

Metadata for “Socio-psychological factors, beyond knowledge, predict people’s engagement with pollinator conservation”

Jessica L. Knapp*^{1,2}, Benjamin B. Phillips*¹, Jen Clements¹, Rosalind F. Shaw¹, and Juliet L. Osborne¹

*These authors contributed equally to the work and are joint first authors.

¹Environment and Sustainability Institute, University of Exeter, Penryn Campus, Penryn, Cornwall, TR10 9FE, UK

²Lund University, Department of Biology, Lund, 223 62, Sweden

Corresponding authors: B. B. Phillips, email: B.B.Phillips@exeter.ac.uk and J. L. Knapp, email: jessica.knapp@biol.lu.se

SUMMARY

A questionnaire about people’s perceptions, knowledge and behaviour relating to pollinators was distributed from March-June 2018, primarily via social media and email. The survey received 1,275 responses, which are provided here, in a single data file.

MATERIALS AND METHODS (from manuscript)

Questionnaire

We created an online questionnaire (Appendix S2) to assess people’s perceptions, knowledge and behaviour relating to pollinators. We broadly used the TPB as a framework around which to structure the questionnaire, and to interpret the findings, namely for predicting respondents’ individual and total number of pollinator conservation actions (Table 1). The questionnaire consisted of 26 questions across four sections: (i) Perceptions: about the environment, nature, pollinators, pollinator declines and pollinator conservation behaviour, (ii) Knowledge: of pollinators, pollinator declines and pollinator conservation actions, (iii) Behaviour: specific actions for conserving the environment and pollinators, and barriers to implementing them, and (iv) Identity: nature exposure (frequency and diversity of interactions) and socio-demography. Whilst we were primarily interested in conservation of wild pollinators, we purposely avoided specifying wild or managed pollinators in the questionnaire because we assumed that most people’s knowledge of pollinators was limited and that distinguishing managed pollinators from wild pollinators would be unfamiliar and/or confusing.

We predominantly used closed questions (24 of 26 questions), consisting of yes/no, multiple choice, and 7-point Likert items but, where appropriate, we provided open boxes to allow participants to elaborate. We included questions from the Monitor of Engagement with the Natural Environment (MENE) (Natural England, 2018) to assess participants’ nature exposure, self-perceived nature-connectedness, and pro-environmental behaviour, adapted questions from the CN-12 (Hatty, Smith, Goodwin, & Mavondo, 2020) to assess participants’ identity as an environmentalist, and used the Conservation Evidence website (<https://www.conservationevidence.com/>) to identify pollinator conservation actions (Table 1). The study received ethical approval from the University of Exeter’s ethics board on 1st February 2019 (application eCORN001741). We pre-tested the survey on two individuals to ensure comprehension of the questions and made minor refinements in response. We then carried out a pilot study on 20 individuals, plotted and analysed the data, and made further minor refinements.

Distribution

The final questionnaire was launched on 27th March 2019 and responses were collected until 1st June 2019. We aimed for the questionnaire to be completed by any adult (age 16+), regardless of their interest in pollinators, and primarily in the UK. We distributed the questionnaire as widely as possible via email (social networks of the authors) and social media (Facebook and Twitter) (Appendix S3), and made further efforts to recruit individuals from key stakeholder groups (gardeners, farmers, land owners, beekeepers, local government, conservationists) using personal contacts and their networks, and by targeting relevant people and groups on Facebook and Twitter (Appendix S3). Our distribution method may have resulted in a selection bias towards people with a pre-existing interest in pollinators and environmentalism, as well as a high digital fluency and/or reliable internet access. Given these limitations, we made further efforts to recruit individuals without a pre-existing affinity to nature or pollinators by distributing the questionnaire to non-nature-focused online groups, and by offering participants entry into a draw for a gift voucher (Appendix S3).

DATA FILE 1: “PollinatorQuestionnaire2018.csv”

Description: Results from the 1,275 respondents to the questionnaire. Each column represents an individual question, or sub question (where appropriate). Each (sub) question is described in full in the first row. Each row represents the responses of a single person. Questions consisted of yes/no, multiple choice, and 7-point Likert items. For 7-point Likert items, a response of ‘1’ represented ‘strongly disagree’ (or equivalent), whilst a response of ‘7’ represented ‘strongly agree’ (or equivalent). In the questionnaire, values of ‘1’ and ‘7’ were labelled as such, whilst intermediate values (2-6) were simply numbered, and so this is how they appear in the data file.

REFERENCES

- Hatty, M. A., Smith, L. D. G., Goodwin, D., & Mavondo, F. T. (2020). The CN-12: a brief, multidimensional connection with nature instrument. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01566>
- Natural England. (2018). *Monitor of engagement with the natural environment: technical report to the 2009-2018 surveys*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/monitor-of-engagement-with-the-natural-environment-headline-reports-and-technical-reports-2016-2017-to-2017-2018>