



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Judge, M;Fernando, JW;Paladino, A;Mikolajczak, G;Kashima, Y

Title:

Lay Concepts of Art, Craft, and Manufacture and the Implications for Sustainable Consumption

Date:

2020-03-01

Citation:

Judge, M., Fernando, J. W., Paladino, A., Mikolajczak, G. & Kashima, Y. (2020). Lay Concepts of Art, Craft, and Manufacture and the Implications for Sustainable Consumption. *Journal of Social Issues*, 76 (1), pp.19-34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12368>.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/252744>

Lay Concepts of Art, Craft and Manufacture and the Implications for Sustainable
Consumption

Madeline Judge¹, Julian W. Fernando², Angela Paladino², Gosia Mikolajczak³, Yoshihisa
Kashima⁴

¹Department of Psychology, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

²Department of Management and Marketing, The University of Melbourne, Australia

³School of Social and Political Sciences, The University of Melbourne, Australia

⁴Melbourne School of Psychological Sciences, The University of Melbourne, Australia

Corresponding author:

Dr Madeline Judge

+31 50 363 6188

m.a.t.judge@rug.nl

University of Groningen

Grote Kruisstraat 2/I

9712 TS Groningen, The Netherlands

Acknowledgements:

This research was partially funded by the Australian Government through the Australian Research Council. IH120100053 “Unlocking the Food Value Chain: Australian industry transformation for ASEAN markets”.

Abstract

An object's creation history plays an important role in how we perceive, value and interact with that object, and has consequences for policy on sustainable consumption. Here, we propose that laypeople in industrialized societies have three dominant concepts of how objects can be created: art, craft and manufacture. These concepts are differentiated by the perceived properties and environmental sustainability of objects, as well as the perceived capabilities of producers. In three experiments, we examined the consequences of framing an object's creation history as art, craft or manufacture. In general, art and craft objects were valued more highly than manufactured objects, and this effect was partially mediated by the perceived transfer of positive emotional residue. Mass-produced goods may be treated as disposable consumables, whereas arts and crafts are more deserving of preservation. That this effect was stronger in Australia than China suggests these effects may be related to a post-materialist orientation.

Keywords: Creation, objects, contagion, valuation, sustainable consumption

Lay Concepts of Art, Craft and Manufacture and the Implications for Sustainable Consumption

The overconsumption of natural resources and the production of waste are major environmental issues. Accordingly, the UN has set “responsible consumption and production” as one of its core sustainable development goals (SDGs; United Nations, 2015). Although considerable research attention has been directed towards encouraging more sustainable behaviours, such as reducing water usage, making energy-efficient purchases or recycling, less is known about how everyday people understand the processes of *production* (or what they consider “sustainable” production), and the behavioural consequences of these lay beliefs. Policy and interventions aiming to reduce overconsumption and waste at the individual and household levels would therefore benefit from research on how lay people understand the processes involved in creating objects¹. In this paper, we propose that laypeople (particularly, individuals in western industrialised societies) have three relatively distinct concepts of the production process: art, craft or manufacture. We present findings from three experiments showing how these lay concepts can have divergent outcomes for how individuals perceive, value and interact with objects, as well as having consequences for perceptions of the people involved in the production process.

Theoretical Framework

How do everyday people understand the processes involved in creating objects? Anthropologists and historians have highlighted the culturally- and historically-located nature of conceptual divides between different forms of production (e.g., Risatti, 2007; Shiner, 2001). These divides usually have a hierarchical structure; for example, the higher valuation placed on the “fine art of inspired genius” over the “mere craft of rules” (Shiner, 2001; p. 24),

¹ Throughout this paper, we use the term ‘object’ as shorthand to refer in to any material object that has been created by intentional human action (i.e., similar to the term ‘artifact’).

or the higher value placed on artisan crafts over industrial mass-produced objects (Risatti, 2007). Here, we take a folk theory approach to investigating how laypeople understand object creation (focusing initially on the perspective of individuals in western, industrialized societies). Folk theories are explanatory beliefs that lay people draw on to explain the world around them (Gelman & Legare, 2011). Our framework integrates intuitive mind-body dualism (i.e., the perceived separation of mind and body; Bloom, 2004) with the property transmission hypothesis (i.e., the belief that effects resemble their causes; White, 2009) to delineate lay people's intuitive reasoning about the role of human agency in object creation. For the mind-body dualism aspect, we propose that individuals envision two key stages in the object creation process: firstly, an *author* generates the mental concept of the object, and secondly, the author (or someone else) uses their body as an *instrument* to manipulate materials and translate the mental concept into physical reality. This structure emphasises individual human agency over manual labour and allows for different actors to perform different stages of the process. For the property transmission aspect, we draw on the literature on the law of contagion; “the belief that objects could acquire the aura or ‘essence’ of a particular source through physical contact with that source” (Huang, Ackerman & Newman, 2017, p. 430), to highlight the different kinds of properties that can be perceived to be transferred from creators to objects².

We propose that this basic folk theory structure can help explain the different value placed on art, craft or manufactured objects. Potentially, the same object could be categorised as art, craft or manufacture depending on descriptions of the authors and instruments who were involved in its production. For example, a ceramic urinal could be described as manufactured by labourers to a company's specifications, as crafted by skilled artisans using

² Please note that the concept of “property transmission” in this paper differs from the notion of transferring the *ownership* of items from one person to another.

traditional methods, or as transformed into a work of art by an artist - as illustrated by Duchamp's *Fountain* artwork (Shiner, 2001). This, in turn, has consequences for the perceived properties transferred from the creator(s) to the object. Although we outline a number of potential properties below (e.g., individual self-essence, emotional residue, and brand essence), in our research, we will focus on the perceived transfer of *positive emotional residue* from creators to objects (i.e., the belief that people can leave traces of emotions on physical spaces that can be detected by others; Savani, Kumar, Naidu, Dweck, 2011).

Art. At present, most psychological research on lay concepts of object creation has focused on creative art (e.g., Newman, Bartels & Smith, 2014; Smith & Newman, 2014). In the concept of art, the author is the individual artist's creative genius and the instrument is usually the artist's body. The perceived property transmission tends to focus on the symbolic qualities of the object, which are assumed to represent the artists' internal mental states or an "endpoint in a creative performance" (Smith & Newman, 2014; p. 303), though some research has also found that artworks can be perceived to carry the nonvisible "essence" of the individual artist (Newman et al., 2014). Since the focus is on the art object as a signifier of internal mental states, there may be less attention directed to the use of the artists' body and therefore less perceived positive emotional residue in the object (or alternatively, there may be a perception of negative emotional residue).

Craft. In the lay concept of craft, we suggest that authorship is usually attributed to a cultural group and the individual craftsperson acts as a kind of conduit for representations of traditional concepts. However, the craftsperson retains a degree of agency due to the requirement for skilled labour in accurately reproducing a traditional concept (i.e., the "thinking hand"; Risatti, 2007). The focus is on the craftsperson's intrinsically motivated use of their body, which can lead to the perceived transmission of positive emotional residue to objects. For example, objects described as "handmade" or "made by people" are believed to

contain the creator's "love" (Fuchs, Schreier & van Osselaer, 2015) or "positive social traces" (Job, Nikitin, Zhang, Carr & Walton, 2017), respectively.

Manufacture. In the lay concept of manufacture, the author is a company or brand, and the instruments are factory workers or labourers (or even machines). In manufacturing, the workers who are making the object are usually restricted in their ability to engage in creativity and/or skilled labour (e.g., Andrighetto, Baldissarri & Volpato, 2017). Therefore, these workers may be seen as unlikely to transfer positive emotional residue to the object. However, if there is a salient brand, there may be a perceived transmission of the "essence" of the brand.

Consequences for Sustainable Consumption

We propose that research on lay concepts of object creation can provide a useful contribution to the psychology of sustainable consumption. Sustainable consumption has been defined as "the use of goods and services that respond to basic needs and bring a better quality of life, while minimising the use of natural resources, toxic materials and emissions of waste and pollutants over the life cycle, so as not to jeopardise the needs of future generations" (Oslo Roundtable, 1994, para. 1). More recently, it has been argued that this definition should include greater attention to social justice issues (UNESCO, 2010), since consumption choices impact not just the environment and future generations but also other people (e.g., the people involved in production systems).

Although policy initiatives that restrict the production of 'single-use' products (e.g., plastic bags) would likely have the largest positive impact on the environment, from a psychological perspective, it is also useful to investigate how objects come to be devalued as 'disposable' in the first place. We propose that one aspect of object valuation involves lay reasoning about the amount and type of human labour invested in creating the object (see also

the folk economic belief that “labor is the source of value”; Boyer & Petersen, 2018). This understanding of the role of human labour in object creation can enable us to understand why individuals (de)value different categories of objects, how they reason about the environmental sustainability of production systems, and how those lay beliefs influence behaviours (e.g., the use and disposal of objects). Lay concepts of production may also contribute to the (de)valuation of the *people* involved in object creation. For example, factory workers tend to be objectified relative to artisans because factory work is perceived to require repetitive, mindless tasks (Andrighetto, et al., 2017).

In a recent theoretical review, Nemeroff and Rozin (2018) highlighted several areas in which contagion research could contribute to promoting sustainability. One area that was not discussed, was the potential of highlighting the invested effort or emotions of the creator when making the object, for increasing the perceived intrinsic value of objects and indirectly encouraging reuse or recycling. This would be relevant to circular economy initiatives aiming to better connect the manufacture, use and recycling of resources. We predicted that art and craft creation contexts would increase the salience that the creator has invested their positive emotional residue in an object (i.e., their “love”), and this would lead to greater distress at the prospect of the object being destroyed (measured in Studies 1 and 2) and higher intentions to preserve the object (measured in Study 3). We also proposed that these creation contexts would be used as a heuristic cue to environmental sustainability, and that art and craft objects would be rated as more sustainable than manufactured objects.

In addition to object perceptions, we explored the consequences of lay concepts of object creation for perceptions of the people making the objects. Prior research has found that factory workers tend to be objectified relative to artisans; that is, they are viewed as more of a “tool” than a “person”, due to engaging in repetitive tasks (Andrighetto et al., 2017). Here, we included related but slightly different measure of objectification; *mind perception* (Gray,

Knobe, Sheskin, Bloom, & Barrett, 2011). It has been argued that mind perception comprises two main components; agency (e.g., the capacity for self-control) and experience (e.g., the capacity to experience complex emotions) (Gray et al, 2011; for an alternative with three factors, see Weisman, Dweck, & Markman, 2017). By including these two dimensions, we hoped to differentiate between specific forms of creator objectification. Consistent with Andrighetto, et al. (2017), we predicted that factory workers would be viewed as lower in both agency and experience than craftspeople and artists (e.g., similar to mechanistic dehumanization; Haslam, 2006). Additionally, we predicted that artists would be perceived as higher in experience but lower in agency than artisans (e.g., similar to animalistic dehumanization; Haslam, 2006), since previous research has found that artists tend to be viewed as high on human-nature traits but low on uniquely-human traits (which roughly correspond to experience and agency, respectively; Loughnan & Haslam, 2007).

Finally, in Study 3, we compared the consequences of the creation context message frames in Australia and China. These two countries have different political, social and environmental influences, which have likely produced different attitudes towards production systems. For example, research has identified differences in the valuation of artworks made by famous individuals in individualistic societies, compared to collectivistic societies, such that duplicates of artworks are more devalued in individualistic societies (Gjersoe, Newman, Chituc & Hood, 2014). This could suggest that a bias towards valuing individual creators might be stronger in individualistic societies like Australia. Furthermore, Australia is described as a post-industrial economy that has exhibited a shift from materialist values emphasizing security, to post-materialist values emphasizing self-expression (e.g., Spies-Butcher, & Stebbing, 2016). In contrast, China has more recently experienced industrialization and its associated environmental impacts, and although there is some evidence of values shifting towards more individualistic values, traditional values such as

hard work are also being retained (Bomhoff & Gu, 2012; Inglehart, 2016). Related to this, research on folk theories of societal change (FTSC) beliefs has found that laypeople tend to believe that society is becoming less warm and more competent (although individuals in China tend to be more optimistic about the future than individuals in Australia; Kashima, et al., 2011). FTSC beliefs in post-industrial economies like Australia could be associated with a nostalgic desire to return to “craft” production, given its association with a “warmer” past society. We therefore predict that the relative differences between art, craft and manufacturing creation contexts will be larger in Australia than in China.

Study 1

Here, we investigated whether the creation context influenced the perceived value of an object (measured as distress at its prospective destruction), and whether this effect was mediated by the perceived transfer of positive emotional residue to the object. We also measured perceptions of the mind of the creators.

Method

Participants. We recruited 496 UK residents via the online panel provider, Prolific. After removing participants who failed an attention check, the remaining sample comprised 474 participants (72.4% female, 27.6% male), who ranged in age from 18 to 72 ($M = 38.08$, $SD = 11.47$).

Procedure and materials. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions describing an individual creating an object in an art, craft or manufacturing context (we also manipulated the gender of the creator, but collapsed across target gender in the analyses). Examples are provided below:

Sarah is an [artist/ craftsperson/ factory worker] who makes objects using [her own original ideas/ age-old traditional ideas/ a company’s original ideas]. Today,

Sarah is creating a new object using her hands and tools. The object she produces is a **[work of art/ craft object/ manufactured object]**.

Participants then completed short measures of distress at destruction (two items, e.g., “How upset would you feel if this object was destroyed?”; Job et al., 2017) ($r = .92$); positive emotional residue (three items, e.g., “To what extent do you think that the object contains love”; Fuchs et al., 2015) ($\alpha = .92$); creator agency ($r = .60$) and creator experience ($r = .72$) (two items each, e.g., “Compared to the average person, how capable is the creator of setting goals”; Waytz & Young, 2014) on 7-point scales from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) (see the Supplementary Materials for full measures).

Results

Means and standard deviations can be found in Table 1. There was a significant effect of creation context on distress at destruction, $F(2,471) = 30.53, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.11$. Post hoc Bonferroni-corrected tests showed that participants were more distressed at the prospect of craft objects being destroyed than both art and manufactured objects, with art objects in turn producing higher distress than manufactured objects. There was a significant effect of creation context on positive emotional residue, $F(2,471) = 135.06, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.36$. Post hoc Bonferroni-corrected tests showed that the art and craft objects were higher in emotional residue than manufactured objects (art objects also appeared to be higher in emotional residue than manufactured objects, but this difference was only marginally significant, $p = .06$). There was also a significant effect of creation context on Agency, $F(2,471) = 13.35, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.05$. Post hoc Bonferroni-corrected tests showed that artists and craftspeople were rated as more agentic than factory workers were (artists and craftspeople did not differ significantly, $p = .18$). For Experience, the effect of creation context was non-significant, $F(2,471) = 1.80, p = .17$.

Using the PROCESS macro for SPSS (Hayes, 2013), we examined whether the effect of creation context on distress at prospective destruction was mediated by perceived positive emotional residue in the object. We set the craft condition as the reference category. The indirect effect of art (relative to craft) on distress via emotional residue was significant, $b = -0.14$, $SE = .06$, 95% CI[-.25, -.03], as was the indirect effect of manufacture (relative to craft), $b = -0.89$, $SE = .16$, 95% CI[-1.21, -.60]. These findings suggest that craft objects produce higher distress at their prospective destruction than both art and manufactured objects, in part because they are perceived to contain more positive emotional residue from the creator.

Study 2

In Study 2, we aimed to replicate the main findings of Study 1. We also expanded on the first study by including two counterbalanced images of objects (a wooden bowl or a metal bowl), a description of the creator's location (Narberth, Wales), and a control condition that displayed just the object image alone (to test whether the art/craft conditions were increasing emotional residue, or whether the manufacturing condition was reducing it). Additionally, we measured explicit beliefs about the environmental sustainability of the object.

Method

Participants. We recruited 567 UK residents via Prolific Academic. After removing participants who failed an attention check item, the remaining sample size was 536 (49.1% female, 50.2% male, 0.7% missing) who ranged in age from 18 to 73 ($M = 36.77$, $SD = 12.02$).

Procedure and materials. Participants were randomly assigned to view one of four creation conditions: art, craft, manufacture or control. They then completed the measures of distress at prospective destruction ($r = .89$), positive emotional residue ($\alpha = .90$), creator

agency ($r = .66$), creator experience ($r = .76$), and the perceived environmental sustainability of the object (a single item; “To what extent do you think that the object is environmentally sustainable?”).

Results

Means and standard deviations can be found in Table 2 (we collapsed across creator gender and object image in the analyses). A one-way ANOVA showed a significant effect of creation context on distress at destruction, $F(3,530) = 11.37, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. Participants expressed higher distress at the prospect of the art and craft objects being destroyed than the manufactured and control objects. There was a significant effect of creation context on positive emotional residue (Welch’s test was used due to unequal samples variances), $F(3,247.72) = 49.17, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .21$; craft objects were rated as highest in positive emotional residue, then art objects, and then manufactured objects (manufactured and control did not differ significantly). There was a significant effect of creation context on perceived environmental sustainability, $F(3,530) = 7.75, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$; art and craft objects were rated as more environmentally sustainable than manufactured objects, but only craft objects differed significantly from the control condition (craft was viewed as more sustainable). There was a small but significant main effect for Agency, $F(3,529) = 3.73, p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$; artists and craftspeople were rated as more agentic than the control condition, but factory workers did not differ to the control. Again, there were no significant differences for Experience, $F(3,529) = 1.09, p = .35$. Excluding the control condition; consistent with Study 1, there were significant indirect effects of creation context on distress at destruction via emotional residue, for both art (relative to craft), $b = -0.29, SE = .09$, 95% CI[-.47, -.12], and manufacture (relative to craft), $b = -0.90, SE = .11$, 95% CI[-1.12, -.69].

Study 3

In Study 3, we aimed to replicate the previous findings and to also investigate potential cultural moderators of the effects by comparing participants from two countries; Australia and China.

Method

Participants. We recruited 699 participants from both Australia and China through SSI, an online participant panel provider. After removing participants with very short response times or long-string responding, the resulting sample size was 686 (310 Chinese residents and 376 Australian residents; 50.7% female, 49.3% male; median age range: 34-44).

Procedure. The design was mixed with one within-subjects variable (creation context: art/craft/manufacture) and one between-subjects variable (country: Australia/China). To control for presentation order and object type effects, we incorporated three object images (a plate, a bowl and a chair) in a Latin square design, in which each participant rated three objects and saw each image once and each creation context once (presentation order was also counterbalanced). In Study 3, we replaced the distress at destruction measure with measures of intentions to preserve the object, (all inter-item correlations $> .53$). We again measured positive emotional residue (all Cronbach's alpha's $> .92$), perceived environmental sustainability (single item), creator agency (all inter-item correlations $> .75$) and creator experience (all inter-item correlations $> .75$).

Results

Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 3 (Australia) and Table 4 (China)³. We collapsed across object images and presentation order to focus on the main

³ We also ran the analyses using variables standardized within-subjects to account for cultural differences in scale use, but the results did not change significantly, so we have reported the unstandardized variables.

effects of creation context and country. A mixed factorial ANOVA showed a significant interaction between creation context and country for preservation intentions, $F(2,1368) = 3.45, p = .03$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. Post hoc tests showed that, in the Australian sample, participants were more willing to preserve art or craft objects than manufactured objects, whereas in the Chinese sample, the difference between art and manufactured objects was non-significant ($p = .15$) and the difference between craft and manufactured objects was smaller. There was a significant interaction between creation context and country for positive emotional residue, $F(1.97, 1337.66) = 6.32, p = .002$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$ (the Greenhouse-Geisser correction is reported due to violating the sphericity assumption). Post hoc tests showed that, in the Australian sample, art and craft objects had more emotional residue than manufactured objects; whereas, in the Chinese sample, the difference between art and manufactured objects was non-significant ($p = .22$) and was also smaller between craft and manufactured objects. There was a significant main effect of creation context on perceived environmental sustainability, $F(2, 1362.46) = 10.83, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, but the interaction with country was non-significant ($p = .10$). Post hoc tests showed that in both countries, art and craft objects were seen as more environmentally sustainable than manufactured objects (art and craft objects did not differ significantly, $p = .77$).

There was a significant interaction between creation context and country for Agency, $F(1.96, 1341.69) = 10.27, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$ (Greenhouse-Geisser correction). Post hoc tests showed that, in the Australian sample, factory workers were rated as significantly lower in Agency than both artists and the craftspeople, whereas, in the Chinese sample, the difference between factory workers and artists was non-significant ($p = .81$) and was smaller between factory workers and craftspeople. For Experience, there was a significant main effect of creation context, $F(1.96, 1342.32) = 43.33, p < .001$ (Greenhouse Geisser correction); in

both countries, factory workers were rated as significantly lower in Experience than artists and craftspeople (artists and craftspeople did not differ significantly).

Discussion

In the current research, we investigated the effects of manipulating the creation history of an object on the perceived properties and value of the object, as well as the perceived characteristics of the creators. Across three studies, art and craft objects were valued significantly higher than manufactured objects (as shown by the participants' reported distress at the prospective destruction of the object), and this effect was partially mediated by beliefs that these objects contained more positive emotional residue (i.e., the creator's "love"). We also found some evidence that, compared to craftspeople and artists, factory workers were rated as lower in agency (Studies 1 and 3), and experience (Study 3 only); however, we did not identify many differences between artists and craftspeople. These findings support past literature, which also identified positive contagion effects for products described as "handmade" (Fuchs et al., 2015) or "made by people" (Job et al., 2017). The findings relating to the agency measure also align with past research showing that factory workers tend to be objectified relative to artisans (Andrighetto et al., 2017).

We also compared samples of participants from two countries, Australia and China, and found that the relative valuation of art and craft objects over manufactured objects (as well as the higher agency of artists and craftspeople relative to factory workers) tended to be stronger in Australia than in China. Overall, this research suggests that lay concepts of art, craft and manufacturing influence perceptions of objects and their creators, and that these effects may be stronger in post-materialist western industrialized countries. However, this should be tested with a wider range of countries.

Implications for Sustainable Consumption

Policy makers should consider how citizens might draw intuitive connections between the environmental sustainability of a product and the social justice implications of its production context (i.e., intuitions about the wellbeing of the creators) (see also Spies-Butcher, & Stebbing, 2016). In the current research, compared to manufactured objects, art and craft objects produced greater distress at the prospect of their destruction, were associated with higher intentions to preserve the object if damaged, and were rated as more environmentally sustainable. One strategy that organizations may employ to try to encourage sustainable consumption, is to provide information on the origins of objects (e.g., Leonard, 2010). However, the present findings suggest that, at least in western industrialised societies, this strategy will likely be most beneficial when the creation context carries a connotation of meaningful work (e.g., craft or art production), which can make the object seem more intrinsically valuable. In contrast, drawing attention to industrial production might activate the lay concept of manufacturing and make the object appear to contain less “love” and be more disposable. The present research also suggests that drawing attention to creation contexts can also influence perceptions of the mental capacities of workers (particularly, their agency), which has implications for social justice and fair-trade policies and campaigns.

The present findings suggest that “craft” objects, in particular, may be more likely to be purchased by pro-environmental consumers (given that these objects were rated as more sustainable than a control condition), and also may be more likely to be cared for, repaired or recycled, compared to manufactured objects (given that these objects produced more distress at the prospect of their destruction). However, future research measuring actual behaviours is required to establish these connections. These lay concepts could also potentially have counterproductive consequences for sustainability; for example, if in certain contexts, industrial production is less resource intensive, but this conflicts with a lay assumption that traditional craft production will be more sustainable (see also, Nemeroff & Rozin, 2018).

Limitations and Future Research

There are a few limitations to the current study. Firstly, consumers are usually not presented with object creation information in isolation, but instead, as part of a broader marketing strategy. Future research should incorporate more realistic product descriptions (i.e., including branding). Secondly, sensitivity power analyses with G*Power 3.1.9.4 (using a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ and power level of $\beta = 0.8$) showed that although we had adequate power to detect small effects in Study 3 ($f = .05$), we may have been slightly underpowered to detect small effects in Study 1 ($f = .14$) and Study 2 ($f = .14$). Future research should use a priori power calculations and consider potential sample size issues. Thirdly, overall, the size of the effects were small, which raises the question of whether they would have significant real-world impact. In future research, it would be useful to measure actual behaviours, rather than just intentions, and to include a wider variety of objects with pairwise comparisons of the folk theories.

In our theoretical framework, we proposed that objects described as art would be more highly valued than craft objects due to the emphasis placed on individual human agency. However, one surprising finding was that art was sometimes valued *less* than craft. This could indicate that people take other factors into account when evaluating art, beyond the perceived emotional residue in the object (e.g., the art object's novelty or aesthetic qualities, competition with a nonvisible "essence" of the artist; or alternatively, the craft object's usefulness). Future research could further examine what distinguishes lay concepts of art and craft, and other potential mechanisms underlying the higher valuation of craft (e.g., the role of socioeconomic status). Another area for future research is to explore whether there are other lay concepts of artifact creation, beyond art, craft and manufacture (e.g., the concept of *design*, which shares features of both art and manufacture). Finally, it would be useful to investigate the possibility of a "backwards contagion" effect from objects to producers (see

also, Nemeroff & Rozin, 2018). For example, research could examine whether a low-quality object negatively impacts perceptions of the person who created it, or alternatively, if people believe that damaging an object can have negative consequences for its creator. As part of this, we would recommend using longer or alternative measures of creator mind perception, given that the two-dimensional framework has been recently challenged (e.g., Weisman et al., 2017).

Conclusion

When developing policy and interventions to promote sustainable consumption, it is important to consider how everyday people understand and interpret information about object production processes. Simply providing information about the creation history of objects may not be enough to increase the valuation of objects or their creators; framing the same object as produced in an art, craft or manufacturing context results in different evaluative and behavioural consequences. This research provides a novel contribution to the literature on sustainable consumption as well as highlighting promising areas for future research on the associations between the valuation of human agency, manual labour and objects.

References

- Andrighetto, L., Baldissarri, C., & Volpato, C. (2017). (Still) Modern Times: Objectification at work. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 47*(1), 25-35.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2190>
- Bloom, P. (2004). *Descartes' baby: How the science of child development explains what makes us human*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bomhoff, E. J., & Gu, M. M. L. (2012). East Asia remains different: A comment on the index of “self-expression values,” by Inglehart and Welzel. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 43*(3), 373-383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022111435096>
- Boyer, P., & Petersen, M. B. (2018). Folk-economic beliefs: An evolutionary cognitive model. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 41*, e158.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X17001960>
- Fuchs, C., Schreier, M., & van Osselaer, S. M. (2015). The Handmade Effect: What's love got to do with it?. *Journal of Marketing, 79*(2), 98-110.
<https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.14.0018>
- Gelman, S. A., & Legare, C. H. (2011). Concepts and folk theories. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 40*, 379-398. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-081309-145822>
- Gjersoe, N. L., Newman, G. E., Chituc, V., & Hood, B. (2014). Individualism and the extended-self: Cross-cultural differences in the valuation of authentic objects. *PloS one, 9*(3), e90787. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0090787>
- Gray, K., Knobe, J., Sheskin, M., Bloom, P., & Barrett, L. F. (2011). More than a body: mind perception and the nature of objectification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(6), 1207-1220. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025883>.

- Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(3), 252-264. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: Guilford Press
- Huang, J. Y., Ackerman, J. M., & Newman, G. E. (2017). Catching (up with) magical contagion: A review of contagion effects in consumer contexts. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research, 2*(4), 430-443. <https://doi.org/10.1086/693533>
- Inglehart, R. (2016). After postmaterialism: An essay on China, Russia and the United States. A comment. *Canadian Journal of Sociology, 41*(2), 213-222. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/canajsocicahican.41.2.213
- Job, V., Nikitin, J., Zhang, S. X., Carr, P. B., & Walton, G. M. (2017). Social traces of generic humans increase the value of everyday objects. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 43*(6), 785-792. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217697694>
- Kashima, Y., Shi, J., Tsuchiya, K., Kashima, E. S., Cheng, S. Y., Chao, M. M., & Shin, S. H. (2011). Globalization and folk theory of social change: How globalization relates to societal perceptions about the past and future. *Journal of Social Issues, 67*(4), 696-715. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01723.x>
- Leonard, A. (2010). *The story of stuff: How our obsession with stuff is trashing the planet, our communities, and our health-and a vision for change*. London, UK: Constable & Robinson.
- Loughnan, S., & Haslam, N. (2007). Animals and androids: Implicit associations between social categories and nonhumans. *Psychological Science, 18*(2), 116-121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01858.x>

- Nemeroff, C., & Rozin, P. (2018). Back in Touch with Contagion: Some Essential Issues. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*, 3(4), 612-624.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/699971>
- Newman, G. E., Bartels, D. M., & Smith, R. K. (2014). Are artworks more like people than artifacts? Individual concepts and their extensions. *Topics in cognitive science*, 6(4), 647-662. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12111>
- Oslo Roundtable. (1994). *Part 1 - The imperative of sustainable production and consumption*. Retrieved from <http://www.iisd.ca/consume/oslo004.html>
- Risatti, H. (2007). *A Theory of Craft: Function and Aesthetic Expression*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Savani, K., Kumar, S., Naidu, N. V. R., & Dweck, C. S. (2011). Beliefs about emotional residue: The idea that emotions leave a trace in the physical environment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(4), 684-701.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024102>
- Shiner, L. (2001). *The Invention of Art: A Cultural History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, R. K., & Newman, G. E. (2014). When multiple creators are worse than one: The bias toward single authors in the evaluation of art. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 8(3), 303-310. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0036928>
- Spies-Butcher, B., & Stebbing, A. (2016). Climate change and the welfare state? Exploring Australian attitudes to climate and social policy. *Journal of Sociology*, 52(4), 741-758. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783315584209>

- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. New York, NY: United Nations.
- UNESCO (2010). *Defining sustainable consumption – three cautionary points*. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/education/tlsf/mods/theme_b/popups/mod09t06s07.html
- Waytz, A., & Young, L. (2014). Two motivations for two dimensions of mind. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 55, 278-283.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.08.001>
- Weisman, K., Dweck, C. S., & Markman, E. M. (2017). Rethinking people's conceptions of mental life. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(43), 11374-11379.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1704347114>
- White, P. A. (2009). Property transmission: an explanatory account of the role of similarity information in causal inference. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(5), 774-793.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016970>

Tables

Table 1.

Means and Standard Deviations by Creation Context (Study 1).

	Art (<i>n</i> = 159)	Craft (<i>n</i> = 159)	Manufacture (<i>n</i> = 156)
Distress at destruction	4.21 (1.70) _a	4.71 (1.40) _b	3.33 (1.59) _c
Positive emotional residue	5.17 (1.17) _a	5.51 (1.19) _a	3.26 (1.64) _b
Creator agency	5.29 (1.04) _a	5.50 (0.91) _a	4.91 (1.11) _b
Creator experience	4.98 (1.16) _a	4.93 (1.08) _a	4.74 (1.26) _a

Note. Common subscripts denote no significant difference between the means. Scale anchors range from 1 to 7.

Table 2.

Means and Standard Deviations by Creation Context (Study 2).

	Art (<i>n</i> = 152)	Craft (<i>n</i> = 151)	Manufacture (<i>n</i> = 156)	Control (<i>n</i> = 75)
Distress at destruction	3.24 (1.69) _{ab}	3.66 (1.80) _a	2.66 (1.59) _c	2.63 (1.62) _{bc}
Positive emotional residue	4.53 (1.39) _a	5.02 (1.22) _b	3.49 (1.55) _c	3.15 (1.42) _c
Environmental sustainability	4.75 (1.24) _{ab}	4.89 (1.11) _a	4.33 (1.18) _c	4.33 (1.33) _{bc}
Creator agency	5.19 (1.07) _a	5.17 (1.10) _a	4.97 (1.19) _{ab}	4.71 (1.35) _b
Creator experience	4.55 (1.09) _a	4.57 (1.10) _a	4.50 (1.34) _a	4.28 (1.35) _a

Note. Common subscripts denote no significant difference between the means. Scale anchors range from 1 to 7.

Table 3.

Means and Standard Deviations by Creation Context, Australian Sample (Study 3).

	Art	Craft	Manufacture
Preservation intentions	4.23 (1.90) _a	4.38 (1.90) _a	3.69 (1.91) _b
Positive emotional residue	4.46 (1.71) _a	4.62 (1.68) _a	3.96 (1.73) _b
Environmental sustainability	4.65 (1.40) _a	4.76 (1.34) _a	4.41 (1.37) _b
Creator agency	4.64 (1.47) _a	4.69 (1.45) _a	4.16 (1.47) _b
Creator experience	4.38 (1.51) _a	4.34 (1.45) _a	3.88 (1.48) _b

Note. Common subscripts denote no significant difference between the means. Within-subjects, $N = 376$. Scale anchors range from 1 to 7.

Table 4.

Means and Standard Deviations by Creation Context, China Sample (Study 3).

	Art	Craft	Manufacture
Preservation intentions	4.70 (1.46) _{ab}	4.81 (1.45) _a	4.48 (1.49) _b
Positive emotional residue	4.83 (1.48) _{ab}	4.94 (1.44) _a	4.67 (1.56) _b
Environmental sustainability	5.12 (1.33) _a	5.15 (1.32) _a	5.01 (1.37) _a
Creator agency	5.04 (1.26) _{ab}	5.17 (1.21) _a	4.97 (1.28) _b
Creator experience	5.05 (1.19) _a	5.07 (1.13) _a	4.71 (1.36) _b

Note. Common subscripts denote no significant difference between the means. Within-subjects, $N = 310$. Scale anchors range from 1 to 7.

Author Biographies

Madeline Judge is a postdoctoral research fellow at the University of Groningen. Her research interests include sustainable consumption and the ideological foundations of meat consumption and vegetarianism.

Julian Fernando is a postdoctoral research fellow at the University of Melbourne. His research interests include utopian thinking, pro-environmental attitudes and behaviour, emotional predictors of social action orientations, and authentic social identity.

Angela Paladino is a Professor of Marketing at the University of Melbourne. Her research interests include pro-environmental attitudes and behaviour, new product adoption in developing markets and understanding organisational innovation performance across markets.

Gosia Mikolajczak is a research fellow at the University of Melbourne. Her research focuses on gender discrimination, ideology, wellbeing, and applications of different quantitative research methods in social research.

Yoshihisa Kashima is Professor of Psychology at the University of Melbourne. His research focuses on cultural dynamics – the formation, maintenance, and transformation of culture over time, with particular emphasis on culture of sustainability.