



Promoting reuse behaviour of young hotel guests

Judith Ogink, Elena Cavagnaro
NHL Stenden UAS, Leeuwarden (The Netherlands)

Abstract

Change in plastic usage is essential to mitigate plastic pollution. Although adolescents can significantly contribute, their plastic-related behaviour as hotel guests remains underexplored. This study seeks to gain a deeper understanding of their reuse behaviour.

Enablers and barriers of reuse behaviour are probed via the COM-B theory in five focus groups with nineteen adolescents (13 - 16 years) from two Dutch Schools.

A thematic analysis of the data was used to investigate their knowledge about plastic pollution, their norms and reasons for plastic usage in a hotel context.

Adolescents have a broad knowledge about pollution and acknowledge reusage as a solution to which they should contribute. Although adolescents consider reusables normal, during hotel stays there were barriers: the infrastructure, unawareness of reuse options and the extra hassle.

Findings suggest that hospitality managers can mitigate plastic pollution by lifting infrastructural barriers and involving their young hotel guests to promote reuse behaviour.

Key Words *Plastic, reuse behaviour, adolescents, hotel guests (Maximum 6)*

Track *Ethically Driven Innovations*

Focus of the Paper *Theoretical/Academic*

Type of Submission *Paper*

Introduction

Plastic pollution is a global problem inherently linked to individuals' behaviour (Pahl et al., 2017). Shifting from single use plastics to a reusable alternative reduces waste significantly and is an important step in tackling plastic pollution (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2019). Choosing reusable alternatives qualifies as Pro Environmental Behaviour (PEB) – “behaviour that consciously seeks to minimize the negative impact of one’s actions on the natural and built world” (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002, p. 240). Being a large consumer of (single use) plastic, the hotel sector should take responsibility for encouraging PEB of staff and guests (WT&TC, 2021).

Considering guests, adolescents form an interesting group for several reasons. Firstly, adolescent behaviour impacts both the present and the future. Secondly, there is no consensus in the literature about how strongly and consistently adolescents show PEB in general and in hospitality settings in particular (Balundè, Perlaviciute, et al., 2020). This point is important, because behaviour differs depending on the context (Georgescu & Herman, 2020). Hospitality is perceived as a hedonic context where pleasure takes precedence over environmental concerns, provoking special holiday habits (MacInnes et al., 2022). Moreover, hotel guests must adapt to the infrastructure provided, which can lower PEB (Dolnicar, 2020). Finally, knowledge to date about PEB of young hotel guests remains limited, specifically concerning plastic use.

When studying behaviour with the intention to enhance PEB, it is essential to focus on a specific target behaviour (Steg & Vlek, 2009). After consultation with the involved hotel, this study focuses on reusable bottles and lunch boxes. The aim of this qualitative study is exploring enablers and barriers to the use of reusable bottles and lunch boxes by adolescent hotel guests, thereby providing a foundation for subsequent intervention research. The final purpose is to motivate adolescents' and hotel owners' contribution to plastic pollution mitigation.

Literature

This section addresses the areas of study that should be integrated to assess the enablers and barriers of adolescents' reuse behaviour in a hotel context. For a better understanding of how this behaviour is influenced three main topics are discussed here: theories of PEB, adolescents' PEB and the influence of a hospitality setting.

COM-B theory

Factors that drive adolescents' PEB are studied through the lens of diverse theories, like the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) and the Value-Identity-Personal Norm model (Van Der Werff & Steg, 2016). Yet, the most encompassing theory is COM-B (Willmott et al., 2021).

The COM-B theory involves three essential conditions - Capability, Opportunity, and Motivation - which interact to generate behaviour (Michie et al., 2011). Capability refers to a person's mental and physical ability to participate in the specified activity and includes having the necessary knowledge and skills. Opportunity includes all external factors that enable or encourage a specific behaviour. Motivation encompasses all mental processes that stimulate and guide behaviour. It goes beyond goals and conscious choices and includes habits, emotions and analytical decision-making.

Capability, Motivation and, alone or in combination, Opportunity influence and are influenced by Behaviour and the other way around: Behaviour can positively or negatively influence the three components. Both Capability and Opportunity can act as an enabler or barrier for Motivation. An advantage of COM-B above other theoretical approaches is that it is linked to interventions in the Behaviour Change Wheel (Michie et al., 2011). We use COM-B as theory to summarize the literature on the main drivers of adolescent PEB and categorize them as a barrier or enabler for a better understanding of plastic avoiding behaviour.

Capabilities

There is increasing consensus that psychological capability, and more specifically awareness and understanding of plastic pollution, drives PEB. Awareness and understanding of the causes and consequences of marine litter are an enabler of self-reported general litter reducing behaviours (Hung et al., 2023; Severin et al., 2023) and of reduced bottled water purchasing (Jovarauskaitė et al., 2020). Educational interventions influence this awareness and understanding. Experimental learning or actively participating in research, beach clean activities or video making projects enable the behaviour directly (Canosa et al., 2021; Hartley et al., 2015, 2018). Only one study measured a Physical Capability and concluded that access to a water tap does not reduce bottled water purchasing (Jovarauskaitė et al., 2020).

Opportunities

Social norms refer to common behaviour or approval by the reference group (Cialdini & Trost, 1998) and falls under Opportunity. Several studies (Evans et al., 2018; Gong et al., 2022; Jia & Yu, 2021) confirm a direct positive relationship between parents' and children's overall PEBs and for plastic avoidance specifically (Žukauskienė et al., 2021). Reducing bottled water purchasing of adolescence, is enabled by norms of closed ones (Balundė, Jovarauskaitė, et al., 2020). (Collado et al., 2019) concluded that adolescents seem to be accurate in the perception of their close ones' environmental actions and that parents and peers influence adolescents plastic avoiding behaviour directly or indirectly, via personal norms. No studies about the relationship between physical opportunities, e.g. the convenience of the behaviour, the profit of the behaviour or the accessibility to the behaviour and adolescents' PEB were found.

Motivations

Drinking tap water instead of bottled water is enabled by biospheric values, environmental self-identity and personal norms (Balundè, Perlaviciute, et al., 2020). For general self-reported PEB, enablers are adolescents' personal norms (Collado et al., 2019), perceived behaviour control, attitudes and intentions (De Leeuw et al., 2015), and emotional intelligence (Robinson et al., 2019). Beside these Reflective Motivations, Automatic Motivation is studied by (Jovarauskaitè et al., 2020) and (Balundè, Perlaviciute, et al., 2020) indicating that habit is the strongest direct barrier for drinking tap water instead of purchasing bottled water in comparison to normative factors, awareness of consequences and situational factors.

Adolescents' PEB

For PEB age plays a role (Bhattarai et al., 2024). The adolescent development stage may influence the engagement in pro-environmental behaviour and scholars have mentioned an "adolescence dip for PEB" (Anderson & Krettenauer, 2021). The longitudinal study of (Krettenauer et al., 2024) disputed this dip existence and concluded that self-reported PEB increases from the early teenage years and levels off from the later teenage years. (Oturai et al., 2022) note a difference for picking up litter during a mass experiment where the younger age group (7-12 years) reported a decrease, while the older age group (13-16 years) held a consistently high engagement prior and after the intervention.

Hotel context

PEB varies across different settings (Dolnicar & Grün, 2009). For example, tourist report buying more single-use water bottles at their tourist destination than at home (Bilynets & Knezevic Cvelbar, 2022). The hotel context can act as a barrier for the Opportunity and Motivation because guests must adapt to the infrastructure provided, which can make PEB more cumbersome (Dolnicar, 2020) and limit the capability to follow homely pro-environmental habits (MacInnes et al., 2022). The Goal Framing Theory (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007) postulates that different contexts frame different goals (hedonic, gain or normative goals) leading to different behaviour. Hospitality is perceived as a hedonic context where hedonic goals, like having fun, can crowd out normative goals, like PEB (Dolnicar, 2020). Considering the above and the high use of single use plastic in hotels, it is surprising that no studies to date have addressed adolescent PEB in hotel settings.

Conclusions literature

Main conclusions from the literature concerning factors influencing adolescents' plastic reuse behaviour are:

- There is a lack of studies concerning adolescents' PEB in a hotel context
- Most studies rely on self-reported behaviour; there is a lack of experimental studies
- A few studies focus on plastic use; PEB is often studied in general
- Most studies focus on enablers of PEB; barriers are understudied
- There is a consensus on the influence on adolescents' PEB by parents and peers

Method

To explore the enablers and barriers for plastic reuse of adolescents in a hospitality context, a qualitative approach using focus groups was chosen. Focus groups are particularly useful to study the perspectives of children (Carey & Asbury, 2012) because they evoke a reduction in power imbalance between the facilitator and the participants. Moreover, sharing the responsibility of answering a question lowers anxiety, particularly among participants who may feel less knowledgeable (Carey & Asbury, 2012).

Participants

Adolescents aged 13–16 years formed the sample. Participants were recruited from a VMBO (n = 11) and a VWO school (n = 8) in The Netherlands. These schools were selected because of different characteristics (age group, education level, visiting the hotel). Participants were selected on a volunteer basis (convenience sampling). Focus groups were held until saturation was reached (Carey & Asbury, 2012). Ethical approval was obtained (NHL Stenden document number 20240515). Participants and their parents signed a consensus form.

Procedure

Following common practice in adolescent research and insights from the pilot phase, focus group size was limited to four (Carey & Asbury, 2012).

Focus groups were conducted in September 2024 in the hotel lounge. The hotel is situated on an island in the Wadden Sea, a World Heritage Area. One researcher facilitated all focus groups. Questions were developed by one author based on the COM-B theory and the themes from the previous literature, reviewed by the second author, and validated with the hotel. After a pilot, questions were slightly adjusted. The final set contained both open and closed questions, probed participants knowledge of plastic pollution, norms around plastic use and other types of PEB, ascription of responsibility and enablers and barriers on reuse behaviour. Guidelines will be shared upon request.

The focus groups lasted between 20-40 minutes, were audio recorded, transcribed verbatim and analysed thematically and iteratively by two researchers separately. In case of disagreement, the researchers conferred until consensus was reached.

Results and discussion

The themes emerging from the data are reported and discussed following the COM-B framework. Deviant behaviour in a different context compared to daily life emerged as an extra theme.

Capabilities

Capabilities themes that emerged from the data are: knowledge about plastic pollution, consequences of their behaviour, reasons for selecting a drink and influence of logistics on using their own bottle and box.

Participants defined (sea) plastic pollution properly. For example, *“It's just an accumulation of plastic that doesn't really break down. And so it stays there. But the environment or the animals suffer from it”*.

They mention several causes: improper disposal behaviour, purposefully dumped, freight lost by ships. One participant mentioned microplastics as effect of plastic pollution, while most participants shared that animals get entangled in the plastic, digesting it and dying. Participants mentioned several mitigation strategies, including cleaning the ocean from litter by using big nets, enough waste bins and proper disposal, fining littering activities, recycling of waste and the use of alternative materials instead of plastic. Our finding about perceiving plastic pollution as a problem and recognising some of the causes, impacts and solutions, aligns with the studies of (Canosa et al., 2021; Hartley et al., 2015; Hung et al., 2023; Severin et al., 2023).

Participants have watched movies and read texts about the plastic soup for school assignments and one respondent had joined a workshop dedicated to this problem. This finding confirms the role of education as an enabler of awareness (Hartley et al., 2018; Hung et al., 2023).

Respondents understood correctly how the use of a reusable bottle and lunchbox mitigates plastic pollution: *“That you don't use plastic bottles and they also don't get thrown away and therefore get into the sea and cause pollution. You only have to buy one anyway, so then you also don't have all the extra things that contribute during delivery and sale.”* Many respondents brought their own bottle and lunchbox on the school trip, because it was stated on the packaging list that they should bring their own lunch for the first day. The possibility of using these for the lunch provided by the hotel was unknown, so they used the offered paper backs and drink cartons. This finding underlies the role of proper communication and the importance of the context to PEB (Dolnicar, 2020; Jovarauskaitė et al., 2020).

Several barriers shared to the use of the own bottle and box resort under physical capabilities. Most shared was the limited capacity of the own bottle and the fear of not being able to refill it while on the island, thus not having enough to drink. The effort connected to using the own bottle and box is also a barrier, including the luggage space it takes. Notably, participants shared that when going to school a reusable box and bottle is used thus confirming that context and infrastructure matters (Dolnicar & Grün, 2009).

Opportunities

Discussed opportunities for the use of one's own bottle and box were norms of parents, family, peers and teachers (social norms). All respondents report clearly that they follow family norms of proper waste disposal and

environmental cleanliness. The direct influence of parents' norms on children's PEB aligns with (Collado et al., 2019; Jia & Yu, 2021). The role of teachers, though, is under researched. Norms about the use of a reusable bottle and lunchbox from parents, peers or teachers, were unclear to some. While most participants referred to their family when discussing PEB, some students strongly claimed that they have or are developing their own norms. This chimes in with literature pointing at the transition phase in which adolescents find themselves, and the development of an own identity (Diem-Wille & Mcquade, 2020).

Motivations

Awareness and beliefs about the negative consequences of plastic pollution, the responsibility for mitigation, and students' personal norms and habits were discussed motivations for PEB.

While participants state that all actors in the chain like governments and business should act to abate plastic pollution, they also recognise their own role. However, this ascription of responsibility is not always translated to the selection of a drink. This extends (Balundé, Jovarauskaitė, et al., 2020), who found also no relation between using unpackaged products and awareness of consequences. Taste, health considerations and especially low cost are (self-enhancement) reasons for selecting a drink.

Personal norms guided various PEB (energy saving, reuse behaviour, sustainable purchasing), although mostly driven by economic reasons. This aligns with previous findings (Collado et al., 2017; Jovarauskaitė et al., 2020).

Respondents take their lunch as usual, without giving it much thought. They take it in reusables or single use packages, meaning that this habit can be a barrier as well as an enabler for reuse behaviour. This extends (Balundé, Jovarauskaitė, et al., 2020) findings of habit strong predictors for waste prevention behaviours.

Emerging theme

In line with (Dolnicar & Grün, 2009), due to the unfamiliar context of the hotel, the preparation of the lunch differed from respondents' daily routine leading to the use of single use packaging instead of the own box and bottle.

Respondents, however, indicate that using their own box and bottle at the hotel is an acceptable option. Respondents suggest communicating clearly about bringing and using own containers while stopping the offer of single-use options. This is surprising in light of the reported hassle of bringing own gear and conflicts with the focus on self-enhancement in the hedonic context of a hotel (Dolnicar, 2020).

Conclusions

Adolescents are aware of plastic pollution and see their own responsibility in mitigating it, also in a hotel setting. They point out logistics and other practical barriers for reuse behaviour.

These insights offers hotels starting points for the design of interventions that reinforce the enablers and lower the barriers for reuse behaviour of young hotel guests.

The findings from the focus groups may not be representative for the broader adolescent population because of selection bias, limiting the applicability of results. Further qualitative and quantitative research is needed to build on these results.

References

Ajzen. (1991). *Theory of planned behaviour*.
https://sk.sagepub.com/hnbk/edvol/hdbk_socialpsychtheories1/chpt/theory-planned-behavior

Anderson, D. J., & Krettenauer, T. (2021). Connectedness to Nature and Pro-Environmental Behaviour from Early Adolescence to Adulthood: A Comparison of Urban and Rural Canada. *Sustainability*, 13(7), 3655.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su13073655>

Balundė, A., Jovarauskaitė, L., & Poškus, M. S. (2020). Exploring adolescents' waste prevention via Value-Identity-Personal norm and Comprehensive Action Determination Models. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 72*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101526>

Balundė, A., Perlaviciute, G., & Truskauskaitė-Kunevičienė, I. (2020). Sustainability in Youth: Environmental Considerations in Adolescence and Their Relationship to Pro-environmental Behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.582920>

Bhattarai, P. C., Shrestha, R., Ray, S., & Knez, R. (2024). Determinants of adolescents' pro-sustainable behavior: A systematic literature review using PRISMA. *Discover Sustainability, 5*(1), 112. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-024-00291-6>

Canosa, A., Paquette, M., Cutter-Mackenzie-Knowles, A., Lasczik, A., & Logan, M. (2021). Young people's understandings and attitudes towards marine debris: A systematic scoping review. *CHILDRENS GEOGRAPHIES, 19*(6), 659–676. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2020.1862759>

Carey, M. A., & Asbury, J.-E. (2012). *Focus group research*. Left Coast Press.

Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. R. (1998). *Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance*.

Collado, S., Evans, G. W., & Sorrel, M. A. (2017). The role of parents and best friends in children's pro-environmentalism: Differences according to age and gender. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 54*, 27–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.09.007>

Collado, S., Staats, H., & Sancho, P. (2019). Normative Influences on Adolescents' Self-Reported Pro-Environmental Behaviors: The Role of Parents and Friends. *Environment and Behavior, 51*(3), 288–314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916517744591>

De Leeuw, A., Valois, P., Ajzen, I., & Schmidt, P. (2015). Using the theory of planned behavior to identify key beliefs underlying pro-environmental behavior in high-school students: Implications for educational interventions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 42*, 128–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.03.005>

Diem-Wille, G., & Mcquade, B. (2020). *Psychoanalytic Perspectives on Puberty and Adolescence: The Inner Worlds of Teenagers and their Parents* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003142676>

Dolnicar, S. (2020). Designing for more environmentally friendly tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 84*, 102933. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102933>

Dolnicar, S., & Grün, B. (2009). Environmentally Friendly Behavior: Can Heterogeneity Among Individuals and Contexts/ Environments Be Harvested for Improved Sustainable Management? *Environment and Behavior, 41*(5), 693–714. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916508319448>

Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (2019). *Reuse – rethinking packaging*. Ellen MacArthur Foundation. <https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/reuse-rethinking-packaging>

Evans, G. W., Otto, S., & Kaiser, F. G. (2018). Childhood Origins of Young Adult Environmental Behavior. *Psychological Science, 29*(5), 679–687. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617741894>

Georgescu, M.-A., & Herman, E. (2020). Are young people ready to have a pro-environmental sustainable behaviour as tourists? An investigation of towel reuse intention. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *12*(22), 1–20. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12229469>

Gong, Y., Li, J., Xie, J., Zhang, L., & Lou, Q. (2022). Will “Green” Parents Have “Green” Children? The Relationship Between Parents’ and Early Adolescents’ Green Consumption Values. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *179*(2), 369–385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04835-y>

Hartley, B. L., Pahl, S., Holland, M., Alampei, I., Veiga, J. M., & Thompson, R. C. (2018). Turning the tide on trash: Empowering European educators and school students to tackle marine litter. *Marine Policy*, *96*, 227–234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2018.02.002>

Hartley, B. L., Thompson, R. C., & Pahl, S. (2015). Marine litter education boosts children’s understanding and self-reported actions. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, *90*(1–2), 209–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.10.049>

Hung, L.-Y., Wang, S.-M., & Yeh, T.-K. (2023). Kolb’s experiential learning theory and marine debris education: Effects of different stages on learning. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, *191*, 114933. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2023.114933>

Jia, F., & Yu, H. (2021). Action, communication, and engagement: How parents “ACE” Children’s pro-environmental behaviors. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *74*, 101575. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2021.101575>

Jovarauskaitė, L., Balundė, A., Truskauskaitė-Kunevičienė, I., Kaniušonytė, G., Žukauskienė, R., & Poškus, M. S. (2020). Toward Reducing Adolescents’ Bottled Water Purchasing: From Policy Awareness to Policy-Congruent Behavior. *SAGE Open*, *10*(4). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020983299>

Kollmuss, A., & Agyeman, J. (2002). Mind the Gap: Why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior? *Environmental Education Research*, *8*(3), 239–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620220145401>

Krettenauer, T., Lefebvre, J. P., & Goddeeris, H. (2024). Pro-environmental behaviour, connectedness with nature, and the endorsement of pro-environmental norms in youth: Longitudinal relations. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *94*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2024.102256>

Lindenberg, S., & Steg, L. (2007). Normative, Gain and Hedonic Goal Frames Guiding Environmental Behavior. In *Journal of Social Issues* (Vol. 63, Issue 1, pp. 117–137).

MacInnes, S., Grün, B., & Dolnicar, S. (2022). Habit drives sustainable tourist behaviour. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *92*, 103329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103329>

Michie, S., van Stralen, M. M., & West, R. (2011). The behaviour change wheel: A new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Implementation Science*, *6*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-6-42>

Oturai, N. G., Pahl, S., & Syberg, K. (2022). How can we test plastic pollution perceptions and behavior? A feasibility study with Danish children participating in “the Mass Experiment.” *Science of the Total Environment*, 806. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150914>

Pahl, S., Wyles, K. J., & Thompson, R. C. (2017). Channelling passion for the ocean towards plastic pollution. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1(10), 697–699. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0204-4>

Robinson, A. C., Downey, L. A., Ford, T. C., Lomas, J. E., & Stough, C. (2019). Green teens: Investigating the role of emotional intelligence in adolescent environmentalism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 138, 225–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.10.009>

Severin, M. I., Akpetou, L. K., Annasawmy, P., Asuquo, F. E., Beckman, F., Benomar, M., Jaya-Ram, A., Malouli, M., Mees, J., Monteiro, I., Ndwiga, J., Neves Silva, P., Nubi, O. A., Sim, Y. K., Sohoun, Z., Shau-Hwai, A. T., Woo, S. P., Zizah, S., Buysse, A., ... Catarino, A. I. (2023). Impact of the citizen science project COLLECT on ocean literacy and well-being within a north/west African and south-east Asian context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1130596. cmedm. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1130596>

Steg, L., & Vlek, C. (2009). Encouraging pro-environmental behaviour: An integrative review and research agenda. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 29(3), 309–317. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2008.10.004>

Van Der Werff, E., & Steg, L. (2016). The psychology of participation and interest in smart energy systems: Comparing the value-belief-norm theory and the value-identity-personal norm model. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 22, 107–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2016.08.022>

Willmott, T. J., Pang, B., & Rundle-Thiele, S. (2021). Capability, opportunity, and motivation: An across contexts empirical examination of the COM-B model. *BMC Public Health*, 21(1), 1014. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-11019-w>

WT&TC. (2021). *Rethinking Single Use Plastic Products (SUPPs) in Travel & Tourism*. <https://wttc.org/sustainability/environment/plastic>

Žukauskienė, R., Truskauskaitė-Kunevičienė, I., Gabė, V., & Kaniušonytė, G. (2021). “My Words Matter”: The Role of Adolescents in Changing Pro-environmental Habits in the Family. *Environment and Behavior*, 53(10), 1140–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916520953150>