.2	0.00	-2.6	0.01
Gender: male	U	-0.8	0.44	-0.1	0.89	0.1	0.92	-0.8	0.41	-1.2	0.24	-0.3	0.74	-0.5	0.62	1.3	0.19	-0.3	0.73	-0.6	0.53	-0.9	0.38
	M	0.3	0.75	0.0	0.99	0.7	0.50	0.5	0.62	1.5	0.15	-0.7	0.52	0.4	0.66	0.3	0.78	0.8	0.44	0.1	0.92	0.7	0.51
Suburb	U	-0.3	0.79	-1.0	0.32	-1.2	0.25	0.1	0.93	0.3	0.80	-0.3	0.79	0.4	0.71	0.1	0.95	0.3	0.79	4.5	0.00	1.8	0.08
	M	-0.7	0.52	-0.8	0.43	-0.7	0.52	-0.4	0.67	0.4	0.68	-0.1	0.95	-0.3	0.78	-0.1	0.94	-0.5	0.64	-4.7	0.00	-1.0	0.32
Rural	U	-2.4	0.02	-1.6	0.11	-1.1	0.30	-2.1	0.04	-2.0	0.04	-1.8	0.08	-1.9	0.05	-1.9	0.06	-2.0	0.05	-3.7	0.00	-2.0	0.04
	M	0.3	0.73	-0.1	0.90	0.5	0.62	0.6	0.56	0.2	0.87	-1.3	0.21	-0.6	0.57	1.6	0.12	1.6	0.11	3.6	0.00	1.7	0.10
Education																							
High school or less	U	-0.1	0.91	0.6	0.57	1.2	0.23	0.2	0.83	0.6	0.52	0.4	0.68	--	--	-1.1	0.27	-1.0	0.34	-1.9	0.06	--	--
	M	0.2	0.81	-0.3	0.78	0.8	0.43	1.0	0.32	0.3	0.76	0.6	0.57	--	--	0.9	0.37	0.8	0.44	1.7	0.08	--	--
Between high school and 4-yr	U	-0.3	0.77	-0.7	0.50	2.1	0.03	-1.0	0.34	-0.6	0.58	0.3	0.75	-0.8	0.41	-0.8	0.43	-1.1	0.29	-0.1	0.94	-0.3	0.74
	M	-0.1	0.95	0.2	0.83	-1.4	0.17	-0.5	0.64	-1.2	0.24	0.1	0.94	-0.5	0.62	-1.0	0.34	-0.6	0.54	-0.3	0.80	0.0	0.98
Greater than 4-yr	U	-0.6	0.57	0.4	0.66	1.7	0.08	0.8	0.44	-0.5	0.59	0.2	0.86	0.0	0.99	0.1	0.96	0.1	0.90	1.2	0.23	1.2	0.22
	M	-0.7	0.50	-0.5	0.59	-0.3	0.77	-0.7	0.50	-0.5	0.61	-0.2	0.88	0.0	0.99	-1.1	0.25	-1.1	0.29	-0.3	0.73	-1.0	0.32
Caucasian	U	0.7	0.51	1.5	0.13	2.8	0.01	0.0	0.98	1.9	0.06	1.4	0.17	0.6	0.54	-1.5	0.13	-0.9	0.39	1.8	0.07	-0.7	0.47
	M	-1.8	0.07	-1.4	0.15	-1.0	0.33	-1.2	0.22	-1.8	0.07	0.4	0.70	-1.3	0.20	0.1	0.95	0.1	0.95	-1.7	0.10	0.5	0.65
Purchased plants	U	1.7	0.09	1.9	0.06	1.0	0.31	0.9	0.40	0.5	0.59	0.4	0.66	0.8	0.45	2.1	0.04	2.7	0.01	5.4	0.00	4.4	0.00
	M	-0.2	0.85	-0.5	0.64	-0.2	0.84	-0.8	0.43	-0.4	0.69	0.6	0.54	-0.4	0.72	-1.9	0.06	-2.4	0.02	-4.2	0.00	-2.7	0.01
Heard of term eco-friendly	U	4.2	0.00	5.9	0.00	--	--	3.6	0.00	4.4	0.00	4.0	0.00	4.6	0.00	2.2	0.03	2.2	0.03	2.7	0.01	-0.4	0.66
	M	-1.7	0.09	-1.6	0.12	--	--	-2.4	0.02	-2.9	0.00	1.8	0.08	-2.0	0.04	-1.6	0.10	-1.3	0.19	-1.7	0.09	0.4	0.72
Heard of term sustainability	U	1.8	0.07	3.2	0.00	--	--	2.3	0.02	2.5	0.01	2.0	0.05	2.6	0.01	1.5	0.15	1.6	0.11	3.5	0.00	1.4	0.16
	M	-1.2	0.22	-1.6	0.11	--	--	-0.8	0.43	-1.3	0.18	0.9	0.40	-0.7	0.50	-0.2	0.84	-0.8	0.45	-2.6	0.01	-0.6	0.56
How often purchase local	U	0.5	0.60	1.1	0.27	--	--	1.3	0.18	2.3	0.02	1.9	0.06	1.1	0.29	-0.5	0.64	-0.1	0.95	2.6	0.01	2.0	0.04
	M	-0.7	0.47	-1.0	0.32	--	--	-0.6	0.53	-1.2	0.25	1.2	0.23	-0.7	0.46	-0.1	0.94	-0.3	0.79	-1.9	0.06	-1.5	0.15
For buying local, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	0.5	0.60	1.2	0.24	1.1	0.29	1.5	0.13	1.9	0.06	1.6	0.11	0.9	0.39	1.4	0.17	1.5	0.13	1.4	0.16	0.6	0.53
	M	-0.4	0.68	-0.4	0.73	-0.2	0.85	-0.5	0.60	-0.6	0.58	1.0	0.34	0.1	0.92	-0.9	0.37	-0.6	0.53	-0.6	0.55	0.0	0.97

Environmentally friendly	U	1.3	0.19	1.8	0.07	1.6	0.10	3.4	0.00	3.7	0.00	2.6	0.01	1.9	0.06	2.6	0.01	2.4	0.02	1.1	0.26	0.1	0.94
	M	-0.7	0.48	-1.1	0.27	-0.4	0.69	-0.9	0.38	-1.8	0.08	1.4	0.16	-0.2	0.83	-1.5	0.13	-1.6	0.10	-0.6	0.55	0.4	0.69
Freshness	U	2.9	0.00	3.5	0.00	4.0	0.00	3.9	0.00	4.8	0.00	4.1	0.00	4.0	0.00	1.3	0.20	1.3	0.20	1.6	0.12	0.1	0.90
	M	-0.8	0.42	-1.4	0.16	-1.0	0.30	-1.0	0.32	-2.0	0.05	1.7	0.09	-1.3	0.19	-0.2	0.87	-0.1	0.91	-0.8	0.42	0.3	0.75
Price	U	1.8	0.08	2.2	0.03	2.3	0.02	3.1	0.00	3.1	0.00	2.4	0.02	2.8	0.01	2.2	0.03	2.4	0.02	0.6	0.53	0.3	0.75
	M	-0.6	0.56	-1.0	0.31	-1.0	0.31	-0.9	0.38	-1.3	0.18	1.1	0.28	0.1	0.94	-0.7	0.47	-1.1	0.26	0.1	0.90	-0.2	0.81
Safe to eat	U	2.0	0.04	2.9	0.00	2.4	0.02	3.0	0.00	3.4	0.00	2.9	0.00	2.6	0.01	1.6	0.11	2.0	0.05	0.2	0.81	-0.4	0.66
	M	-0.4	0.66	-0.6	0.53	-0.2	0.81	-1.3	0.20	-1.9	0.06	1.3	0.21	-0.8	0.45	-0.8	0.45	-0.7	0.46	-0.1	0.90	0.5	0.60
Support local economy	U	1.6	0.11	2.0	0.05	2.1	0.04	3.4	0.00	3.5	0.00	2.4	0.02	1.8	0.08	0.9	0.38	1.3	0.21	1.8	0.07	0.3	0.79
	M	-0.3	0.80	-0.6	0.58	0.1	0.90	-0.7	0.51	-1.1	0.26	0.9	0.35	-0.2	0.87	0.2	0.81	0.2	0.87	-1.1	0.26	0.2	0.84
Other	U	-0.3	0.73	0.2	0.88	0.6	0.52	--	--	--	--	-0.6	0.57	0.1	0.94	0.0	0.98	0.0	0.98	1.4	0.16	1.4	0.17
	M	-0.6	0.56	-0.9	0.38	-0.6	0.57	--	--	--	--	-0.5	0.64	-0.1	0.91	0.0	0.99	0.2	0.83	-0.4	0.73	-0.8	0.45
How often purchase organic	U	-0.6	0.53	-0.3	0.76	-0.1	0.92	0.2	0.83	0.2	0.85	0.4	0.69	0.3	0.75	-0.1	0.92	-0.1	0.93	2.1	0.04	--	--
	M	-0.7	0.50	-0.5	0.64	0.0	0.98	-1.0	0.32	-0.9	0.35	0.1	0.92	-0.4	0.73	-0.6	0.58	-0.7	0.48	-1.4	0.18	--	--
For buying organic, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	-0.4	0.72	-0.9	0.39	-0.7	0.48	0.7	0.48	1.1	0.28	0.7	0.46	-0.2	0.83	0.8	0.41	0.7	0.50	1.2	0.23	-0.1	0.96
	M	-0.3	0.76	-0.1	0.91	-0.3	0.74	-1.1	0.30	-0.6	0.52	0.5	0.64	-0.2	0.88	-1.1	0.27	-1.0	0.34	-0.8	0.40	0.1	0.94
Environmentally friendly	U	0.7	0.52	0.2	0.83	-0.1	0.96	1.3	0.20	1.1	0.28	0.0	0.98	0.2	0.87	0.6	0.55	0.2	0.88	0.5	0.63	-0.6	0.55
	M	0.0	0.99	-0.7	0.46	-0.3	0.78	-0.3	0.73	-0.4	0.73	0.2	0.84	0.4	0.67	-0.2	0.82	-0.7	0.50	-0.2	0.83	0.4	0.72
Freshness	U	--	--	2.0	0.05	2.0	0.05	2.5	0.01	2.5	0.01	1.7	0.09	1.8	0.08	1.1	0.29	1.0	0.34	0.6	0.58	-0.5	0.59
	M	--	--	-1.0	0.33	-1.0	0.33	-0.7	0.50	-1.1	0.28	0.9	0.36	-0.2	0.82	0.1	0.91	-0.4	0.71	-0.5	0.59	0.5	0.59
Price	U	1.2	0.23	0.9	0.38	1.1	0.28	2.9	0.01	2.5	0.01	2.5	0.01	2.7	0.01	1.4	0.16	0.5	0.63	1.4	0.16	0.0	1.00
	M	-0.6	0.55	-1.4	0.17	-1.2	0.22	-0.2	0.88	-0.7	0.46	1.5	0.14	0.3	0.77	-0.2	0.84	-0.6	0.53	-0.7	0.47	0.1	0.91
Safe to eat	U	1.0	0.31	0.6	0.55	0.5	0.61	1.6	0.12	1.7	0.10	1.5	0.14	1.3	0.20	0.1	0.92	-0.4	0.70	0.5	0.61	-1.0	0.33
	M	-0.7	0.46	-0.6	0.57	-0.5	0.60	-0.9	0.40	-1.2	0.24	0.8	0.41	-0.7	0.46	0.2	0.84	0.3	0.73	-0.3	0.74	0.7	0.47
Support local economy	U	1.7	0.09	1.2	0.23	1.1	0.26	--	--	2.0	0.05	--	--	1.9	0.06	1.6	0.10	1.4	0.17	1.1	0.28	1.2	0.25
	M	-0.5	0.63	-1.3	0.21	-1.3	0.19	--	--	-1.0	0.34	--	--	-0.2	0.85	-1.1	0.28	-1.0	0.31	-0.5	0.59	-0.6	0.58
Other	U	0.2	0.85	-0.4	0.72	-0.3	0.75	--	--	--	--	-2.3	0.02	-0.7	0.50	-1.0	0.32	-0.8	0.42	1.4	0.15	1.2	0.22
	M	-0.6	0.58	-0.3	0.77	0.3	0.76	--	--	--	--	-1.3	0.20	-0.2	0.83	0.8	0.43	0.9	0.37	-0.6	0.55	-0.8	0.44
How often use re-usable shopping bags	U	--	--	4.2	0.00	--	--	4.6	0.00	4.7	0.00	4.9	0.00	4.9	0.00	3.0	0.00	2.9	0.00	--	--	1.6	0.10
	M	--	--	-1.1	0.28	--	--	-1.1	0.26	-2.0	0.05	2.7	0.01	-0.2	0.88	-1.4	0.16	-2.4	0.02	--	--	-1.0	0.35
How often use low flow water devices in home	U	0.9	0.39	1.1	0.26	0.9	0.39	1.2	0.24	1.3	0.19	1.6	0.10	--	--	1.6	0.12	2.3	0.02	4.1	0.00	2.3	0.02
	M	-0.7	0.50	-1.6	0.11	-1.3	0.20	-1.0	0.31	-1.3	0.19	0.8	0.44	--	--	-0.7	0.49	-1.4	0.16	-3.7	0.00	-1.5	0.15

Appendix table 8. Statistics for Balancing Tests for Pre- and Post-Matching Comparisons for Treatment 6A Using Radius Matching with a 0.1 Caliper

		Clear glass		Brown glass		Green glass		Newspaper		Magazines		Cardboard boxes		Aluminum cans		Plant containers		Plant tags		Plant waste		Food waste	
		t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	t-value	p-value
Age	U	3.1	0.00	2.0	0.04	2.0	0.04	3.0	0.00	2.1	0.04	1.4	0.17	2.4	0.02	2.7	0.01	2.2	0.03	0.9	0.40	-1.0	0.32
	M	1.6	0.12	-0.1	0.89	1.1	0.27	0.5	0.60	1.7	0.10	-0.3	0.80	-0.5	0.64	-0.9	0.37	-0.6	0.56	-0.6	0.52	0.6	0.53
# Adults	U	-0.7	0.51	-1.0	0.30	-1.2	0.24	-0.9	0.37	0.5	0.63	0.9	0.37	-0.1	0.94	-0.9	0.38	-1.0	0.30	-1.0	0.34	0.5	0.62
	M	-0.4	0.73	0.3	0.73	0.5	0.64	0.2	0.88	-0.7	0.49	0.1	0.94	0.3	0.75	0.1	0.89	0.5	0.64	0.5	0.66	-0.5	0.63
# Children	U	0.4	0.66	0.1	0.92	--	--	0.7	0.50	0.2	0.81	1.3	0.18	0.1	0.95	0.2	0.87	0.4	0.70	-1.2	0.23	0.0	0.97
	M	0.5	0.64	0.9	0.36	--	--	-1.0	0.31	-0.7	0.49	-0.5	0.60	-0.1	0.92	0.1	0.91	0.4	0.72	0.5	0.60	-0.1	0.91
Income	U	0.6	0.58	1.7	0.09	1.1	0.29	--	--	2.6	0.01	1.6	0.10	0.9	0.37	1.4	0.16	1.8	0.08	0.0	0.97	1.6	0.11
	M	0.4	0.70	-0.1	0.94	0.2	0.82	--	--	-1.0	0.31	0.3	0.78	0.1	0.93	-0.3	0.75	-1.1	0.26	0.0	0.97	-1.2	0.23
Gender: male	U	-1.4	0.16	-2.2	0.03	-2.1	0.04	-2.3	0.02	-2.0	0.05	-3.0	0.00	-2.5	0.01	--	--	-1.9	0.06	-0.8	0.44	-0.8	0.42
	M	-1.0	0.33	0.6	0.55	1.3	0.21	0.6	0.54	0.8	0.43	0.8	0.45	1.9	0.06	--	--	1.8	0.07	0.9	0.39	0.2	0.88
Suburb	U	1.1	0.28	0.9	0.39	0.7	0.51	0.9	0.38	1.5	0.15	2.1	0.04	1.2	0.23	1.5	0.14	2.0	0.05	-0.1	0.91	1.4	0.16
	M	0.7	0.51	0.3	0.73	-1.1	0.29	0.2	0.85	-1.0	0.33	0.6	0.58	0.6	0.58	-0.2	0.88	-0.4	0.71	0.0	0.97	-1.8	0.08
Rural	U	-0.7	0.52	0.0	1.00	-1.2	0.22	-0.8	0.44	-1.0	0.33	-0.4	0.71	1.1	0.27	0.8	0.43	-0.4	0.67	2.6	0.01	0.9	0.40
	M	-0.5	0.59	-0.9	0.36	0.0	0.99	-0.5	0.60	1.4	0.16	-0.2	0.83	-0.8	0.42	0.4	0.70	1.3	0.19	-1.2	0.25	0.4	0.68
Education																							
High school or less	U	0.3	0.77	0.9	0.40	0.1	0.89	1.4	0.17	0.2	0.85	-0.1	0.96	1.0	0.32	1.5	0.13	0.5	0.60	1.8	0.08	-0.1	0.90
	M	0.2	0.82	-0.6	0.53	-0.7	0.47	0.1	0.92	2.1	0.03	0.0	0.97	-1.0	0.31	-0.3	0.75	0.7	0.48	-1.0	0.34	0.1	0.93
Between high school and 4-yr	U	0.4	0.66	-0.7	0.48	-0.1	0.90	-0.2	0.87	-0.1	0.96	1.1	0.26	0.9	0.37	1.5	0.15	1.4	0.17	-0.1	0.91	1.0	0.33
	M	0.1	0.96	0.8	0.44	-0.8	0.46	0.1	0.93	-0.7	0.46	-0.6	0.57	-0.5	0.62	-0.7	0.51	-0.1	0.92	0.2	0.86	-1.1	0.29
Greater than 4-yr	U	-0.6	0.54	-0.6	0.57	-0.9	0.36	-0.6	0.58	-0.7	0.48	-2.7	0.01	-3.0	0.00	-2.1	0.03	-2.3	0.02	-0.8	0.44	1.3	0.19
	M	-0.3	0.77	0.9	0.38	2.8	0.01	0.6	0.54	0.5	0.63	0.8	0.42	2.5	0.01	1.5	0.14	-0.3	0.74	0.1	0.95	-0.5	0.65
Caucasian	U	1.2	0.23	3.0	0.00	1.9	0.06	2.4	0.02	0.5	0.64	1.1	0.26	2.2	0.03	4.3	0.00	1.6	0.12	2.4	0.02	--	--
	M	0.6	0.56	-1.3	0.20	-1.0	0.32	-0.8	0.46	0.8	0.41	-1.1	0.27	-1.2	0.25	-2.1	0.04	-1.5	0.14	-1.7	0.09	--	--
Purchased plants	U	1.9	0.06	2.6	0.01	--	--	1.2	0.22	1.1	0.27	1.8	0.07	0.3	0.77	1.3	0.19	0.5	0.63	2.6	0.01	0.8	0.43
	M	1.1	0.25	-0.5	0.60	--	--	-0.6	0.54	-0.8	0.45	0.1	0.91	-0.2	0.87	-0.7	0.51	-0.7	0.49	-1.6	0.11	-1.0	0.34
Heard of term eco-friendly	U	-0.2	0.88	--	--	0.2	0.87	3.5	0.00	1.4	0.16	1.9	0.05	2.3	0.02	0.9	0.36	3.0	0.00	1.2	0.23	0.9	0.35
	M	-0.1	0.92	--	--	0.2	0.85	-3.8	0.00	-1.2	0.23	-2.0	0.04	-1.5	0.15	-0.5	0.62	-1.0	0.34	-0.8	0.41	0.0	0.98
Heard of term sustainability	U	0.6	0.56	0.6	0.55	-0.4	0.69	1.0	0.32	-0.2	0.81	0.5	0.61	0.9	0.36	-0.1	0.89	1.5	0.13	1.6	0.12	0.9	0.37
	M	0.3	0.76	-0.6	0.55	0.3	0.74	-0.3	0.76	-0.7	0.48	-0.6	0.55	-0.6	0.54	-1.2	0.24	-1.0	0.31	-0.8	0.41	-0.5	0.65
How often purchase local	U	1.4	0.15	1.6	0.11	2.3	0.02	3.2	0.00	1.6	0.11	--	--	0.9	0.36	0.6	0.55	--	--	3.0	0.00	2.7	0.01
	M	1.0	0.34	0.6	0.52	-0.1	0.94	-0.1	0.96	0.1	0.89	--	--	-0.7	0.51	0.3	0.75	--	--	-1.7	0.09	-1.2	0.22
For buying local, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	-0.1	0.90	-0.4	0.73	0.3	0.74	0.4	0.66	-0.2	0.81	0.2	0.84	-0.3	0.79	-1.5	0.14	-0.5	0.62	--	--	2.1	0.04
	M	0.3	0.77	0.1	0.94	-0.6	0.58	0.2	0.88	2.3	0.02	-0.2	0.88	0.6	0.53	-1.1	0.27	-0.4	0.67	--	--	-1.0	0.30

Environmentally friendly	U	-0.1	0.95	-0.1	0.95	0.2	0.84	0.1	0.93	-0.8	0.45	0.7	0.50	0.9	0.38	-0.3	0.78	0.6	0.57	--	--	1.8	0.07
	M	0.3	0.78	-0.2	0.87	-0.8	0.46	-0.2	0.86	1.4	0.15	-0.2	0.86	0.4	0.72	-1.3	0.18	-0.7	0.46	--	--	-1.1	0.27
Freshness	U	3.0	0.00	2.8	0.01	3.0	0.00	2.8	0.01	3.0	0.00	3.0	0.00	2.1	0.04	2.6	0.01	3.7	0.00	1.3	0.20	1.3	0.19
	M	1.8	0.07	-0.5	0.64	-3.4	0.00	-1.1	0.27	1.2	0.24	-0.6	0.57	-1.2	0.25	-1.8	0.07	-0.9	0.35	-0.9	0.37	-0.8	0.45
Price	U	-0.9	0.38	-1.6	0.12	-1.7	0.09	-0.1	0.92	-0.6	0.57	0.1	0.94	-1.1	0.29	-0.7	0.47	0.4	0.72	0.4	0.69	-0.5	0.60
	M	-0.2	0.84	-0.9	0.37	-0.8	0.42	-2.1	0.04	0.5	0.63	-0.4	0.69	-1.2	0.25	-0.7	0.51	0.4	0.69	0.1	0.96	-0.5	0.59
Safe to eat	U	1.2	0.23	1.1	0.30	1.2	0.23	1.4	0.15	1.1	0.29	1.6	0.12	2.1	0.04	1.3	0.20	3.0	0.00	0.8	0.41	0.6	0.53
	M	0.9	0.39	-0.3	0.77	-1.4	0.15	-0.3	0.77	1.5	0.14	-0.5	0.61	-2.0	0.05	-1.2	0.23	-0.9	0.38	-0.7	0.46	-0.1	0.89
Support local economy	U	2.2	0.03	1.2	0.24	--	--	1.6	0.12	1.2	0.23	1.6	0.11	1.6	0.12	0.3	0.74	1.0	0.33	--	--	2.8	0.01
	M	1.3	0.18	-0.3	0.75	--	--	0.4	0.72	1.5	0.13	0.1	0.92	0.1	0.89	-1.5	0.14	-0.7	0.46	--	--	-1.1	0.28
Other	U	-2.2	0.03	-2.1	0.04	-2.0	0.05	-2.6	0.01	-3.3	0.00	-1.9	0.06	-2.0	0.04	-1.8	0.07	-1.0	0.31	2.0	0.05	1.2	0.24
	M	-0.9	0.35	0.6	0.56	-0.5	0.60	-0.5	0.66	2.5	0.01	0.1	0.89	0.6	0.53	-0.1	0.96	0.8	0.45	-0.8	0.42	-0.5	0.62
How often purchase organic	U	-0.2	0.83	--	--	-0.1	0.89	-0.8	0.44	--	--	-0.5	0.63	-0.8	0.43	-1.9	0.06	-1.3	0.19	--	--	--	--
	M	0.2	0.84	--	--	-0.3	0.80	0.8	0.44	--	--	-0.1	0.93	1.0	0.33	0.9	0.39	0.5	0.60	--	--	--	--
For buying organic, importance of:																							
Carbon footprint	U	0.3	0.80	0.2	0.81	0.2	0.88	0.4	0.70	0.0	0.99	0.1	0.93	0.4	0.69	-1.9	0.06	-0.4	0.70	1.1	0.26	--	--
	M	0.6	0.53	0.2	0.82	-0.6	0.57	-0.9	0.40	1.4	0.18	0.4	0.70	0.2	0.84	-1.0	0.30	-0.5	0.65	-0.6	0.58	--	--
Environmentally friendly	U	1.3	0.19	1.4	0.16	2.2	0.03	0.8	0.41	0.6	0.55	1.0	0.30	0.7	0.48	-0.6	0.55	0.2	0.81	0.7	0.47	0.3	0.74
	M	1.2	0.22	0.1	0.91	-1.1	0.28	0.0	0.98	1.3	0.19	-0.2	0.86	0.7	0.51	-0.9	0.39	-0.3	0.74	-0.6	0.58	0.2	0.84
Freshness	U	2.1	0.03	--	--	--	--	2.0	0.05	1.8	0.07	2.3	0.02	1.3	0.18	0.4	0.67	2.0	0.05	0.5	0.65	-0.8	0.42
	M	1.7	0.09	--	--	--	--	0.5	0.61	1.4	0.15	-0.3	0.75	-0.1	0.95	-1.7	0.09	-1.2	0.22	-0.7	0.48	0.4	0.69
Price	U	1.2	0.25	0.4	0.66	0.1	0.95	0.6	0.58	0.0	0.98	1.8	0.07	0.6	0.55	-0.1	0.91	0.8	0.41	0.3	0.79	-0.3	0.77
	M	0.9	0.40	-1.2	0.25	0.0	0.99	-1.9	0.06	-1.5	0.14	-0.3	0.74	-0.7	0.50	-1.5	0.13	-0.7	0.50	0.0	0.99	-0.4	0.71
Safe to eat	U	2.5	0.01	2.8	0.01	2.8	0.01	0.9	0.36	0.7	0.52	1.4	0.16	2.2	0.03	0.9	0.35	2.0	0.05	0.3	0.78	0.1	0.91
	M	1.9	0.06	-0.6	0.55	-1.2	0.24	0.3	0.75	0.6	0.52	-0.5	0.59	-0.2	0.87	-1.6	0.11	-1.4	0.16	-0.5	0.62	0.0	0.97
Support local economy	U	1.6	0.11	1.0	0.30	1.3	0.21	1.1	0.29	0.5	0.60	0.9	0.37	2.0	0.04	-0.7	0.52	0.9	0.36	0.8	0.45	-0.1	0.95
	M	1.1	0.26	0.5	0.63	-0.4	0.70	-0.5	0.64	0.9	0.36	0.0	0.99	-0.1	0.91	-0.3	0.74	-0.3	0.80	-0.5	0.64	0.0	0.99
Other	U	-0.5	0.60	-0.2	0.82	-1.0	0.31	-1.8	0.07	--	--	0.2	0.87	0.2	0.82	-2.2	0.03	-0.8	0.41	1.0	0.34	-0.7	0.47
	M	0.2	0.83	0.0	1.00	-0.1	0.92	-0.9	0.38	--	--	-0.4	0.70	-0.1	0.96	-0.3	0.79	-0.1	0.92	-0.1	0.96	0.4	0.72
How often use re-usable shopping bags	U	2.8	0.01	3.5	0.00	3.2	0.00	3.7	0.00	--	--	2.7	0.01	3.1	0.00	1.9	0.06	--	--	2.7	0.01	1.5	0.13
	M	1.5	0.13	-0.9	0.36	-1.5	0.15	-1.5	0.15	--	--	-0.5	0.61	-0.6	0.54	-0.9	0.39	--	--	-1.8	0.07	-0.7	0.48
How often use low flow water devices in home	U	1.3	0.18	2.0	0.04	2.2	0.03	2.7	0.01	1.8	0.08	0.7	0.48	2.1	0.04	0.4	0.70	--	--	--	--	1.6	0.12
	M	0.9	0.38	0.1	0.93	-0.3	0.77	-0.3	0.79	1.2	0.25	-0.5	0.63	-0.6	0.58	-1.1	0.27	--	--	--	--	-0.9	0.35