

---

# Factors affecting zero-waste behaviors: Focusing on the health effects of microplastics

Eun-Hi Choi<sup>1</sup> <sup>¶</sup>, Hyunjin Lee<sup>1,\*</sup>, Mi-Jung Kang<sup>1,\*</sup>, Inwoo Nam<sup>1</sup>, Hui-Kyeong Moon<sup>1</sup>, Ji-Won Sung<sup>1</sup>, Jae-Yun Eu<sup>1</sup>, and Hae-Bin Lee<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Nursing, Eulji University, Uijeongbu-si, Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea

\*Corresponding author: [hjlee@eulji.ac.kr](mailto:hjlee@eulji.ac.kr) (HL); [gippem@eulji.ac.kr](mailto:gippem@eulji.ac.kr) (MJK)

<sup>¶</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work.

**Short title: Effects of microplastic on human health**

## Abstract

Microplastics harm human health. Therefore, the present study assessed the knowledge and attitude of university students towards reducing microplastic use and examined their zero-waste behaviors. Our results lay the foundation for program development aimed at promoting zero-waste activities. The study was conducted from August 20, 2021, to September 10, 2021, including students at a university in G metropolitan city. Questions were developed to verify how the use of disposables and the knowledge, attitude, and behaviors related to zero-waste were affected after the COVID-19 pandemic. A survey was conducted with 197 students, and the data of 196 students were analyzed. Family type ( $\beta=0.146$ ,  $p=0.042$ ) and usage of disposables ( $\beta=0.158$ ,  $p=0.049$ ) were the factors affecting zero-waste behavior in Model 1. In Model 2, which included the subcategory of zero-waste knowledge, the health effects of microplastics ( $\beta=0.197$ ,  $p=0.008$ ) and environmental preservation ( $\beta=0.236$ ,  $p=0.001$ ) were significant factors.

25 In Model 3, which included the subcategory of zero-waste attitude, the health effects of  
26 microplastics ( $\beta=0.149$ ,  $p=0.016$ ), use of eco-friendly products ( $\beta=0.342$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and  
27 environmental preservation ( $\beta=0.317$ ,  $p<.001$ ) were significant factors. Therefore, additional  
28 studies and education on the health effects of microplastics are warranted, and suitable  
29 alternatives for disposables must be developed.

30 **Keywords:** zero-waste; health; microplastics

31

## 32 **Introduction**

33 During the COVID-19 pandemic [1], the World Health Organization (WHO) recommended  
34 wearing masks, maintaining social distance, and avoiding gatherings [2]. To maintain social  
35 distancing, non-face-to-face classes using online platforms were started, and students attended  
36 classes from homes or dorm rooms without attending colleges. Consequently, they ended up  
37 spending more time in their living spaces [3] and frequently used home meal replacement or  
38 delivery food [4].

39 Given these changes in lifestyle during the pandemic, the demand for plastic products increased,  
40 producing a severe impact on the environment. Plastic waste management was already  
41 considered a major environmental issue before the COVID-19 pandemic [5-6]. After the  
42 outbreak, the demand for plastic disposables, such as convenience and delivery food containers,  
43 has dramatically increased [7], leading serious environmental issues. In particular, the annual  
44 usage of plastic per person in Korea is 132.7 kg, which is the highest in the world [8]. However,  
45 the current waste management system is not sufficiently effective to manage existing plastic

46 waste [9], and the rapid increase in the amount of plastic waste due to COVID-19 is expected to  
47 lead to a bigger problem.

48 Plastic waste contains many harmful substances, with microplastic being the most hazardous  
49 material [10]. In previous studies, microplastics were detected in marine organisms, and harmful  
50 effects of microplastics in various aquatic organisms have been reported [11-12]. In addition,  
51 microplastics were detected in table salt [13], drinking water [14], and air [15], indicating that  
52 human exposure to microplastics is inevitable. Recent studies have reported the association of  
53 microplastics with the development of various diseases, including cancer [16-18].

54 These concerns regarding plastic waste led to the creation of a new concept of zero waste. Its  
55 definition differs depending on the purpose of the activity and position of the activity subject  
56 [19-21]. In 2018, Zero Waste International Alliance (ZWIA) was defined it as ‘the conservation  
57 of all resources through responsible production, consumption, reuse, and recovery of all  
58 products, packaging, and materials, without burning them and without discharge to land, water,  
59 or air, which may threaten the environment or human health.’ [19]. According to Hannon &  
60 Zaman [21], zero-waste is a catalyst that can encourage the participation of local communities to  
61 build sustainable cities for the future. Zero waste is considered a concept that goes beyond  
62 ‘generating no waste’ and is part of the resource recirculation society, which believes that waste  
63 is a resource.

64 Previous overseas studies related to zero waste were mainly related to industrial field and  
65 resource recirculation [21], recycling insurance and pre-recycling methods [22], and zero-waste  
66 cities [20, 23–24, 25], with a focus on building resource recirculation cities with cooperation  
67 between governments and industries. However, local research has been limited to passion

68 industries, design, and resource utilization [26-29], and there has been no study related to health  
69 and healthcare.

70 To this end, the present study identified how the knowledge and attitude of zero-waste affected  
71 the behavior of students who spent relatively more time in their living spaces than other age  
72 groups because of online classes during the COVID-19 pandemic. Based on previous reports on  
73 the adverse effects of microplastics on human health, the present study aimed to lay a foundation  
74 for program development promoting zero-waste activities.

75

## 76 **Materials and Methods**

### 77 **Study design**

78 This was a cross-sectional study designed to identify how the knowledge and attitude of zero  
79 waste affected the behavior of students during the COVID-19 pandemic, when the usage of  
80 disposables was increased.

### 81 **Subjects and data collection**

82 The study was conducted from August 20, 2021, to September 10, 2021, including university  
83 students in G metropolitan city. The convenience sampling method was used to assess subjects  
84 who agreed to the study purpose. The minimum sample size required for regression analysis was  
85 173 subjects using the G Power 3.1 Program and considering the significant level of 0.5, power  
86 of 0.95, and total predictive factor of 14 in linear multiple regression analysis. Considering 20%

87 dropout rate, the survey was conducted on 197 subjects, and the data of 196 subjects were  
88 analyzed.

89 Data were collected following the approval of the Institutional Bioethics Committee of E  
90 University (EU21-061). Online surveys were conducted after the study participants were  
91 informed of the purpose of the study, and they provided consent for data collection.

## 92 **Study tools**

### 93 **General characteristics**

94 As general characteristics of the study subjects, age, sex, school year, major, and family type  
95 were assessed. The majors were categorized as health and medicine, natural science and  
96 engineering, education, humanity and social science, and others. The family types were classified  
97 as single-member households and two or more-member households.

### 98 **Change in the usage of disposables after COVID-19 outbreak**

99 To verify the change in the usage of disposables after COVID-19 outbreak, the following two  
100 questions were asked: ‘After COVID-19 outbreak, do you experience a change in the usage of  
101 delivery apps?’ and ‘After COVID-19 outbreak, do you experience a change in usage of parcel  
102 delivery service?’ two answers were provided, ‘no change’ and ‘increase’.

### 103 **Zero-waste knowledge focusing on microplastics**

104 Questions related to the knowledge of zero waste focusing on microplastics were developed by  
105 reviewing the literature and searching social networking sites (SNS), the Internet, and newspaper

106 articles. The suitability of questions was verified by three professionals and five zero-waste  
107 executors.

108 Knowledge was divided into three categories: the generation process of microplastics, the health  
109 impact of microplastics, and environmental preservation. There were five questions regarding the  
110 generation process of microplastics: “I have never heard of microplastics,” “microplastics are  
111 generated during the disposal of plastic containers, there are microplastics in toothpaste and  
112 cosmetics, microplastics are reproduced by sunlight,” and “waste has come a full circle and come  
113 to my table.” There were six questions regarding the health impact of microplastics: “plastic  
114 itself contains carcinogens,” “microplastics lead to the accumulation of residual contaminants in  
115 the human body,” “microplastics cause systemic inflammation and immunosuppression,” “intake  
116 of microplastics causes cough, labored respiration, and pulmonary function insufficiency,”  
117 “microplastics can travel through blood vessels,” and “disposable cups contain substances  
118 causing an inflammatory response and adenocarcinoma.” There were four questions regarding  
119 environmental preservation: “I know what zero waste campaign is, I know environment-friendly  
120 enterprises, I know what is a recycle symbol,” and “I know some environmental policies, such as  
121 collecting empty bottles and tumbler discounts.”

122 Three answers were provided: “Yes, No, or Not sure.” “Yes” was assigned one point, and “No”  
123 and “Not sure” were assigned zero points. Points for each category were summed. The  
124 generation process of microplastics was scored from 0 to 5, and the environmental preservation  
125 and health impact of microplastics were scored from 0 to 4. Cronbach’s alpha for this tool was  
126 0.745.

## 127 **Zero-waste attitude**

128 Questions related to zero-waste attitudes were developed by reviewing the literature and  
129 searching SNS, the Internet, and newspaper articles. Three professionals and five zero-waste  
130 executors verified the suitability of the questions.

131 The attitude was classified into five categories: eco-friendly production by companies,  
132 purchasing eco-friendly products, using eco-friendly products, separating disposables, and  
133 environmental campaigning. There were two questions regarding eco-friendly production by  
134 companies: “It is important to make products from materials that can be recycled” and “a  
135 company should make eco-friendly products”. There were four questions on purchasing eco-  
136 friendly products: “I think the things that I do not need are trash, I think the more eco-friendly  
137 products are, the better, carrying something like a tumbler is inconvenient, and It is important to  
138 use less disposable packaging.

139 There were three questions on using eco-friendly products: “It is boring to use purchased  
140 products for a long time,” “It is convenient to use straws, wooden chopsticks, and plastic bags,”  
141 and “It is convenient to use disposable wet wipes.” There were five questions on separating  
142 disposables: “eventually, it is beneficial for me to reduce the usage of disposable containers”,  
143 “the problem of disposable waste does not directly affect me”, “it is meaningless to make an  
144 effort to reduce the usage of disposables”, and “I feel uncomfortable generating plastic waste”.

145 There were two questions on environmental campaigning: “I closely follow environmental  
146 campaigns” and “I have thought about participating in an environmental campaign”.

147 Each question was answered based on a 5-point Likert scale, with “strongly disagree” assigned  
148 one point and “strongly agree” assigned five points. Among the questions, negative responses for  
149 zero waste were processed as reverse questions. Average scores for each category are presented.

150 A higher score indicated a positive attitude. Cronbach’s alpha for this tool was 0.731.

## 151 **Zero-waste behaviors**

152 Questions related to zero-waste behavior were developed by reviewing the literature and  
153 searching for SNS, the Internet, and newspaper articles. Three professionals and five zero-waste  
154 executors verified the suitability of questions.

155 Behavior was classified into four categories: purchasing eco-friendly products, using eco-  
156 friendly products, separating disposables, and environmental campaigns. There were five  
157 questions on purchasing eco-friendly products: “I check the recycle mark before buying  
158 something”, “I reduce waste by only purchasing what I need”, “I purchase products using as less  
159 disposable packaging as possible”, “I use eco-friendly products if it is possible”, and “if possible,  
160 I select no disposable check box when I order delivery food”. There were four questions on using  
161 eco-friendly products: “I keep using a product once I purchase it, I reuse daily necessities with  
162 containers by refilling them, I try not to use disposable wet wipes, and “I do not use disposables  
163 when I have reusable dishware”. There were four questions on separating and sending out  
164 disposables: “I actively separate and send out food and plastics, I try not to use delivery apps and  
165 parcel delivery services as much as possible because they generate much disposable waste, I  
166 remove the plastic packaging of PET bottles before taking them out to prevent generating mixed  
167 waste, and “I empty and clean recyclable plastic items before taking them out”. There were two  
168 questions on environmental campaigns: “I participate in empty bottle collection and tumbler  
169 discount” and “I reduce disposable waste by using reusable shopping bags”.

170 Each question was answered based on a 5-point Likert scale, with “strongly disagree” assigned  
171 one point and “strongly agree” assigned five points. Among the questions, negative responses for



172 zero waste were processed as reverse questions. Average scores for each category are presented.  
173 Higher scores indicated pro-zero-waste behavior. Cronbach's alpha for this tool was 0.767.

## 174 **Data analysis**

175 Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS (version 26.0; IBM SPSS Statistics, NYC, USA).  
176 The general characteristics and variables of the participants are presented as means and standard  
177 deviations or frequencies and percentages. The subjects' general characteristics and differences  
178 in zero-waste behavior depending on the usage change of disposables after COVID-19 were  
179 analyzed using a t-test and ANOVA, respectively, followed by Scheffé's post hoc test.  
180 Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to investigate the effect of zero-waste  
181 behavior, controlling for sex, age, school year, and major. In Model 1, the family type and usage  
182 change of disposables after the COVID-19 outbreak were entered. In Model 2, zero-waste  
183 knowledge was entered as a subcategory in Model 1. In Model 3, zero waste attitude was entered  
184 as a subcategory in Model 2.

185

## 186 **Results**

### 187 **General characteristics of the study subjects**

188 The general characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1. A total of 196  
189 participants, including 34 men (17.3%) and 162 women (82.7%), were included. The mean age  
190 of participants was 20.9 years. Regarding the school year, there were 48 (24.5%) first-year  
191 students, 33 (16.8%) second-year students, 79 (40.3%) third-year students, and 36 (18.3%)  
192 fourth- or higher-year students. Regarding major, 45 (35.2%) participants studied health and

193 medicine, 36 (18.4%) studied natural science and engineering, 45 (23%) studied education, and  
194 82 (39.3%) studied anthropology, sociology, and arts. Regarding family type, 25 participants  
195 (12.8%) lived alone and 171 (87.2%) lived with their families. Regarding the usage of  
196 disposables due to COVID-19, 136 (69.4%) participants reported increased usage. Regarding the  
197 usage of delivery apps due to COVID-19, 135 (68.9%) participants reported increased usage.  
198 Regarding the usage of parcel delivery services, 134 (68.4%) participants reported increased  
199 usage.

200 **Table 1. General characteristics of the subjects (n = 196)**

Variable	Category	N	n (%)
Sex	Male	34	17.3
	Female	162	82.7
Age (years)	18	18	9.2
	19	29	14.8
	20	34	17.3
	21	46	23.5
	22	30	15.3
	23	22	11.2
	≥24	17	8.7
	M ± SD		20.9 ± 1.8
School year	First year	48	24.5
	Second year	33	16.8
	Third year	79	40.3
	Fourth year and above	36	18.3
Major	Health and medicine	33	16.8
	Natural science and engineering	36	18.4

---

	Education	45	23.0
	Humanities, social sciences, and arts	82	39.3
<b>Family type</b>	Living alone	25	12.8
	Living with family	171	87.2
<b>Usage of disposable packing containers due to COVID-19</b>	No change	60	30.6
	Increase	136	69.4
<b>Usage of delivery apps due to COVID-19</b>	No change	61	31.1
	Increase	135	68.9
<b>Usage of parcel delivery services due to COVID-19</b>	No change	62	31.6
	Increase	134	68.4

---

201

## 202 **Zero-waste knowledge, attitude, and behavior**

203 Regarding zero-waste knowledge, the score for the MP generation process was 3.1/5 points and  
204 that for environmental preservation was 2.6/4 points. The score for the health effects of  
205 microplastics was 3.1/6. The average score for this category was 8.8/15.

206 Regarding zero-waste attitude, the score for eco-friendly production by companies was 4.4/5  
207 points, that for purchasing eco-friendly products was 3.7/5 points, that for using eco-friendly  
208 products was 2.8/5 points, that for separating disposables was 4.1/5 points, and that for  
209 environmental campaigning was 3.6/5 points. The average score for each category was 3.7/5.

210 Regarding zero-waste behavior, the score for purchasing eco-friendly products was 3.5/5 points,  
211 that for using eco-friendly products was 3.7/5 points, that for separating disposables scored 4.0/5  
212 points, and that for environmental campaigning was 3.6/5 points. The average score for the  
213 category was 3.7/5 points (Table 2).

214 **Table 2. Zero-waste knowledge, attitude, and behavior (n = 196)**

Variable	Mean ± SD	Range	
<b>Knowledge</b>	Microplastic generation process (sum)	3.1 ± 1.2	0–5
	Health effects of microplastics (sum)	3.1 ± 0.8	0–6
	Environment protection (m)	2.6 ± 0.8	0–4
	Total knowledge (mean ± SD)	8.8 ± 3.1	0–15
<b>Attitude</b>	Eco-friendly production of companies	4.4 ± 0.6	1–5
	Purchasing eco-friendly products	3.7 ± 0.5	1–5
	Using eco-friendly products	2.8 ± 0.6	1–5
	Separating disposables	4.1 ± 0.6	1–5
	Environmental campaigns	3.6 ± 0.8	1–5
<b>Behavior</b>	Total attitude (mean ± SD)	3.7 ± 0.4	1–5
	Purchasing eco-friendly products	3.5 ± 0.6	1–5
	Using eco-friendly products	3.7 ± 0.5	1–5
	Separating disposables	4.0 ± 0.6	1–5
	Environmental campaigns	3.6 ± 0.9	1–5
Total behavior (mean ± SD)	3.7 ± 0.5	1–5	

215

216 **General characteristics and differences in zero-waste behavior due**  
 217 **to usage change of disposables after COVID-19 outbreak**

218 Zero-waste behaviors, depending on the general characteristics of the study subjects, revealed  
 219 significant differences by sex ( $t=-3.632$ ,  $p=0.001$ ) and family type ( $t=-2.324$ ,  $p=0.021$ ). Zero-  
 220 waste behaviors showed significant differences in the usage of disposables after the COVID-19  
 221 outbreak ( $t=-2.454$ ,  $p=0.015$ ) (Table 3).

222 **Table 3. General characteristics and differences in zero-waste behaviors**  
 223 **depending on the usage change of disposables after the outbreak of COVID-19**  
 224 **(n = 196)**

Variable	Category	Mean ± SD	t / F	p
<b>Sex</b>	Male	3.1 ± 0.5	-3.632	0.001
	Female	3.7 ± 0.4		
<b>Age (years)</b>	18	3.5 ± 0.4	1.391	0.220
	19	3.6 ± 0.5		
	20	3.8 ± 0.4		
	21	3.8 ± 0.4		
	22	3.6 ± 0.4		
	23	3.6 ± 0.6		
	≥24	3.8 ± 0.4		
<b>School year</b>	First year	3.6 ± 0.4	2.115	0.100
	Second year	3.7 ± 0.5		
	Third year	3.7 ± 0.4		
	Fourth year and above	3.8 ± 0.4		
<b>Major</b>	Health and medicine	3.8 ± 0.5	1.384	0.249
	Natural science and engineering	3.7 ± 0.4		
	Education	3.6 ± 0.5		
<b>Family type</b>	Humanities, social sciences, and arts	3.7 ± 0.4	-2.324	0.021
	Living alone	3.9 ± 0.5		
	Living with family	3.7 ± 0.4		

---

<b>Usage of disposable packing containers</b>	No change	3.6 ± 3.6	-2.454 0.015
	Increase	3.7 ± 0.4	
<b>Usage of delivery apps</b>	No change	3.7 ± 0.4	-0.583 0.560
	Increase	3.7 ± 0.5	
<b>Usage of parcel delivery services</b>	No change	3.7 ± 0.4	-0.499 0.619
	Increase	3.7 ± 0.5	

---

225

## 226 **Factors influencing zero-waste behavior**

227 Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to identify the factors affecting zero-  
228 waste behavior (Table 4). Sex, age, school year, and major were entered in each hierarchical  
229 regression model. The Durbin–Watson statistic was used to assess multicollinearity for verifying  
230 the basic assumption of regression analysis. The Durbin–Watson value was 2.232, and  
231 multicollinearity was low (variance inflation factor [VIF] < 5).

232 In Model 1, family type ( $\beta=0.146$ ,  $p=0.042$ ) and disposable usage ( $\beta=0.158$ ,  $p=0.049$ ) were  
233 significant factors. The regression model was significant ( $F=3.540$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and the explanatory  
234 power was 11.5%.

235 Model 2 included the subcategories of zero-waste knowledge. The health effects of microplastics  
236 ( $\beta=0.197$ ,  $p=0.008$ ) and environmental campaign ( $\beta=0.236$ ,  $p=0.001$ ) were significant factors.  
237 The regression model was significant ( $F=5.185$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and the explanation power was  
238 21.8%.

239 In Model 3, the subcategories of zero-waste attitude were included. The health effects of  
240 microplastics ( $\beta=0.149$ ,  $p=0.016$ ), use of eco-friendly products ( $\beta=0.342$ ,  $p<.001$ ), and

241 environmental campaign ( $\beta=0.317$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) were significant factors. The regression model was  
 242 significant ( $F=10.730$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and the explanation power was 47.3%.

243 **Table 4. Factors influencing zero-waste behavior**

Variable	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	$\beta$	t	p	VIF	$\beta$	t	p	VIF	$\beta$	t	p	VIF
Family type (ref=living with family)	0.146	0.899	0.042	1.113	0.116	1.721	0.087	1.125	0.021	0.361	0.718	1.196
Usage of disposable containers (ref=no change)	0.158	0.714	0.049	1.400	0.123	1.619	0.107	1.436	0.073	1.134	0.259	1.528
Usage of delivery apps (ref=no change)	-0.096	0.664	0.247	1.506	-0.100	-1.281	0.202	1.521	-0.009	-0.138	0.890	1.577
Usage of parcel delivery (ref=not change)	0.047	0.863	0.517	1.159	0.048	0.704	0.483	1.161	0.012	0.217	0.829	1.192
Knowledge	Microplastic generation process				0.044	0.615	0.540	1.306	-0.024	-0.407	0.685	1.339
	Health effects of microplastics				0.197	2.667	0.008	1.365	0.149	2.443	0.016	1.384
	Environmental campaign				0.236	3.300	0.001	1.272	0.098	1.523	0.130	1.531
	Eco-friendly production of companies								0.036	0.548	0.584	1.594
	Purchasing eco-friendly products								0.053	0.858	0.392	1.409
Attitude	Using eco-friendly products								0.342	6.122	<.001	1.153
	Separating disposables								0.099	1.530	0.128	1.549
	Environmental campaign								0.317	4.745	<.001	1.654
R2	0.161				0.270				0.522			
Adjusted R2	0.115				0.218				0.473			
F	3.540				5.185				10.730			
P	<.001				<.001				<.001			
Durbin-Watson statistic	2.232											

244 \* Control variables: sex, age, school year, and major

245 \* Standardized  $\beta$

246

247 **Discussion**

248 The present study was undertaken to lay a foundation for program development aimed at  
249 improving zero-waste behavior by identifying the effects of zero-waste knowledge and attitude.  
250 Overall, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the usage of disposables amongst university students  
251 has increased.

252 In our analysis, score for the health effects of microplastics was the lowest, at 3.1/6 points, in the  
253 zero-waste knowledge category. Moreover, only the knowledge of health effects of microplastics  
254 affected zero-waste behavior amongst the knowledge categories. In other words, knowledge of  
255 the adverse link between microplastics and health was a major factor promoting zero-waste  
256 awareness and behavior. Previous studies have reported the detection of microplastics in table  
257 salt [13], drinking water [14], air [15], and marine organisms [11-12]. Various adverse effects of  
258 MPs on marine organisms have been reported [11-12]. Contamination of natural resources by  
259 microplastics enables their entry into the food chain and thus into the human body [29]. The  
260 accumulation of microplastics in human liver, kidney, and intestines disrupts energy and lipid  
261 metabolism [30]. However, the participants of the present study showed a low level of  
262 knowledge regarding the health effects of microplastics. Thus, health information related to  
263 microplastics should be provided. However, such education should be based on empirical studies  
264 of microplastics and its health risk. Animal experiments and studies have proven the risk of  
265 microplastics in other organisms [31-32]; however, no study has confirmed the health hazards in  
266 humans. This is because studies on the environment and its health effects are extensive, and the  
267 health risk appears over the long-term rather than the short-term. Furthermore, health risk differs  
268 amongst individual, rendering the identification of health problems caused by the environment  
269 difficult [33]. Studies collecting fundamental data for building scientific knowledge in the long-  
270 term are warranted to promote awareness regarding the health risks of microplastics.



271 In the category of zero-waste attitude, eco-friendly production of companies achieved the highest  
272 scores, whilst the usage of eco-friendly products achieved the lowest scores. The usage of eco-  
273 friendly products includes using the purchased products for a long time, convenience of using  
274 disposables, and convenience of cleaning with disposable wet wipes. According to a study on  
275 environmental problems by IPSOS [34], 91% of Korean respondents answered that there was  
276 concern regarding packaging waste and using disposables that cause environmental pollution. In  
277 terms of individual behavior to reduce unrecyclable packing materials, 27% of respondents  
278 answered that they tried to minimize their use by overcoming the habit of buying disposables,  
279 which was a low percentage, consistent with the results of the present study.

280 In another study, respondents answered that they occasionally use disposables because they are  
281 convenient and cheap. Nonetheless, with increased awareness of the environmental regulation  
282 policy, respondents tried avoiding the use of disposables to protect the environment [35]. In  
283 2018, the Ministry of Environment announced a plan aimed at shifting the linear economic  
284 structure involving production and disposal to a circulating system involving production and  
285 recycling by 2027 [36]. Accordingly, regulatory measures were enacted to restrict the use of  
286 replaceable disposables and minimize unnecessary excessive packaging. However, this policy  
287 was modified and the use of disposables was allowed after the COVID-19 pandemic [37].  
288 Accordingly, the usage of disposables increased due to COVID-19, and compliance with zero-  
289 waste behaviors became challenging as the non-use of disposables led to customer  
290 inconvenience. Therefore, more promotions and campaigns are required to encourage people to  
291 change their habits and inculcate zero-waste behaviors. Furthermore, companies should develop  
292 various alternative products that customers can use conveniently, such as tumblers, and offer  
293 them with a wide range of choices.

294 The present study showed that more interest in environmental campaigns and a positive attitude  
295 towards participating in such campaigns led to positive effects on zero-waste behaviors.  
296 Recently, Korea introduced environmental issues to the educational curriculum [38]. In  
297 elementary schools, education on environmental pollution is mandatory, although there is  
298 insufficient knowledge of environmental practices and participation in middle and high school  
299 curricula [39]. Furthermore, in the Korean education system, which focuses on college entrance  
300 examinations, it is difficult for students to acquire information on environmental issues and to  
301 have the opportunity to think about them by themselves. Therefore, students must be offered  
302 more opportunities to gain sufficient knowledge about environmental issues. This will help them  
303 acquire reliable information, promote zero-waste behaviors, and foster thinking on minimizing  
304 environmental pollution or microplastic usage. Additionally, various exciting public relations  
305 campaigns should be developed to encourage people.

306 Based on our results, the increased usage of disposables, delivery apps, and parcel delivery  
307 services due to COVID-19 did not affect zero-waste behavior. According to a previous study, the  
308 increased usage of delivery food due to COVID-19 has altered eating habits [40]. Students must  
309 use delivery apps and disposable containers to avoid contracting COVID-19; this increase is  
310 expected to be temporary during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, according to the Institute  
311 of Medicine, more infectious diseases are expected to emerge, indicating other possible  
312 outbreaks in the future [41]. Given the prolonged COVID-19 pandemic, awareness regarding the  
313 health effects of microplastics, importance of using recyclable products, and concerns for the  
314 environment should be promoted.

315 There were some limitations in the present study. First, the study subjects were limited to a  
316 particular age group rather than all age groups. University students are intelligent, and other

317 factors may be added for different age groups. Second, although the measurement tool was  
318 developed with much effort, but it could not assess the comprehensive effect of microplastics  
319 and waste. Therefore, additional tools should be created. Finally, this was a cross-sectional study  
320 undertaken at a specific time when the COVID-19 pandemic extended. Additional studies on  
321 zero-waste behaviors in the long term are warranted. Despite these limitations, our study  
322 identified factors affecting zero-waste behavior and contributed to environmental research. Zero-  
323 waste behaviors may vary depending on age and presence/absence of chronic diseases. Future  
324 studies should include other subject groups. In recent years, the infertility rate has been rising,  
325 while the birth rate has reduced. Therefore, additional studies are required to verify the link  
326 between reproductive health and microplastics in the environment.

327

## 328 **Data Availability Statement**

329 All relevant data are within the paper.

## 330 **Funding statement**

331 The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or  
332 preparation of the manuscript.

## 333 **Authors contribution**

334 Eun-Hi Choi: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Supervision,  
335 Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft

336 Hyunjin Lee: Supervision, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

337 Mi-Jung Kang: Supervision, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

338 Inwoo Nam: Conceptualization, Methodology, Data curation, Investigation

339 Hui-Kyeong Moon: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation

340 Ji-Won Sung: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, † IN, HKM and JWS also

341 contributed equally to this work.

342 Jae-Yun Eu: Data curation, Methodology, Investigation

343 Hae-Bin Lee: Data curation, Methodology, Investigation

344

## 345 **References**

346 1. Worldometer COVID-19 Coronavirus pandemic; 2021. Available:

347 <http://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/#countries%3C>. (Accessed 24 November 2021).

348 2. World Health Organization. Holding gatherings during the COVID-19 pandemic: WHO

349 policy brief; 2021. Available: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/holding-gatherings->

350 [during-the-covid-19-pandemic-who-policy-brief-2-august-2021](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/holding-gatherings-during-the-covid-19-pandemic-who-policy-brief-2-august-2021).

351 3. Kim M, Yeon JY. Change of dietary habits and the use of home meal replacement and

352 delivered foods due to COVID-19 among college students in Chungcheong province, Korea. J

353 Nutr Health. 2021;54:383–397. doi:[10.4163/jnh.2021.54.4.383](https://doi.org/10.4163/jnh.2021.54.4.383).

- 354 4. Choi EH, Kim WJ, Baek EM. Latent class analysis of health behaviour changes due to  
355 COVID-19 among middle-aged Korean workers. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19:  
356 1832. PubMed: [35162855](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35162855/).
- 357 5. Rajmohan KVS, Ramya C, Viswanathan MR, Varjani S. Plastic pollutants: effective waste  
358 management for pollution control and abatement. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sci. Health* 2019;12:72–  
359 84. doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2019.08.006
- 360 6. Park JH. The present condition of plastic pollution and the management plans of major  
361 countries and its implications. *J Water Policy Econ*. 2018;31:77–88.
- 362 7. Kim AJ, Lim SR. Investigation of plastic waste discharge after COVID-19 outbreak and  
363 plastic waste management measures. *Proceedings of Korea Society of Waste Management*  
364 *Conference 2021*:722–722.
- 365 8. EUROMAP. Plastics resin production and consumption in 63 countries worldwide; 2016.  
366 Available: <https://www.pagder.org/images/files/euromappreview.pdf>.
- 367 9. KONETIC. The present condition of the plastic waste problems and solutions at home and  
368 abroad. Available: <https://www.konetic.or.kr/main.asp>.
- 369 10. Efimova I, Bagaeva M, Bagaev A, Kileso A, Chubar IP. Secondary microplastics generation  
370 in the Sea Swash Zone with coarse bottom sediments: laboratory experiments. *Front Mar Sci*.  
371 2018;5:313. doi:[10.3389/fmars.2018.00313](https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2018.00313).
- 372 11. Wright SL, Thompson RC, Galloway TS. The physical impacts of microplastics on marine  
373 organisms: a review. *Environ Pollut*. 2013;178:483–492. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2013.02.031](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2013.02.031).

- 374 12. Prinz N, Korez S. Understanding how microplastics affect marine biota on the cellular level  
375 is important for assessing ecosystem function: a review. In Jungblut S, Liebich V, Bode-Dalby  
376 M, editors. YOUMARES 9-The Oceans: Our Research, Our Future. Springer, Cham; 2020. pp.  
377 101–120.
- 378 13. Peixoto D, Pinheiro C, Amorim J, Oliva-Teles L, Guilhermino L, Vieira MN. Microplastic  
379 pollution in commercial salt for human consumption: a review. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci.*  
380 2019;219:161–168. doi:[10.1016/j.ecss.2019.02.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2019.02.018).
- 381 14. Mason SA, Welch VG, Neratko J. Synthetic polymer contamination in bottled water. *Front*  
382 *Chem.* 2018;6:407. doi:[10.3389/fchem.2018.00407](https://doi.org/10.3389/fchem.2018.00407).
- 383 15. Dris R, Gasperi J, Rocher V, Saad M, Renault N, Tassin B. Microplastic contamination in an  
384 urban area: a case study in Greater Paris. *Environ Chem.* 2015;12:592–599.  
385 doi:[10.1071/EN14167](https://doi.org/10.1071/EN14167).
- 386 16. Lehner R, Weder C, Petri-Fink A, Rothen-Rutishauser B. Emergence of nanoplastic in the  
387 environment and possible impact on human health. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2019;53: 1748–1765.  
388 doi:[10.1021/acs.est.8b05512](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b05512).
- 389 17. Segovia-Mendoza M, Nava-Castro KE, Palacios-Arreola MI, Garay-Canales C, Morales-  
390 Montor J. How microplastic components influence the immune system and impact on children  
391 health: Focus on cancer. *Birth Defects Res.* 2020;112:1341–1361. doi: 10.1002/bdr2.1779
- 392 18. Solleiro-Villavicencio H, Gomez-De León CT, Del Río-Araiza VH, Morales-Montor J. The  
393 detrimental effect of microplastics on critical periods of development in the neuroendocrine  
394 system. *Birth Defects Res.* 2020;112:1326–1340. doi:10.1002/bdr2.1776

- 395 19. Zero Waste International Alliance. Zero Waste Definition. 2018. Available:  
396 <https://zwia.org/zero-waste-definition/>
- 397 20. Song Q, Li J, Zeng X. Minimizing the increasing solid waste through zero waste strategy. J.  
398 Clean. Prod. 2015;104:199–210. doi:[10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.08.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.08.027)
- 399 21. Hannon J, Zaman AU. Exploring the phenomenon of zero waste and future cities. Urban Sci.  
400 2018;2:90. doi:[10.3390/urbansci2030090](https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci2030090).
- 401 22. Greyson J. An economic instrument for zero waste, economic growth and sustainability. J  
402 Clean Prod. 2007;15:1382–1390. doi:[10.1016/j.jclepro.2006.07.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2006.07.019).
- 403 23. Zaman AU, Lehmann S. The zero waste index: a performance measurement tool for waste  
404 management systems in a ‘zero waste city’. J Clean Prod. 2013;50:123–132.  
405 doi:[10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.11.041](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.11.041).
- 406 24. Zaman AU, Lehmann S. Urban growth and waste management optimization towards ‘zero  
407 waste city’. City Cult Soc. 2011;2:177–187. doi:[10.1016/j.ccs.2011.11.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2011.11.007).
- 408 25. Binnemans K, Jones PT, Blanpain B, Van Gerven T, Pontikes Y. Towards zero-waste  
409 valorisation of rare-earth-containing industrial process residues: a critical review. J Clean Prod.  
410 2015;99:17–38. doi:[10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.02.089](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.02.089).
- 411 26. Yoo H, Lee SY. A Study on the development of zero-waste fashion hanbok-focusing on  
412 virtual fitting simulation. ksdc.2020;26:361–372. doi:[10.18208/ksdc.2020.26.4.361](https://doi.org/10.18208/ksdc.2020.26.4.361)
- 413 27. Kim IK, Cha YM, Lee JA. Development of recycling zero-waste fashion design. adr.  
414 2016;29: 215–229. doi:[10.15187/adr.2016.05.29.2.215](https://doi.org/10.15187/adr.2016.05.29.2.215).

- 415 28. Heo JY. A study of the design of bags with zero waste. JBDA 2019; 20: 507–518.  
416 doi:[10.47294/KSBDA.20.3.38](https://doi.org/10.47294/KSBDA.20.3.38).
- 417 29. Jiang B, Kauffman AE, Li L, McFee W, Cai B, Weinstein J, et al. Health impacts of  
418 environmental contamination of micro- and nanoplastics: a review. Environ Health Prev Med.  
419 2020;25: 29. doi:[10.1186/s12199-020-00870-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12199-020-00870-9).
- 420 30. Deng Y, Zhang Y, Lemos B, Ren H. Tissue accumulation of microplastics in mice and  
421 biomarker responses suggest widespread health risks of exposure. Sci. Rep. 2017;24:46687.  
422 doi:[10.1038/srep46687](https://doi.org/10.1038/srep46687).
- 423 31. Wang YL, Lee YH, Hsu YH, Chiu IJ, Huang CC, Huang CC, et al. The kidney-related  
424 effects of polystyrene microplastics on human kidney proximal tubular epithelial cells HK-2 and  
425 male C57BL/6 Mice. Environ Health Perspect. 2021;129: 57003. doi:[10.1289/EHP7612](https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP7612).
- 426 32. Hesler M, Aengenheister L, Ellinger B, Drexel R, Straskraba S, Jost C, et al. Multi-endpoint  
427 toxicological assessment of polystyrene nano- and microparticles in different biological models  
428 in vitro. Toxicol In Vitro. 2019;61:104610. doi:[10.1016/j.tiv.2019.104610](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tiv.2019.104610).
- 429 33. Yong CQY, Valiyaveetil S, Tang BL. Toxicity of microplastics and nanoplastics in  
430 mammalian systems. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17:1509.  
431 doi:[10.3390/ijerph17051509](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17051509).
- 432 34. IPSOS. Koreans' awareness of environmental issues; 2019. Available:  
433 [https://www.ipsos.com/ko-kr/ibsoseu-peobeullig-jiguui-nal-hwangyeongmunje-geullobeol-josa-](https://www.ipsos.com/ko-kr/ibsoseu-peobeullig-jiguui-nal-hwangyeongmunje-geullobeol-josa-mich-sisajeom-hwangyeongwanlyeon)  
434 [mich-sisajeom-hwangyeongwanlyeon](https://www.ipsos.com/ko-kr/ibsoseu-peobeullig-jiguui-nal-hwangyeongmunje-geullobeol-josa-mich-sisajeom-hwangyeongwanlyeon).



- 435 35. Jung J, Lee H. The study on university student's awareness about environmental protection  
436 by policies to regulate usage of disposable products. Korean association of human ecology. The  
437 Journal of Academic Conferences Hosted by Korean Association of Human Ecology. 2019.
- 438 36. European Environment Agency. Impacts of COVID-19 on single-use plastic in Europe's  
439 environment; 2021. Available: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/impacts-of-covid-19-on>.
- 440 37. European Environment Agency. Impacts of COVID-19 on single-use plastic in Europe's  
441 environment. 2021. Available: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/impacts-of-covid-19-on>.
- 442 38. Lee SK, Kim N. Environmental education in schools of Korea: context, development and  
443 challenges. Jpn J Environ Educ. 2017;26: 7–14. doi:[10.5647/jsoee.26.4\\_7](https://doi.org/10.5647/jsoee.26.4_7).
- 444 39. Lee SK, Kim N, Ju H, Kwak Y, Park YK, Park H, et al. Content analysis of environmental  
445 education in the 2015 revised national curriculum and implications for the next curriculum: focus  
446 on social studies, science, ethics, practical arts and Korean language subjects. 2020;33: 443–462.  
447 doi:[10.17965/kjee.2020.33.4.443](https://doi.org/10.17965/kjee.2020.33.4.443).
- 448 40. Kim MH, Yeon JY. Change of dietary habits and the use of home meal replacement and  
449 delivered foods due to COVID-19 among college students in Chungcheong province, Korea. J.  
450 Nutr. Health. 2021;54:383–397. doi:[10.4163/jnh.2021.54.4.383](https://doi.org/10.4163/jnh.2021.54.4.383).
- 451 41. Institute of Medicine. (US) Forum on Microbial Threats. Microbial Evolution and Co-  
452 Adaptation: A Tribute to the Life and Scientific Legacies of Joshua Lederberg: Workshop  
453 Summary. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US). Infectious Disease Emergence:  
454 Past, Present, and Future. 2009; 5. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK45714/>.