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**Supplementary Figure 1.** Perceived impacts of marine litter in Benin at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01.
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**Supplementary Figure 2.** Perceived impacts of marine litter in Cabo Verde at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01.

**Supplementary Figure 3.** Perceived impacts of marine litter in Côte d’Ivoire at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error.

**Supplementary Figure 4.** Perceived impacts of marine litter in Ghana at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error.
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**Supplementary Figure 5.** Perceived impacts of marine litter in Malaysia at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01.
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**Supplementary Figure 6.** Perceived impacts of marine litter in Nigeria at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \**p* < .05.
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**Supplementary Figure 7.** Perceived causes of marine litter in Benin at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01.
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**Supplementary Figure 8.** Perceived causes of marine litter in Cabo Verde at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \*\**p* < .01.
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**Supplementary Figure 9.** Perceived causes of marine litter in Côte d’Ivoire at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \*\**p* < .01.
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**Supplementary Figure 10.** Perceived causes of marine litter in Ghana at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01.
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**Supplementary Figure 11.** Perceived causes of marine litter in Malaysia at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01.
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**Supplementary Figure 12.** Perceived causes of marine litter in Nigeria at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \*\**p* < .01.

**Supplementary Table 1.** Attitudes towards beach litter removal at pre-intervention, per country (1 – 5 scale: *strongly disagree*–*strongly agree*). *Note.* \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Attitudes towards beach litter removal at baseline, per country**  | **M (SD)**  | **Significant differences** |
| 12345 | **Benin**            Local government is responsible           Local community is responsible            Everyone is responsible, including me           Collective activities are important to keep the beach litter-free           Only the original polluters are responsible |  3.80 (0.99) 3.62 (0.96) 3.95 (1.22) 4.05 (0.82) 2.55 (1.27)  | 1 > 5\*\*2 > 5\*3 > 5\*\*4 > 5\*\* |  |
| 12345 | **Cabo Verde**            Local government is responsible           Local community is responsible            Everyone is responsible, including me           Collective activities are important to keep the beach litter-free           Only the original polluters are responsible |  2.89 (0.96) 3.89 (0.76) 4.89 (0.32) 4.39 (0.78) 2.28 (0.96)  | 3 > 1\*\*4 > 1\*2 > 5\*3 > 5\*\*4 > 5\*\* |  |
| 12345 | **Côte d’Ivoire**            Local government is responsible           Local community is responsible            Everyone is responsible, including me           Collective activities are important to keep the beach litter-free           Only the original polluters are responsible |  2.86 (1.12) 3.73 (1.32) 4.86 (0.35) 4.77 (0.53) 2.18 (1.40)  | 3 > 1\*\*4 > 1\*\*3 > 5\*\*4 > 5\*\* |  |
| 12345 | **Ghana**            Local government is responsible           Local community is responsible            Everyone is responsible, including me           Collective activities are important to keep the beach litter-free           Only the original polluters are responsible |  2.70 (1.11)3.81 (1.18) 4.72 (0.76) 4.39 (0.90) 1.87 (1.06)  | 2 > 1\*\*3 > 1\*\*4 > 1\*\* 3 > 2\* |  2 > 5\*\*3 > 5\*\*4 > 5\*\* |
| 12345 | **Malaysia** Local government is responsible           Local community is responsible            Everyone is responsible, including me           Collective activities are important to keep the beach litter-free           Only the original polluters are responsible   |  3.64 (0.95) 3.88 (0.86) 4.24 (0.68) 4.14 (0.74) 3.05 (1.11)  | 3 > 1\*2 > 5\*\*3 > 5\*\*4 > 5\*\* |  |
| 12345 | **Nigeria**           Local government is responsible           Local community is responsible            Everyone is responsible, including me           Collective activities are important to keep the beach litter-free           Only the original polluters are responsible   |  3.17 (1.10) 3.53 (1.14) 4.47 (0.71) 4.35 (0.69) 2.19 (1.01)  | 3 > 1\*\*4 > 1\*\*3 > 2\*\*4 > 2\*\* | 1 > 5\*\*2 > 5\*\*3 > 5\*\*4 > 5\*\* |
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**Supplementary Figure 13.** Self-reported litter-reducing behaviors in Benin at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *never*–*a great deal*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \*\**p* < .01.
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**Supplementary Figure 14.** Self-reported litter-reducing behaviors in Cabo Verde at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *never*–*a great deal*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01.
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**Supplementary Figure 15.** Self-reported litter-reducing behaviors in Côte d’Ivoire at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *never*–*a great deal*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01.
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**Supplementary Figure 16.** Self-reported litter-reducing behaviors in Ghana at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *never*–*a great deal*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \*\**p* < .01.
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**Supplementary Figure 17.** Self-reported litter-reducing behaviors in Malaysia at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *never*–*a great deal*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01.
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**Supplementary Figure 18.** Self-reported litter-reducing behaviors in Nigeria at pre-intervention (1 – 5 scale: *never*–*a great deal*). *Note.* Error bars represent standard error. \*\**p* < .01.