

# **DELIVERABLE 4.4**

WP4 Interim Report - preliminary results from the Circular Consumption Survey

> Main Author Eoin Grealis

Co-Author Henrike Rau



#### Disclaimer

This report was written as part of the CircEUlar project under EC grant agreement 101056810. The information, documentation and figures available in this deliverable were written by the CircEUlar project consortium and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission. The European Commission is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.

#### Statement of originality

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

#### How to quote this document

*Grealis, E., Rau, H., (2025) Preliminary results from the Circular Consumption Survey (CircEUlar Deliverable 4.4)* 



This deliverable is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).



## **CircEUlar**

## Developing circular pathways for an EU low-carbon transition

| Deliverable number         | 4.4   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Deliverable name:          | CircEular WP4 Interim Report - preliminary results from Circular Consumption Survey                   |
| WP / WP number:            | Circular Consumption/WP4  |
| Delivery due date:         | 30/04/2025  |
| Actual date of submission: | 16/04/2025  |
| Deliverable description:   | This document describes the initial findings from the pan European <i>Circular Consumption Survey</i> |
| Dissemination level:       | Public  |
| Lead author(s):            | Grealis, E., Rau, H.,   |
| Contributors:              | Pacheco, I.M., Joltreau, E., Balundė, A.  |

### **Version log**

| Version | Date       | Issued by                    | Description | Summary of changes                   |
|---------|------------|------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1       | 26/03/2025 | Eoin Grealis,<br>Henrike Rau | First draft | n/a                                  |
| 2       | 15/04/2025 | Eoin Grealis,<br>Henrike Rau | Final draft | Inclusion of additional Italian data |



## **Executive Summary**

This CircEUlar deliverable consists of a preliminary report and summary of the initial findings from a pan-European survey of circular consumption practices (CCPs) i.e. practices which on the balance of probability lead to less resource intensive consumption and support moves towards a circular economy. The *Circular Consumption Survey* was conducted in five European countries with a broad geographical spread namely, the United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and Lithuania. Nationally representative samples were selected based on age, sex, level of education, and region. Over 1,000 respondents from each country were surveyed and asked to provide information on the incidence, and frequency of their engagement with various CCPs as well information on the importance or otherwise of various factors affecting their (non)-willingness to engage in these practices in the future.

In addition to activity levels, standardised social variables were collected to facilitate statistical and segmentation analyses of socio-economic and demographic factors for both engagers and non-engagers in CCPs. Data on material stocks and existing competences was collected to examine existing opportunities for engagement while data on meaning, motivational and cultural factors as well as views on circular citizenship were collected to assess their potential impact on both current and future engagement.

The purpose of the data collection can be summarised as the intention to gather information on:

- (i) past and current engagement in CCPs,
- (ii) socio-economic, motivational and material factors that impact the adoption of CCPs, and
- (iii) indicators concerning future engagement in CCPs.

Data collected from the survey will be combined with insights from the biographical consumption interviews to perform iterative content analysis which combined with statistical and segmentation analyses will yield insights into the acceptance and adoption factors associated with CCPs and potential consumer groups.



## **Keywords**

circularity, circular consumption survey, practice theory, digitalisation, mobility, buildings, household services, representative survey, attitudes, motivations, material conditions, skills, competences, meanings



Figure 1: Circular Consumption Research Design (Grealis & Rau 2023a)



## Contents

| Executive Summary 4                               |
|---|
| Keywords  |
| Figures 8   |
| Tables  |
| Definitions and Clarifications                    |
| Circular Consumption Practices11                  |
| Elements of Practices 11                          |
| Unit of analysis 11                               |
| Enablers and barriers of circular practices 11    |
| Commoning 11                                      |
| Quantitative Stock Measures 12                    |
| Material Conditions                               |
| Survey Notes 12                                   |
| Sample Size 12                                    |
| Weights   |
| Variable labels                                   |
| Likert-Ordering                                   |
| Randomisation                                     |
| Ethics  |
| Household Income                                  |
| Italian Survey Data13                             |
| Section 1: Introduction                           |
| Section 2: Methodological Overview15              |
| Data Collection                                   |
| Quotas  |
| Language16  |
| Section 3: Data Validation                        |
| Duration and distribution                         |
| Living Space                                      |
| Representativeness                                |
| Section 4: Socio-economic and demographic data 21 |
| Household Size                                    |
| Income & Activity Status 23                       |



| Tenure, Urbanity & Dwelling                          |
|--|
| Section 5: Mobility, carless-ness, and car sharing   |
| Car ownership and carless-ness                       |
| Car sharing and car shedding                         |
| Public, Active, and Multi-Modal Transport            |
| Section 6: Commoning & repair                        |
| Living space sharing and downsizing                  |
| Borrowing and Lending 41                             |
| Repair Activity                                      |
| Section 7: Digitalisation and second-hand trading 44 |
| Material Conditions, Skills and Competences 44       |
| Perceived impacts on consumption                     |
| Contribution to second-hand trading54                |
| Section 8: Circular Citizenship                      |
| Concluding Summary                                   |
| Appendix A: Representativeness quotas                |
| Appendix B: Variable names and summary labels71      |
| Appendix C: Circular Consumption Survey descriptives |
| Appendix D: Questionnaire                            |
| References   |



## Acronyms/Abbreviations

| FAs       | Focus Areas  |
|-----------|--|
| CCPs      | Circular Consumption Practices                               |
| CircEUlar | Developing circular pathways for an EU low-carbon transition |
| EU        | European Union   |
| NUTS      | Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics             |
| UN        | United Nations   |
| Varname   | Variable name  |
| WP        | Work Package   |

## **Figures**

| Figure 1: Circular Consumption Research Design (Grealis & Rau 2023a)  | 5      |
|---|--------|
| Figure 2: Distribution of survey response times for all respondents   | 16     |
| Figure 3: Unweighted distribution of living space by country  | 18     |
| Figure 4: Distribution of responses to all 7-Point Likert questions posed to all respondents                | 19     |
| Figure 5: Mean household size by country  | 22     |
| Figure 6: Income distribution across all 11 bands for monthly disposable household income                   | 23     |
| Figure 7: Self-estimated monthly disposable household income by participant country                         | 24     |
| Figure 8: Percentage shares of likelihood of using car sharing if it was available                          | 31     |
| Figure 9: Likelihood to shed car if adequate car sharing was available.                                     | 32     |
| Figure 10: How would you rate the current public transport provision in your local area?                    | 33     |
| Figure 11: Local public transport provision rating by country   | 34     |
| Figure 12: Mean number of bicycles per household for all respondents  | 35     |
| Figure 13: Mean number of bicycles per household those who report owning at least one bicycle               | 36     |
| Figure 14: How often do you cycle?  | 38     |
| Figure 15: Extent of willingness of respondents in all countries to live in a smaller home if readily avail | lable. |
|   | 41     |
| Figure 16: Respondent rating of quality of internet access by country                                       | 45     |
| Figure 17: Frequency of asking other people for help solving digital/I.T problems                           | 46     |
| Figure 18: Frequency of others asking for your help when solving digital/I.T problems                       | 47     |
| Figure 19: Distribution of combined measure of digital competency   | 48     |
| Figure 20: Perceived impact of digitalisation on the amount of travel                                       | 50     |
| Figure 21: Perceived impact of digitalisation on energy consumption   | 51     |
| Figure 22: Perceived impact of digitalisation on media consumption  | 52     |
| Figure 23: Perceived impact of digitalisation on the amount of household goods/services purchased           | 54     |
| Figure 24: 7-point distribution of preference for second-hand goods for all respondents.                    | 55     |
| Figure 25: Respondent preference for buying second-hand by country  | 56     |
| Figure 26: Respondent stated frequency of acquisition of second-hand goods online by country                | 57     |
| Figure 27: Respondent stated frequency of disposal of second-hand goods online by country                   | 58     |
| Figure 28: Share of respondent agreement with being able to dispose of goods more easily online             | 59     |
| Figure 29: Distribution of frequency of respondent actions to pressure the government by country            | 62     |
| Figure 30: Distribution of respondent frequency of actions to pressure businesses by country                | 63     |
|   |        |



## **Tables**

| Table 1: Number of survey respondents by country   | 15       |
|--|----------|
| Table 2: Unweighted tabulation of Gender, Age Group & Education by country   | 19       |
| Table 3: Unweighted shares of all 39 NUTS1 Regions by country  | 20       |
| Table 4: Sample Household size by Country  | 21       |
| Table 5: Sample tenure status by country   | 24       |
| Table 6: Sample activity status by participant country   | 25       |
| Table 7: Self-reported level of urbanity in respondents' residential area  | 26       |
| Table 8: Dwelling type by country  | 26       |
| Table 9: Number of cars per household by participant country.  | 27       |
| Table 10: Number of respondents reporting an electric car by country   | 28       |
| Table 11: Number of respondents with a hybrid car by participant country   | 28       |
| Table 12: Number of respondents reporting having a leased car by participant country   | 29       |
| Table 13: Number of respondents reporting having a company car by participant country  | 29       |
| Table 14: At least one car-sharing option available reported by country  | 30       |
| Table 15: Frequency of use of car sharing by country with at least one sharing option available  | 30       |
| Table 16: Reported likelihood of using car-sharing if it was available.  | 31       |
| Table 17: Likelihood of shedding car with adequate car-sharing by country  | 32       |
| Table 18: Public transport rating by country   | 34       |
| Table 19: Reported number of households who do not own a bicycle by country.   | 35       |
| Table 20: Mean number of bicycles per household for all respondents and for those who report owning  | at       |
| least one bicycle  | 36       |
| Table 21: Bicycle use by country   | 37       |
| Table 22: Current level of space sharing reported by respondents   | 39       |
| Table 23: Willingness to permanently share spaces with non-family members  | 39       |
| Table 24: Willingness to move to a smaller home  | 40       |
| Table 25: Level of borrowing reported by respondents by participant country  | 41       |
| Table 26: Level of lending reported by respondents by participant country  | 42       |
| Table 27: Level of self-repair activity reported by respondents by participant country   | 43       |
| Table 28: Level of repair service purchase activity reported by respondents by participant country   | 43       |
| Table 29: Respondent rating of internet access by country  | 45       |
| Table 30: Smartphone use to access the internet by country   | 46       |
| Table 31: Frequency of being asked for help with I.T problems by country   | 47       |
| Table 32: Frequency of others asking for I.T help by country   | 48       |
| Table 33: Perceived impact of digitalisation on amount of travel by country  | 49       |
| Table 34: Perceived impact of digitalisation on energy consumption by country  | 50       |
| Table 35: Perceived impact of digitalisation on media consumption by country   | 52       |
| Table 36: Perceived impact of digitalisation on consumption of household goods by country  | 53       |
|  |          |
| Table 37: Level of agreement with preference for buying second-hand by country   | 55       |
| Table 37: Level of agreement with preference for buying second-hand by country   Table 38: Rates of online second-hand good acquisition by country | 55<br>56 |



| Table 40: Perceived impact of online offering on ease of good disposal by country              | 58      |
|--|---------|
| Table 41: Frequency of buying unwanted items by country  | 59      |
| Table 42: Respondents agreeing with the statement that buying items they ultimately don't need | happens |
| less often when they buy something online  | 60      |
| Table 43: Respondent frequency of actions to pressure the government by country                | 61      |
| Table 44: Respondent frequency of actions to influence businesses by country                   | 62      |
| Table 45: Respondent frequency of actions to influence people around them by country           | 63      |
| Table 46: Mean frequency of engagement buy country   | 65      |



## **Definitions and Clarifications**

## **Circular Consumption Practices**

We understand Circular Consumption Practices (CCPs) to be practices that have the potential to increase circularity such as reducing overall consumption, extending the useful life of products and avoiding waste. CircEUlar is primarily concerned with promising higher-impact consumption practices that are likely to make a substantial positive contribution to circularity (e.g. voluntary carlessness or 'car shedding') compared to lower-impact activities like recycling that nevertheless require significant amounts of time, energy and effort.

It is acknowledged in this and other CircEUlar publications that there may be specific circumstances, contexts and/or instances where a practice which is assumed to be circular, may not in fact contribute to increased total circularity or that while increasing material circularity, a practice leads to adverse environmental outcomes e.g. the repair/refurbishment of a particularly inefficient heating systems, or a production process that increases localised toxicity. There are also likely instances where reduced consumption in one area results in increases in total consumption elsewhere, due to rebound and/or backfire effects (Druckman et al. 2011). However, the focus of the study is to assess the instance, frequency, enablers and barriers of/to CCPs which have the greatest *potential* to contribute to circularity rather than to assess, calculate and or affirm the circularity of a particular practice in every context.

### **Elements of Practices**

By their very nature, different CCPs require different (infra-)structures, skills and competences. Moreover, they have diverse meanings ascribed to them by those who continually reproduce them. As we investigate different CCPs across the three Focus Areas (FAs), differential weight is placed on investigating these elements of practice due to the differential weight of importance each element holds in the performance of those practices.

### Unit of analysis

While the broader unit of analysis for profiling engagement, acceptance and adoption of CCPs is the household, we asked individual respondents about their attitudes to CCPs and the meanings they associated with performing them. Acquiring detailed information on all household members would have been unduly onerous on respondents and would have consumed a considerable amount of the time allocated to the survey. Asking respondents to report on the number of children in the household by age group and the presence of dependents was deemed to be a feasible alternative that yielded sufficient amounts of information about the household.

### Enablers and barriers of circular practices

Enablers and barriers are factors that affect the attractiveness and feasibility of particular circular practices, including motivational factors (e.g., values, norms, perceptions), contextual factors (e.g., availability of products and services), and cultural factors (reflecting differences between regions and countries).

### Commoning

To assess the potential for high-impact CCPs, we have included questions that aim to capture the extent to which sharing/commoning practices and collaboration among residents form a regular part of participants' lives (Huber, 2022).



### **Quantitative Stock Measures**

While we have included both stock and use variables to assess the resource and material requirements for individual CCPs, it is recognised that survey respondents may not be able to reliably quantify less tangible use variables at short notice (e.g. the number of online second-hand purchases per annum, or the annual number of non-work trips taken over 100km). Where possible, we have attempted to frame such questions in a simplified accessible manner both to aid recall and reduce the memory burden for respondents. Already available regional and national statistics concerning CCPs have been used to complement survey data.

### **Material Conditions**

Material conditions from a practice perspective include the available infrastructure from which one is practically able to draw on.

## **Survey Notes**

#### Sample Size

The target sample size was 1,000 respondents in each participant country. This follows conventional standards as the minimum number of respondents to canvass where the target population is over 1 million (European Commission, 2025), which was the case for all 5 participant countries. A sample size of 1,000 returns a margin of error (which quantifies the range within which the true population parameter is expected to lie) of + or - 3.1 % for maximum variability (0.5) at the 95% confidence interval typically required for statistical significance.

### Weights

The *Circular Consumption Survey* contains data from respondents selected to be nationally representative of the population in terms of age, gender, education and region. This is facilitated by the calculation and inclusion of normalised probability weights in the data set which sum to 1 for each country. These weights can facilitate country comparison when reporting means and relative frequencies but only when the analysis is confined within each country. Simple cross-country pooled analysis using the provided weights should not be used as while the sample sizes are similar, population sizes vary significantly. Such analysis would require the calculation of population level weights. Probability weights should also not be directly used with statistical models which rely on equal probability sampling or IIA (independence of irrelevant alternatives) assumptions.

### Variable labels

To increase usability and ease of handling, summary variable labels have been provided for each variable in the data set which are described in Appendix B. However, all data analysis should be conducted and interpreted with reference to the full version of the question which was presented to respondents of the survey. The full version of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix D.



### Likert-Ordering

Likert-scaled variables were collected which included a mixture of 4-, 5- and 7-point scales covering attitudinal & willingness statements, frequency of CCP engagement, service ratings, frequency of engagement and estimations of social capital. All Likert variables were collected by presenting respondents with a numerical scale ordered from positive to negative (in terms of contribution to circularity) ordered left to right. From a science communication it is understood that authors of future reports and other users of the data may wish to recode particular Likert variables such as those that cover frequency of engagement in certain practices, where higher coded values relate to lower levels of frequency. However, for reasons of consistency, in this report, all Likert variables have been reported as collected.

### Randomisation

Of the Likert question collected 110 were collected in 18 question sets. Where responses were grouped as part of a single question theme, e.g., on the importance of various factors for engagement in a particular circular consumption practice. In all cases the order of questions was randomised to limit the impact of any order effects on data quality.

### **Ethics**

All survey data was collected anonymously through a sub-contracted third-party, with no ethical issues or points of concern identified. Also, no "personal data" was collected according to the definition of the General Data Protection Regulation (European Union, 2018). The survey design was approved by the LMU Ethikkommission (Projekt Nr.: 24-0905) as having no requirement for ethical consultation. While it is noted that with modern technological advances the potential to identify individual respondents from any published survey is increasing, the omission of more highly disaggregated geographical data from the finalised survey secures the data against "reasonable" attempts to identify, link or infer the identity of survey respondents, as per the recommendations of the European Data Protection Board (EDPB) following the previous principles developed by the Article 29 Working Party (European Data Protection Board, 2020).

### Household Income

Households were asked to select their monthly net household income after taxes and benefits from 11 income bands. To ensure that respondents were able to reasonably estimate their income and respond within a reasonable timeframe, fixed equal width income bands (500 increments for bands 1-8 ad 1000 increments for bands 9-11) were provided as answer options. While country-specific deciles would have returned a more accurate representation of the income distribution and allowed for easier direct cross-country comparison, the burden it would have placed on the respondents in terms of income estimation was deemed too onerous.

### Italian Survey Data

During the data review, it was discovered that respondents in Italy with the lowest levels of education were under-sampled. This occurred due to the inadvertent omission of the lowest of seven education categories in the Italian survey, which led to a corresponding over-sampling of individuals with higher education levels. To address this issue, an additional 320 respondents were surveyed in Italy, and normalized probability weights were recalculated for the entire Italian sample (1,409 observations).



As a result, the unweighted Italian sample contains a disproportionately higher number of respondents with higher levels of education compared to population quotas (see Section 2: Quotas & Table 2). Consequently, the probability weights for Italian respondents span a wider range to ensure nationally representative estimates.

Due to the additional respondents, Italians now comprise 25% of the total sample, whereas respondents from the United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands, and Lithuania each represent approximately 18%–19%. Accordingly, unweighted results reported in each table should be interpreted with this distribution in mind.

While an unweighted sample more closely resembling the weighting quotas could have been facilitated by dropping observations, for completeness, in this report, the descriptives for all respondents are reported.

## **Section 1: Introduction**

This report presents selected descriptive results derived from the nationally representative *Circular Consumption Survey* conducted across five countries: the United Kingdom (UK), Germany (DE), the Netherlands (NL), Italy (IT), and Lithuania (LT). The survey collects data on current levels of circular consumption practices (CCPs), that is, practices which on the balance of probability contribute to greater levels of circularity. Specifically, it collects data on potential high impact practices in the CircEUIar focus areas (FAs) of mobility, buildings & household services, and digitalisation, with a focus on practices such as car sharing and carless-ness, commoning and online second-hand trading.

Following the methodological overview and a description of the data collection and validation process, the report highlights key descriptives starting with socio-economic and demographic characteristics. It subsequently summarises and highlights by country a number of selected variables which outline current levels of engagement in selected high-impact CCPs across all five participant countries as well as examining the levels of willingness of current non-engagers to take up CCPs in the future if certain conditions are met. Summary and highlighted data are also provided for variables covering respondents' stated importance of potential enablers, barriers and opportunities to/for engagement, including relevant competences, current material conditions, and prevailing structures. Data is also collected on motivational factors and the meanings and values associated with certain CCPs that may act as either barriers or enablers to engagement in CCPs and circular citizenship behaviours.

Regarding the survey's execution, methodological considerations such as sample size, representative quotas, weighting procedures, language considerations, and ethical considerations are also detailed in the survey notes, with a view to providing data which may be used to accurately reflect the broader population of each surveyed country.

The report concludes with a summary of areas of potential investigation and provides a number of appendices, including variable labels and summary statistics on all 250 variables as well as details on the representativeness quotas. This mid-term assessment serves as a foundational analysis, offering preliminary insights that will be further explored in subsequent stages of research.



## Section 2: Methodological Overview

## **Data Collection**

Following the finalisation of the data collection frame, the *Circular Consumption Survey* was collected during the months of October and November 2024 across the United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and Lithuania with an additional 320 respondents surveyed in Italy in March 2025. Pilot versions of the survey were conducted in advance in each country, with adjustments being made before full launch where necessary. In total, 5,651 observations were collected with nationally representative quotas and weights assigned on the basis of age, gender, education, and region. For ease of use and transparency, tables and figures in this report describe the unweighted survey results and in text reported percentages are always rounded to the nearest whole number.

| Country        | No. of Respondents | Percent |
|----------------|--------------------|---------|
| United Kingdom | 1,053              | 18.65   |
| Germany        | 1,100              | 19.43   |
| Netherlands    | 1,081              | 19.13   |
| Italy          | 1,409              | 24.93   |
| Lithuania      | 1,008              | 17.84   |
| Total          | 5,651              |         |

Table 1: Number of survey respondents by country

The dataset itself comprises 66 question sets, resulting in a total of 250 variables. It includes 127 Likert-scale variables using a mix of 4-, 5- and 7-point scales to capture attitudinal and willingness statements, frequency of CCP engagement, service ratings, and social capital. In addition to these attitudinal measures, the dataset collects key socio-demographic information, including age, gender, education, region, main activity, monthly household income (in bands), household composition, tenure and rural-urban classification.

It also covers material conditions such as living space and dwelling type, providing an overview of respondents' living situations as well as recording materials stocks for key variables of interest related to the focus areas of the CircEUlar project (Grealis and Rau, 2023). Examples include private car ownership and the number and type of alternative mobility tools owned by the household (e.g., bicycles).

## Quotas

To provide the opportunity to report outcomes at a national level, nationally representative samples in each country were selected in terms of age, gender, level of education and region (NUTS<sup>1</sup>1 level), i.e. the standardised key variables for capturing socio-economic, demographic and cultural variations within the population. Respondents were chosen to match specific characteristics (e.g., gender balance, age distribution) and are not clustered within groups. The primary source data used to generate quotas for each country were the latest available regional population statistics by age and gender (Eurostat, 2024b) and the population by educational attainment level, sex and age (Eurostat, 2024a). For the United Kingdom, statistics data from the Office for National Statistics (England and Wales), the Scottish census, and the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research agency were used. The representativeness quotas for all countries are reported in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics: see <u>https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/nuts</u>



Appendix A. While more targeted representativeness criteria for specific variables of interest such as carless households would undoubtedly result in more accurate estimates for target variables, they would also result in a significant increase in complexity and associated costs without significantly improving the representativeness of the survey for all other variables.

### Language

The survey was translated from English into four different languages through a collaborative process involving consultation with data collection partners. Native speakers with research experience were engaged to ensure cultural and contextual relevance for each translation. Although great care was taken to maintain consistency across languages, there may still be instances where responses are not precisely comparable due to subtle nuances and variations in meaning between languages. The full questionnaire in English is included in Appendix 2 while the survey in all languages is published with the survey's accompanying documentation.

## **Section 3: Data Validation**

## **Duration and distribution**

The average completion time for the *Circular Consumption Survey* was 24 minutes and 59 seconds across all countries. All response times lower than 15 minutes were excluded as responses under this lower limit were deemed to include a high risk to data quality due to an increased likelihood of insufficient cognitive processing, insufficient reading time and random or patterned responses due to survey fatigue. Times under 15 minutes were also not observed during preliminary piloting.



Figure 2: Distribution of survey response times for all respondents



A bimodal distribution of response times was observed (Figure 2). While this was somewhat anticipated due to certain cohorts being required to complete fewer questions, the precise reason for this distribution is unclear, though it is likely influenced by several factors. Primarily, there seems to be an age effect. Older respondents (those 60+) typically took longer to complete the survey, but the distribution of their response times followed a more normal distribution, possibly due to fewer interruptions. By contrast, those under 30 completed the survey more quickly and although the bimodal distribution was still present, it was less pronounced. While bimodal distributions can result from various factors such as differences in respondent familiarity, device usage, survey length, and attention levels, we theorize that in this case, the primary cause is two distinct clusters corresponding to participant age groups and those who took a break during completion of the survey and those who did not.

## **Living Space**

During the piloting phase it was observed that inconsistent responses were submitted in the United Kingdom sample for the question "Approximately how much living space does your current home have?" (varname: *sqmtre*). This problem was somewhat anticipated due to the fact that in the United Kingdom historically, properties have been categorised and marketed according to the number of bedrooms rather than the calculated floor space which was often unavailable. In the pilot, respondents were asked to submit their floor space in sq. feet to account for the fact that while official statistics report in metric, imperial measurements are still in common use. However, this returned numerous implausible entries on the lower end of the scale. An attempt to remedy this was undertaken in the full launch by highlighting to respondents the requirement to estimate their floor space in square metres. While this had the effect of more easily identifying less plausible entries, ultimately the significant number of rounded entries suggests that many respondents did not have the accurate information to hand and simply guessed. More generally, across all countries, where less plausible (i.e. very low) estimates were returned, there is a possibility that those in existing sharing arrangements such as house shares interpreted the question as purely relating to their own private living space in the residence e.g. their private unit/room in a shared living situation. As such, any analysis undertaken which relies on living space estimates in particular should be treated with caution.





Approximately how much living space (sq. metres) does your current home have?



### **Responding Effort**

To provide consistency and avoid confusing the participant, Likert-question sets typically cover similar themes with similar if not identical response options. In the *Circular Consumption Survey*, the response options were also consistently presented from left to right, positive to negative. Given the large amount of Likert-scale variables recorded, the data was tested for insufficient effort responding (Hong et al., 2020). Evidence of straight lining (continually choosing the same answer option on the same scale) was detected within some question sets, with 15% of respondents choosing the same response category for the first set of nine, 7-point Likert variables. This rose to 22% for the final set of nine 7-point Likert question variables. This is somewhat anticipated as logically consistent responses from respondents will automatically result in some straight lining. Additionally, as respondents got tired towards the end of the survey their responding effort would be expected to drop. Across the sixty-one 7-point Likert variables which were posed to all respondents, straight-lining dropped to 2.5% of the sample, with the distribution of responses to all 7-Point Likert questions (primarily value and attitudinal questions) posed to all respondents presenting as normal and slightly right (negatively) skewed (Figure 4). This distribution was consistent across all countries.



Figure 4: Distribution of responses to all 7-Point Likert questions posed to all respondents

Given that all responses completed under 15 minutes were eliminated from the final data set and the issue was not specific to any of the weighting characteristics and no discernible pattern was identified, no additional observations were removed from the raw data set for lack of responding effort. Researchers should however be aware of such results and in each case consider the suitability or otherwise of including respondents who consistently selected the same response option.

## Representativeness

The unweighted distribution of age group, gender, education (Table 2) and region (Table 3) closely aligns with the representativeness quotas outlined in Appendix A for categories in each country with the exception of the education quotas for Italy, the reasons for which are outlined in the Italian survey data note above.

|            | UK |    | UK DE |    | NL |    | IT |    | LT |    |
|------------|----|----|-------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Gender (%) | Р  | s  | Р     | S  | Р  | s  | Р  | s  | Р  | S  |
| Male       | 49 | 49 | 49    | 49 | 50 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 46 | 46 |
| Female     | 51 | 51 | 51    | 51 | 50 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 54 | 54 |

Table 2: Unweighted tabulation of Gender, Age Group & Education by country

|               | UK DE |    | NL |    | IT |    | LT |    |    |    |
|---------------|-------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Age Group (%) | Р     | S  | Р  | s  | Р  | s  | Р  | s  | Р  | S  |
| 16 - 29       | 23    | 22 | 16 | 14 | 22 | 21 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 19 |
| 30 - 39       | 16    | 15 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 16 | 17 |



| 40 - 49 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 16 |
|---------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 50 - 59 | 16 | 15 | 19 | 20 | 17 | 19 | 19 | 17 | 17 | 18 |
| 60 - 69 | 13 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 15 | 17 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| 70+     | 16 | 16 | 18 | 19 | 17 | 16 | 20 | 21 | 17 | 15 |

| Education/Training | U  | K  | D  | E  | N  | IL | IT | *  | ]  | LT |
|--------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| ISCED-Level %      | Р  | s  | Р  | s  | Р  | s  | Р  | 5  | Р  | S  |
| Level 0-2          | 19 | 18 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 37 | 26 | 12 | 12 |
| Level 3-4          | 40 | 41 | 48 | 48 | 38 | 38 | 44 | 38 | 48 | 50 |
| Level 5-8          | 41 | 41 | 29 | 28 | 38 | 38 | 19 | 36 | 41 | 38 |

Where P= population share and s = unweighted sample percentage \* See survey note on Italian survey data

### Table 3: Unweighted shares of all 39 NUTS1 Regions by country

| Regions NUTS1             |                  |              |              |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| % Share                   | Population Share | Sample share | % Share diff |
| East England UK           | 9                | 9            | 0            |
| East Midlands UK          | 9                | 8            | 1            |
| London UK                 | 13               | 14           | -1           |
| North East UK             | 4                | 4            | 0            |
| North West UK             | 11               | 10           | 1            |
| Northern Ireland UK       | 3                | 3            | 0            |
| Scotland UK               | 8                | 8            | 0            |
| South East UK             | 14               | 14           | 0            |
| South West UK             | 9                | 9            | 0            |
| Wales UK                  | 5                | 5            | 0            |
| West Midlands UK          | 9                | 9            | 0            |
| Yorkshire & the Humber UK | 8                | 9            | -1           |
| Baden Württemberg DE      | 13               | 13           | 0            |
| Bayern DE                 | 16               | 16           | 0            |
| Berlin DE                 | 5                | 5            | 0            |
| Brandenburg DE            | 3                | 3            | 0            |
| Bremen DE                 | 1                | 1            | 0            |
| Hamburg DE                | 2                | 2            | 0            |
| Hessen DE                 | 8                | 8            | 0            |
| Mecklenburg-Vorpommern DE | 2                | 2            | 0            |
| Niedersachsen DE          | 10               | 10           | 0            |
| Nordrhein-Westfalen DE    | 22               | 22           | 0            |
| Rheinland-Pfalz DE        | 5                | 4            | 1            |
| Saarland DE               | 1                | 1            | 0            |
| Sachsen DE                | 5                | 5            | 0            |
| Sachsen-Anhalt DE         | 3                | 2            | 1            |



| Schleswig-Holstein DE  | 4  | 4  | 0  |
|------------------------|----|----|----|
| Thüringen DE           | 3  | 3  | 0  |
| North NL               | 10 | 11 | -1 |
| East NL                | 21 | 22 | -1 |
| West NL                | 48 | 46 | 2  |
| South NL               | 21 | 22 | -1 |
| North-West IT          | 28 | 27 | 1  |
| North-East IT          | 20 | 19 | 1  |
| Centre IT              | 21 | 22 | -1 |
| South IT               | 20 | 22 | -2 |
| Islands IT             | 11 | 9  | 2  |
| Capital region LT      | 29 | 29 | 0  |
| Central and Western LT | 71 | 71 | 0  |

## Section 4: Socio-economic and demographic data

The majority of the socio-economic and demographic variables collected were drawn from the EU's guidelines for standardised key social variables (SKSV) (European Union, 2019, European Union, 2021). Key socio-economic, demographic and contextual information about survey respondents was collected to later serve as potential explanatory variables for material conditions that affect people's capacity to engage in CCPs across the three FAs. Some variables were combined to reduce the burden for respondents, e.g., collecting the number of children in distinct age categories together rather than requiring respondents to fill out a completed household grid. A combination of individual- and household-level socio-economic and demographic variables included gender, age, the presence of a partner, children, and other dependents in the household. Additional socio-economic data included tenure status, net estimated household disposable income band (defined as after tax and benefits are applied) and activity status of the respondent. To provide some basis for assessing the material conditions of the household's residence and local context in terms of local infrastructure etc., respondents self-reported their residence type and the level of urbanity.

### **Household Size**

Table 4 presents the distribution of household sizes across all five countries. Single, two- and three-person households respectively make up around 80% of the sample. Larger households (5+ members) are relatively rare, with just 288 households (5.4%) falling into this category. Across all countries, the unweighted mean sample household size was above the mean household size reported by Eurostat a total sample mean of 2.46 above the European average of 2.3 (Eurostat, 2023).

| Household Size | Country           |         |             |        |           |       |  |  |
|----------------|-------------------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|--|
|                | United<br>Kingdom | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |  |  |
| 1              | 251               | 319     | 247         | 195    | 154       | 1166  |  |  |
| 2              | 399               | 450     | 488         | 492    | 383       | 2212  |  |  |
| 3              | 182               | 199     | 157         | 366    | 223       | 1127  |  |  |
| 4              | 145               | 107     | 136         | 278    | 155       | 821   |  |  |

#### Table 4: Sample Household size by Country



| 5  | 54     | 18   | 41   | 58   | 57   | 228  |
|--|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 6  | 10     | 6    | 7    | 17   | 22   | 62   |
| 7  | 10     | 1    | 3    | 3    | 7    | 24   |
| 8  | 2      | 0    | 1    | 0    | 2    | 5    |
| 9  | 0      | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 1    |
| 10   | 0      | 0    | 1    | 0    | 4    | 5    |
| Total  | 1053   | 1100 | 1081 | 1409 | 1008 | 5651 |
| Mean   | 2.46   | 2.16 | 2.33 | 2.69 | 2.72 | 2.46 |
| Eurostat (2023)/ Office<br>for National Statistics<br>(2025) | 2.36** | 2.0  | 2.1  | 2.2  | 1.9  |      |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

\*\*Figures for the UK based on information from the Office for National Statistics (2025)

While the United Kingdom, Germany and the Netherlands returned values within 0.22 of the mean household size reported by Eurostat (2023) mean household sizes from Italy and Lithuania were notably higher with survey respondents from those countries coming from larger households that the reported national averages to the order of 0.4 and 0.8 persons respectively.

The Italian and Lithuania samples returned the highest average household sizes, at 2.64 and 2.72 members, respectively, while the German sample returned the smallest average household size of 2.16 members (Figure 5).



Figure 5: Mean household size by country



It should be noted however that as household size was not a representativeness quota, such differences are not entirely unanticipated. The sampling of larger households than the true mean is likely due to issues such as coverage (e.g. the loss of older single-person households from sampling frames due to relocation/death and the difficultly in acquiring younger single-person households due to early life mobility) and higher non-response rates (Eurostat, 2010) resulting in lower levels of participation from certain types of single-person households. Certain households may be less likely to respond due to factors such as lower levels of social integration and an absence of other household members who might encourage and support participation by suppling information which the individual respondent cannot readily access or recall (Johansson-Tormod and Klevmarken, 2022).

## Income & Activity Status

Household disposable income bands (after tax plus benefits) across all countries followed a left-skewed truncated distribution (Figure 6), with some bunching in the highest income categories.



Figure 6: Income distribution across all 11 bands for monthly disposable household income

On a per country basis, Figure 7 shows that household income distributions for survey respondents in the United Kingdom, Germany, and the Netherlands exhibit greater levels of bunching at the higher end compared to Italy and Lithuania. In contrast, Italian and Lithuanian respondents display a more pronounced skew toward the lower income brackets, with a noticeable clustering in the lower- and middle-income brackets. This pattern reflects broader economic differences between these countries, due to disparities in wages, cost of living, labour market structures, differential marginal tax band rates and the stepped distribution of two-income households in each country likely resulting in unexpected distributions in individual income bands e.g. in the 3,500-3,999-income band.







Figure 7: Self-estimated monthly disposable household income by participant country

## Tenure, Urbanity & Dwelling

Regarding tenure, average levels of home ownership both with and without an outstanding mortgage were 64% across the sample, with predictably lower levels of ownership for Germany (45%). Interestingly, the Dutch sample contained a relatively high share of owners with outstanding mortgages, compared to the other four participant samples which could perhaps be due to earlier life stage mortgage acquisition but warrants further investigation. In terms of tenancy, German respondents reported the highest levels of tenancy at the market rate, contrasting with respondents from the Netherlands who reported the highest levels of rent at a reduced market rate and respondents from Lithuania reporting the highest levels of rent-free tenancy.

| Please describe your<br>Tenure/Residential Status. | Country           |         |             |        |           |       |  |
|--|-------------------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
|  | United<br>Kingdom | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |  |
| Owner no outstanding mortgage                      | 464               | 305     | 124         | 771    | 512       | 2176  |  |
|  | 44.06             | 27.73   | 11.47       | 54.72  | 50.79     | 38.51 |  |
| Owner with outstanding mortgage                    | 207               | 194     | 583         | 281    | 159       | 1424  |  |
|  | 19.66             | 17.64   | 53.93       | 19.94  | 15.77     | 25.20 |  |
| Tenant with rent at market rate                    | 224               | 537     | 161         | 191    | 197       | 1310  |  |
|  | 21.27             | 48.82   | 14.89       | 13.56  | 19.54     | 23.18 |  |
| Tenant with rent at reduced rate                   | 103               | 46      | 200         | 47     | 26        | 422   |  |
|  | 9.78              | 4.18    | 18.50       | 3.34   | 2.58      | 7.47  |  |

| Table | 5: | Sample | tenure | status | by | country |
|-------|----|--------|--------|--------|----|---------|
|       |    |        |        |        | ~  | ~       |



| Tenant, Rent free | 55   | 18   | 13   | 119  | 114   | 319  |
|-------------------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|
|                   | 5.22 | 1.64 | 1.20 | 8.45 | 11.31 | 5.65 |
| Total             | 1053 | 1100 | 1081 | 1409 | 1008  | 5651 |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

In terms of activity status, similar levels of employment were observed in the United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands and Italy. Lithuania respondents reported a higher level of both employment and unemployment relative to the other four participant countries. The sample collected in Lithuanian also returned a commensurately low number of respondents who described their activity status as "retired". This is likely due to a number of factors including a 4–6-year lower life expectancy in Lithuania (77.6 in 2023) in comparison to the other four countries (Eurostat, 2025) and by the slight under-representation of those in the higher age group category (see Table 2). Other potential reasons include differences in interpretation, structure and social provision in the "Retired" category with only 40% of persons leaving the labour market 6 months after reaching retirement age (Valstybės duomenų agentūra (State Data Agency), 2024).

| What is your main activity status?                      |                   |         | Country     |        |           |        |
|---|-------------------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
|   | United<br>Kingdom | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
| Employed  | 558               | 655     | 568         | 717    | 649       | 3147   |
|   | 52.99             | 59.55   | 52.54       | 50.89  | 64.38     | 55.69  |
| Unemployed  | 52                | 29      | 21          | 145    | 108       | 355    |
|   | 4.94              | 2.64    | 1.94        | 10.29  | 10.71     | 6.28   |
| Retired   | 296               | 277     | 270         | 334    | 63        | 1240   |
|   | 28.11             | 25.18   | 24.98       | 23.70  | 6.25      | 21.94  |
| Unable to work due to long-<br>standing health problems | 63                | 43      | 117         | 8      | 40        | 271    |
| 0 1   | 5.98              | 3.91    | 10.82       | 0.57   | 3.97      | 4.80   |
| Student, pupil  | 48                | 35      | 45          | 82     | 74        | 284    |
|   | 4.56              | 3.18    | 4.16        | 5.82   | 7.34      | 5.03   |
| Fulfilling domestic tasks                               | 14                | 43      | 38          | 95     | 50        | 240    |
| C   | 1.33              | 3.91    | 3.52        | 6.74   | 4.96      | 4.25   |
| Compulsory military or civilian service                 | 0                 | 0       | 0           | 0      | 2         | 2      |
|   | 0.00              | 0.00    | 0.00        | 0.00   | 0.20      | 0.04   |
| Other   | 22                | 18      | 22          | 28     | 22        | 112    |
|   | 2.09              | 1.64    | 2.04        | 1.99   | 2.18      | 1.98   |
| Total   | 1053              | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|   | 100.00            | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

#### Table 6: Sample activity status by participant country

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

Respondents' self-reported level of urbanity is displayed in Table 7. While the subjective definitions seemed to have performed well for the United Kingdom and Germany, most noticeably, respondents from the largest urban areas in the Netherlands did not consider themselves to be resident in "a big city" despite the fact that the Netherlands is the participant country with the highest population density. This was likely due to



translation difficulties and terminology with specific population-level interpretations attached to certain terms such as "Een metropool". Additionally, while Lithuania is the participant country with the lowest population density, it reports the lowest number of respondents living in the lowest two urbanity categories. Single-country and cross-country analyses using urbanity should thus be carefully handled with reference to the original translations and the respondent distributions.

| How would you describe the area   | Country |         |             |        |           |        |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| where your residence is located.  | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
|                                   | Kingdom | 2       |             |        |           |        |
| A big city                        | 221     | 284     | 27          | 200    | 385       | 1117   |
|                                   | 20.99   | 25.82   | 2.50        | 14.19  | 38.19     | 19.77  |
| The suburbs or outskirts of a big | 236     | 205     | 147         | 147    | 65        | 800    |
| city                              |         |         |             |        |           |        |
|                                   | 22.41   | 18.64   | 13.60       | 10.43  | 6.45      | 14.16  |
| A large town                      | 209     | 185     | 165         | 220    | 308       | 1087   |
|                                   | 19.85   | 16.82   | 15.26       | 15.61  | 30.56     | 19.24  |
| A small town                      | 232     | 192     | 346         | 566    | 131       | 1467   |
|                                   | 22.03   | 17.45   | 32.01       | 40.17  | 13.00     | 25.96  |
| Rural Area or village             | 155     | 234     | 396         | 276    | 119       | 1180   |
|                                   | 14.72   | 21.27   | 36.63       | 19.59  | 11.81     | 20.88  |
| Total                             | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|                                   | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

#### Table 7: Self-reported level of urbanity in respondents' residential area

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

Focusing on dwelling type, survey respondents from the United Kingdom and the Netherlands reported similar levels (75-78%) of individual housing (detached, semi-detached and terrace), with a greater proportion of terraced housing reported by respondents from the Netherlands (Table 8). In contrast, survey respondents in Germany, Italy and Lithuania reported much greater levels of apartment dwelling (54-58%).

#### Table 8: Dwelling type by country

| Which dwelling type do you live in? |         |         | Country     |        |          |        |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|----------|--------|
|                                     | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuani | Total  |
|                                     | Kingdom | -       |             | -      | а        |        |
| Detached house                      | 249     | 294     | 133         | 413    | 375      | 1464   |
|                                     | 23.65   | 26.73   | 12.30       | 29.31  | 37.20    | 25.91  |
| Semi-detached house                 | 331     | 124     | 200         | 141    | 40       | 836    |
|                                     | 31.43   | 11.27   | 18.50       | 10.01  | 3.97     | 14.79  |
| Terraced house                      | 222     | 42      | 465         | 75     | 17       | 821    |
|                                     | 21.08   | 3.82    | 43.02       | 5.32   | 1.69     | 14.53  |
| Apartment                           | 223     | 635     | 270         | 766    | 561      | 2455   |
| -                                   | 21.18   | 57.73   | 24.98       | 54.36  | 55.65    | 43.44  |
| Other (e.g. Mobile Home/Trailer,    | 28      | 5       | 13          | 14     | 15       | 75     |
| Boathouse, Dormitory, Adjacent      |         |         |             |        |          |        |
| Housing/Bedsit, Tiny House etc.)    |         |         |             |        |          |        |
|                                     | 2.66    | 0.45    | 1.20        | 0.99   | 1.49     | 1.33   |
| Total                               | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008     | 5651   |
|                                     | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00   | 100.00 |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages



Across all countries surveyed, the mean age of respondents was 49, with 51% percent of the sample reporting their gender as female. More than half of all respondents (62%) reported living with a partner while 31% of all households reported the presence of children.

## Section 5: Mobility, carless-ness, and car sharing

This section reports data relating to current engagement in mobility-related CCPs such as carless-ness, levels of car sharing, and active mobility. Stated levels of willingness to engage in car sharing and car shedding where sharing services would be available as well as information on existing structures and competencies for public, active, and multi-modal mobility also feature.

### Car ownership and carless-ness

Regarding car ownership, respondents were asked "How many cars does your household have? (including leased and company-cars)." This facilitated the later reporting of "ownership type" for each car, i.e., whether it was privately owned, leased, or a company car<sup>2</sup>.

Most respondents (52%) reported being part of a one-car household, with a further quarter of respondents (26%) belonging to a two-car household (Table 9). Carless households made up 17% of the total sample with over a fifth of respondents in the United Kingdom (21%) and Lithuania (23%) reporting non-ownership of a car by the household.

| No. of cars owned by household |                   |         | Country     | 7      |           |        |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| `                              | United<br>Kingdom | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
| 0                              | 225               | 197     | 146         | 144    | 236       | 948    |
|                                | 21.37             | 17.91   | 13.51       | 10.22  | 23.41     | 16.78  |
| 1                              | 532               | 582     | 632         | 750    | 452       | 2948   |
|                                | 50.52             | 52.91   | 58.46       | 53.23  | 44.84     | 52.17  |
| 2                              | 242               | 271     | 249         | 434    | 259       | 1455   |
|                                | 22.98             | 24.64   | 23.03       | 30.80  | 25.69     | 25.75  |
| 3                              | 36                | 37      | 41          | 67     | 42        | 223    |
|                                | 3.42              | 3.36    | 3.79        | 4.76   | 4.17      | 3.95   |
| 4                              | 12                | 8       | 9           | 12     | 12        | 53     |
|                                | 1.14              | 0.73    | 0.83        | 0.85   | 1.19      | 0.94   |
| 5                              | 6                 | 5       | 4           | 2      | 7         | 24     |
|                                | 0.57              | 0.45    | 0.37        | 0.14   | 0.69      | 0.42   |
| Total                          | 1053              | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|                                | 100.00            | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

Table 9: Number of cars per household by participant country.

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> While the term "possession type" would have been more accurate, it was decided that this would be potentially confusing for participants and had the potential to slow response times.



Concerning car type, survey respondents were asked about details for each car reported, i.e., whether it was a conventional, hybrid, or electric vehicle. Only 6% of respondents reported having an electric car (Table 10), with 12% reporting hybrid use (see Table 11).

| Number of Electric Cars | n       | Country |             |        |           |        |  |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|--|
| Household               |         |         |             |        |           |        |  |
|                         | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |  |
|                         | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |        |  |
| 0                       | 957     | 1024    | 1003        | 1370   | 973       | 5327   |  |
|                         | 90.88   | 93.09   | 92.78       | 97.23  | 96.53     | 94.27  |  |
| 1                       | 84      | 67      | 73          | 34     | 31        | 289    |  |
|                         | 7.98    | 6.09    | 6.75        | 2.41   | 3.08      | 5.11   |  |
| 2                       | 11      | 9       | 5           | 4      | 4         | 33     |  |
|                         | 1.04    | 0.82    | 0.46        | 0.28   | 0.40      | 0.58   |  |
| 3                       | 1       | 0       | 0           | 1      | 0         | 2      |  |
|                         | 0.09    | 0.00    | 0.00        | 0.07   | 0.00      | 0.04   |  |
| Total                   | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |  |
|                         | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |  |

#### Table 10: Number of respondents reporting an electric car by country

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

| Number of Hybrid Cars in |         | Country |             |        |           |        |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Household                |         |         |             |        |           |        |
|                          | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
|                          | Kingdom | -       |             | -      |           |        |
| 0                        | 874     | 1025    | 950         | 1181   | 935       | 4965   |
|                          | 83.00   | 93.18   | 87.88       | 83.82  | 92.76     | 87.86  |
| 1                        | 152     | 70      | 124         | 206    | 64        | 616    |
|                          | 14.43   | 6.36    | 11.47       | 14.62  | 6.35      | 10.90  |
| 2                        | 23      | 5       | 7           | 21     | 9         | 65     |
|                          | 2.18    | 0.45    | 0.65        | 1.49   | 0.89      | 1.15   |
| 3                        | 4       | 0       | 0           | 1      | 0         | 5      |
|                          | 0.38    | 0.00    | 0.00        | 0.07   | 0.00      | 0.09   |
| Total                    | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|                          | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

#### Table 11: Number of respondents with a hybrid car by participant country

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

Moving on to ownership status, only 6% of the sample reported a leasing arrangement (Table 12), with just 5% of respondents mentioning a company car (Table 13).



| Number of Leased Cars in<br>Household | Country |         |             |        |           |        |  |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|--|
|                                       | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |  |
|                                       | Kingdom | -       |             | -      |           |        |  |
| 0                                     | 957     | 1050    | 990         | 1360   | 946       | 5303   |  |
|                                       | 90.88   | 95.45   | 91.58       | 96.52  | 93.85     | 93.84  |  |
| 1                                     | 90      | 40      | 85          | 44     | 59        | 318    |  |
|                                       | 8.55    | 3.64    | 7.86        | 3.12   | 5.85      | 5.63   |  |
| 2                                     | 4       | 9       | 5           | 5      | 3         | 26     |  |
|                                       | 0.38    | 0.82    | 0.46        | 0.35   | 0.30      | 0.46   |  |
| 3                                     | 2       | 1       | 1           | 0      | 0         | 4      |  |
|                                       | 0.19    | 0.09    | 0.09        | 0.00   | 0.00      | 0.07   |  |
| Total                                 | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |  |
|                                       | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |  |

#### Table 12: Number of respondents reporting having a leased car by participant country

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

#### Table 13: Number of respondents reporting having a company car by participant country

| Number of Company Cars in | Country |         |             |        |           |        |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Household                 |         |         | ·           |        |           |        |
|                           | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
|                           | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |        |
| 0                         | 1018    | 1039    | 990         | 1368   | 969       | 5384   |
|                           | 96.68   | 94.45   | 91.58       | 97.09  | 96.13     | 95.28  |
| 1                         | 32      | 55      | 85          | 39     | 34        | 245    |
|                           | 3.04    | 5.00    | 7.86        | 2.77   | 3.37      | 4.34   |
| 2                         | 3       | 6       | 4           | 1      | 5         | 19     |
|                           | 0.28    | 0.55    | 0.37        | 0.07   | 0.50      | 0.34   |
| 3                         | 0       | 0       | 2           | 0      | 0         | 2      |
|                           | 0.00    | 0.00    | 0.19        | 0.00   | 0.00      | 0.04   |
| 4                         | 0       | 0       | 0           | 1      | 0         | 1      |
|                           | 0.00    | 0.00    | 0.00        | 0.07   | 0.00      | 0.02   |
| Total                     | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|                           | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

## Car sharing and car shedding

All respondents were asked to state whether they had access to car sharing services in their local area. The share of respondents who reported the availability of commercial sharing options was 28% while 20% reported informal car sharing opportunities and 9% community options. At least one car sharing option was reported as being available in the local area by 45% of respondents (Table 14).



| At least one car sharing option       |         | Country |             |        |           |        |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|--|--|
| available in my local area.           |         |         |             |        |           |        |  |  |
|                                       | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |  |  |
|                                       | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |        |  |  |
| No Sharing available                  | 583     | 668     | 583         | 851    | 408       | 3093   |  |  |
| _                                     | 55.37   | 60.73   | 53.93       | 60.40  | 40.48     | 54.73  |  |  |
| At least one sharing option available | 470     | 432     | 498         | 558    | 600       | 2558   |  |  |
|                                       | 44.63   | 39.27   | 46.07       | 39.60  | 59.52     | 45.27  |  |  |
| Total                                 | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |  |  |
|                                       | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |  |  |

#### Table 14: At least one car-sharing option available reported by country

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

Of the 2,558 respondents who reported the availability of car sharing services, 73% of respondents reported that they either rarely (27%) or never (45%) use them, with weekly (11%) or monthly (11%) use the most common frequency levels reported for what may be subjectively deemed as regular use (Table 15). The distribution of frequency across participant countries was largely similar, with the greatest level of non-use of available options reported in Germany (61% "Never" and 21% "Rarely").

|                                   | 1       |         |             |        |           |        |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| How often do you use car sharing? |         |         | Countr      | V.     |           |        |
|                                   | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
|                                   | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |        |
| Daily                             | 46      | 9       | 29          | 30     | 33        | 147    |
|                                   | 9.79    | 2.08    | 5.82        | 5.38   | 5.50      | 5.75   |
| Weekly                            | 69      | 37      | 39          | 65     | 71        | 281    |
|                                   | 14.68   | 8.56    | 7.83        | 11.65  | 11.83     | 10.99  |
| Monthly                           | 52      | 32      | 40          | 75     | 76        | 275    |
|                                   | 11.06   | 7.41    | 8.03        | 13.44  | 12.67     | 10.75  |
| Rarely                            | 119     | 90      | 119         | 135    | 232       | 695    |
|                                   | 25.32   | 20.83   | 23.90       | 24.19  | 38.67     | 27.17  |
| Never                             | 184     | 264     | 271         | 253    | 188       | 1160   |
|                                   | 39.15   | 61.11   | 54.42       | 45.34  | 31.33     | 45.35  |
| Total                             | 470     | 432     | 498         | 558    | 600       | 2558   |
|                                   | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

#### Table 15: Frequency of use of car sharing by country with at least one sharing option available

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

Out of 5,651 respondents, 3,093 reported no availability of car sharing options. These respondents were then asked how likely it would be that they would use car sharing if it was available (1= "Yes, very likely" to 7= "No, very unlikely"; Figure 8).





Figure 8: Percentage shares of likelihood of using car sharing if it was available.

Very low levels of likelihood of using car sharing (where none was currently available) were reported across all participant countries, with only 14, 18 and 12% of respondents rating their likelihood from 1-3 in the United Kingdom, Germany and the Netherlands respectively. Noticeably higher rates of likelihood were reported in Italy and Lithuania. However, across all respondents, 59% rated their likelihood level between 5-7, with 34% reporting their likelihood as "No, very unlikely (7)" (Table 16).

| Table 16: ] | Reported | likelihood | of using | car-sharing | if it was | available |
|-------------|----------|------------|----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|
|             |          |            |          | <b>-</b>    |           |           |

| Would you be likely to use car sharing if it was available? | g Country |         |             |        |           |       |  |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
|   | United    | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |  |
|   | Kingdom   | -       |             | -      |           |       |  |
| Yes, very likely (1)  | 19        | 19      | 12          | 90     | 56        | 196   |  |
|   | 3.26      | 2.84    | 2.06        | 10.58  | 13.73     | 6.34  |  |
| 2   | 17        | 31      | 28          | 75     | 30        | 181   |  |
|   | 2.92      | 4.64    | 4.80        | 8.81   | 7.35      | 5.85  |  |
| 3   | 46        | 69      | 31          | 104    | 58        | 308   |  |
|   | 7.89      | 10.33   | 5.32        | 12.22  | 14.22     | 9.96  |  |
| 4   | 79        | 143     | 102         | 172    | 82        | 578   |  |
|   | 13.55     | 21.41   | 17.50       | 20.21  | 20.10     | 18.69 |  |
| 5   | 57        | 77      | 48          | 106    | 38        | 326   |  |
|   | 9.78      | 11.53   | 8.23        | 12.46  | 9.31      | 10.54 |  |
| 6   | 88        | 92      | 106         | 133    | 46        | 465   |  |
|   | 15.09     | 13.77   | 18.18       | 15.63  | 11.27     | 15.03 |  |
| No, very unlikely (7)                                       | 277       | 237     | 256         | 171    | 98        | 1039  |  |



|       | 47.51  | 35.48  | 43.91  | 20.09  | 24.02  | 33.59  |
|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Total | 583    | 668    | 583    | 851    | 408    | 3093   |
|       | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

Respondents were then asked about the potential of car sharing to result in 'car shedding'. This question was only asked of those respondents who reported car use and currently did not have any car-sharing options available in their local area. Here, a cross-country profile similar to likelihood of car sharing (Figure 8) emerged, with higher levels of likelihood to shed their car reported by respondents in Italy and Lithuania (Figure 9).



Figure 9: Likelihood to shed car if adequate car sharing was available.

The overall likelihood of car shedding reported was low, with 66% of respondents choosing scale points between 5-7, including 37% selecting "No, very unlikely (7)" (Table 17).

| Table 17: | Likelihood | of shedding | car with ade | quate car-sl | haring by o | country |
|-----------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------|
|           |            |             |              | 1            |             | ~       |

| Would you get rid of your car if    | Country |         |             |        |           |       |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|
| adequate car sharing was available? |         |         |             |        |           |       |
|                                     | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |
|                                     | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |       |
| Yes, very likely (1)                | 13      | 11      | 10          | 68     | 28        | 130   |
|                                     | 2.83    | 1.92    | 1.96        | 8.68   | 9.03      | 4.93  |
| 2                                   | 11      | 30      | 13          | 70     | 26        | 150   |



|                       | 2.40   | 5.24   | 2.54   | 8.94   | 8.39   | 5.69   |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 3                     | 20     | 53     | 34     | 85     | 35     | 227    |
|                       | 4.36   | 9.25   | 6.65   | 10.86  | 11.29  | 8.61   |
| 4                     | 51     | 84     | 75     | 128    | 62     | 400    |
|                       | 11.11  | 14.66  | 14.68  | 16.35  | 20.00  | 15.17  |
| 5                     | 60     | 66     | 50     | 105    | 33     | 314    |
|                       | 13.07  | 11.52  | 9.78   | 13.41  | 10.65  | 11.91  |
| 6                     | 78     | 77     | 99     | 141    | 43     | 438    |
|                       | 16.99  | 13.44  | 19.37  | 18.01  | 13.87  | 16.62  |
| No, very unlikely (7) | 226    | 252    | 230    | 186    | 83     | 977    |
|                       | 49.24  | 43.98  | 45.01  | 23.75  | 26.77  | 37.06  |
| Total                 | 459    | 573    | 511    | 783    | 310    | 2636   |
|                       | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

### Public, Active, and Multi-Modal Transport

To provide a basis for assessing existing structures and local conditions impacting respondents' capacity to reduce their car use, they were asked to rate their local transport provision on a 7-point scale from "Very good (1)" to "Very poor (7).



Figure 10: How would you rate the current public transport provision in your local area?



While 22% of respondents rated their public transport provision neither positively nor negatively (with a rating of 4), 43% gave their local area public transport provision a positive rating (1-3) while 35% chose a negative rating (5–7).



Figure 11: Local public transport provision rating by country

While the distribution of local public transport ratings was similar across all countries surveyed, Italian respondents rated their local transport provision more negatively (Figure 11): just 30% selected scores between 1 and 3, compared to 47% for all other respondents (Table 18).

| Table | 18: | Public | transport | rating | by | country |  |
|-------|-----|--------|-----------|--------|----|---------|--|
|       |     |        | 1         |        | ~  |         |  |

| How would you rate the current | Country |         |             |        |           |       |  |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| local area?                    |         |         |             |        |           |       |  |
|                                | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |  |
|                                | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |       |  |
| Very Good (1)                  | 147     | 121     | 76          | 70     | 121       | 535   |  |
|                                | 13.96   | 11.00   | 7.03        | 4.97   | 12.00     | 9.47  |  |
| 2                              | 192     | 236     | 199         | 139    | 181       | 947   |  |
|                                | 18.23   | 21.45   | 18.41       | 9.87   | 17.96     | 16.76 |  |
| 3                              | 175     | 213     | 182         | 219    | 159       | 948   |  |
|                                | 16.62   | 19.36   | 16.84       | 15.54  | 15.77     | 16.78 |  |
| 4                              | 203     | 215     | 250         | 329    | 235       | 1232  |  |
|                                | 19.28   | 19.55   | 23.13       | 23.35  | 23.31     | 21.80 |  |
| 5                              | 146     | 137     | 196         | 252    | 160       | 891   |  |



|               | 13.87  | 12.45  | 18.13  | 17.89  | 15.87  | 15.77  |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 6             | 120    | 84     | 110    | 237    | 82     | 633    |
|               | 11.40  | 7.64   | 10.18  | 16.82  | 8.13   | 11.20  |
| Very Poor (7) | 70     | 94     | 68     | 163    | 70     | 465    |
|               | 6.65   | 8.55   | 6.29   | 11.57  | 6.94   | 8.23   |
| Total         | 1053   | 1100   | 1081   | 1409   | 1008   | 5651   |
|               | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

In terms of active mobility, considerable differences emerged between respondents in participant countries. The mean number of bicycles reported by United Kingdom respondents was just 0.69, contrasting with anticipated high levels of reported bicycle ownership in the Netherlands at 2.35 bicycles per household (Figure 12 & Table 20).





This disparity is largely due to very high number of respondents in the United Kingdom (60%) who stated that the household does not own a bicycle, contrasting with the Netherlands where only 11% of respondents reported no bicycle ownership (Table 19). Overall, almost 36% of respondents reported that their household does not own a bicycle.

| Table 19: Reported number of households who do not own a bicycle by countr | y. |
|--|----|
|--|----|

| Household does not own a bicycle. | Country |         |             |        |           |       |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|
|                                   | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |
|                                   | Kingdom | -       |             | -      |           |       |
| Not selected                      | 419     | 796     | 960         | 825    | 642       | 3642  |



|          | 39.79  | 72.36  | 88.81  | 58.55  | 63.69  | 64.45  |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Selected | 634    | 304    | 121    | 584    | 366    | 2009   |
|          | 60.21  | 27.64  | 11.19  | 41.45  | 36.31  | 35.55  |
| Total    | 1053   | 1100   | 1081   | 1409   | 1008   | 5651   |
|          | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages



#### Figure 13: Mean number of bicycles per household those who report owning at least one bicycle.

When looking only at households who did report bicycle ownership (Figure 13), the contrast was less pronounced. Respondents in the United Kingdom reported bicycle ownership averaging 1.73 bicycles per household, compared to 2.65 in the Netherlands (Table 20).

## Table 20: Mean number of bicycles per household for all respondents and for those who report owning at least one bicycle.

| How many bicycles            | Country |         |             |        |           |  |  |
|------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--|--|
|                              | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania |  |  |
|                              | Kingdom | -       |             | -      |           |  |  |
| Mean                         | 0.67    | 1.64    | 2.35        | 1.20   | 1.38      |  |  |
| Mean (at least one bicycles) | 1.73    | 2.27    | 2.65        | 2.04   | 2.16      |  |  |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data


In terms of regularity of bicycle use among those who reported household bicycle ownership, 36% of respondents reported that they themselves rarely or never cycle, with a further 14% reporting that they cycle on a monthly basis. The remaining 51% of respondents reporting cycling on a weekly (32%) or daily (18%) basis (Table 21).

# Table 21: Bicycle use by country

| How often do you cycle? | Country |         |             |        |           |        |  |  |  |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|--|--|--|
|                         | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |  |  |  |
|                         | Kingdom | -       |             | -      |           |        |  |  |  |
| Daily                   | 47      | 138     | 330         | 75     | 58        | 648    |  |  |  |
|                         | 11.22   | 17.34   | 34.38       | 9.09   | 9.03      | 17.79  |  |  |  |
| Weekly                  | 127     | 297     | 379         | 251    | 127       | 1181   |  |  |  |
|                         | 30.31   | 37.31   | 39.48       | 30.42  | 19.78     | 32.43  |  |  |  |
| Monthly                 | 71      | 96      | 94          | 122    | 137       | 520    |  |  |  |
| -                       | 16.95   | 12.06   | 9.79        | 14.79  | 21.34     | 14.28  |  |  |  |
| Rarely                  | 97      | 213     | 110         | 274    | 276       | 970    |  |  |  |
| -                       | 23.15   | 26.76   | 11.46       | 33.21  | 42.99     | 26.63  |  |  |  |
| Never                   | 77      | 52      | 47          | 103    | 44        | 323    |  |  |  |
|                         | 18.38   | 6.53    | 4.90        | 12.48  | 6.85      | 8.87   |  |  |  |
| Total                   | 419     | 796     | 960         | 825    | 642       | 3642   |  |  |  |
|                         | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |  |  |  |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists *frequencies* and second row lists *column percentages* 

Respondents from the Netherlands and Germany report the highest frequency of bicycle use, with 75% and 55% reporting weekly or daily use. Lower levels of frequency of use were reported by respondents from the United Kingdom, Italy, and Lithuania who reported daily or weekly use levels of 41%, 40% and 29% respectively (Figure 14).





Figure 14: How often do you cycle?

# Section 6: Commoning & repair

# Living space sharing and downsizing

This section describes the current rate of sharing and/or commoning of living spaces reported by respondents. Participants were asked if they currently share a kitchen, bathroom, basement, garden, utility room, or entrance/hallway with a non-family member. All respondents were also asked if they would be willing to permanently share those spaces (where applicable) with non-family members. Overall, levels of reported space sharing were low across all countries, with 73% of respondents stating that they did not share any of the living or residential spaces described. The rate of space sharing was the highest in Lithuania with 39% of respondents reporting they shared at least one of the listed spaces. In contrast, only 17% of respondents from the Netherlands reported sharing at least one of the listed spaces (Table 22). Respondents from the Netherlands also reported the lowest level of space sharing for all categories apart from entrances and hallways with Lithuania reporting the highest rates in all categories apart from gardens.



| Do you currently share?             | Country |         |             |        |           |       |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|--|--|
|                                     |         |         |             |        |           |       |  |  |  |
| % of total respondents who reported | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |  |  |  |
| sharing the follow areas.           | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |       |  |  |  |
| Kitchen                             | 83      | 55      | 58          | 125    | 138       | 459   |  |  |  |
|                                     | 7.88    | 5.00    | 5.37        | 8.87   | 13.69     | 8.12  |  |  |  |
| Bathroom                            | 80      | 63      | 48          | 112    | 134       | 437   |  |  |  |
|                                     | 7.60    | 5.73    | 4.44        | 7.95   | 13.29     | 7.73  |  |  |  |
| Basement                            | 44      | 118     | 43          | 104    | 156       | 465   |  |  |  |
|                                     | 4.18    | 10.73   | 3.98        | 7.38   | 15.48     | 8.23  |  |  |  |
| Garden                              | 137     | 119     | 65          | 230    | 100       | 651   |  |  |  |
|                                     | 13.01   | 10.82   | 6.01        | 16.32  | 9.92      | 11.52 |  |  |  |
| Utility room                        | 67      | 82      | 25          | 68     | 95        | 337   |  |  |  |
|                                     | 6.36    | 7.45    | 2.31        | 4.83   | 9.42      | 5.96  |  |  |  |
| Entrance/hallway <sup>3</sup>       | 136     | 211     | 146         | 200    | 235       | 928   |  |  |  |
| -                                   | 12.92   | 19.18   | 13.51       | 14.19  | 23.31     | 16.42 |  |  |  |
| I currently do not share any spaces | 829     | 793     | 895         | 970    | 611       | 4098  |  |  |  |
|                                     | 78.73   | 72.09   | 82.79       | 68.84  | 60.62     | 72.52 |  |  |  |
| Total respondents                   | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651  |  |  |  |

# Table 22: Current level of space sharing reported by respondents

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row shows the independent percentage of total respondents for each area.

The type of space to be shared mattered greatly in this context. Somewhat higher levels of sharing were reported in what might be commonly interpreted as less private areas such as entrances (16%) and gardens (12%), contrasting with low shares for more private areas such as kitchens (8%) and bathrooms (8%). Current structural arrangements as well as cultural norms and prescriptions regarding public and private spaces are likely to be the primary drivers for these differences.

Participants were then asked about their level of willingness to permanently share those spaces with nonfamily members where applicable, with answer options ranging from "Very willing" (1) to "Not at all willing" (7). Respondents from the Netherlands reported the lowest willingness to permanently share space across all categories despite reporting the second highest average living space per household member (Table 23).

Table 23: Willingness to permanently share spaces with non-family members.

| Would you be willing to share your space with non-family member? | Country |         |             |        |           |  |
|--|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--|
| Mean Likert response 1-Very Willing to                           | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania |  |
| 7-Not at all willing   | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |  |
| Kitchen  | 5.93    | 6.09    | 6.20        | 5.89   | 5.83      |  |
| Bathroom   | 6.03    | 6.26    | 6.31        | 6.03   | 5.91      |  |
| Basement   | 5.18    | 4.93    | 5.69        | 5.12   | 5.24      |  |
| Garden   | 4.88    | 4.55    | 5.54        | 4.54   | 5.27      |  |
| Utility room   | 5.25    | 4.65    | 5.99        | 5.49   | 5.31      |  |
| Entrance/hallway   | 5.27    | 4.76    | 5.43        | 5.36   | 5.29      |  |
| Mean reported living space per household member**                | 68.83   | 50.82   | 57.83       | 46.94  | 35.28     |  |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

\*\*see note on living space in Section 3: Data validation

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The category entrance/hallway was not defined further and followed the respondent's interpretation



In terms of willingness to downsize, 28% of respondents stated a willingness level of 3 or better, with almost 56% of respondents returning a score of 5-7. In fact, 32% of all respondents stated that they were "Not at all willing (7)" to move to a smaller home if it was readily available.

| Extent of willingness to live in a smaller home if one was readily available |         |         | Country     |        |           |        |
|--|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
|  | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
|  | Kingdom | -       |             | -      |           |        |
| Very willing (1)   | 123     | 82      | 116         | 122    | 81        | 524    |
|  | 11.68   | 7.45    | 10.73       | 8.66   | 8.04      | 9.27   |
| 2  | 100     | 102     | 91          | 104    | 52        | 449    |
|  | 9.50    | 9.27    | 8.42        | 7.38   | 5.16      | 7.95   |
| 3  | 106     | 153     | 103         | 168    | 79        | 609    |
|  | 10.07   | 13.91   | 9.53        | 11.92  | 7.84      | 10.78  |
| 4  | 173     | 171     | 159         | 250    | 170       | 923    |
|  | 16.43   | 15.55   | 14.71       | 17.74  | 16.87     | 16.33  |
| 5  | 98      | 122     | 122         | 208    | 134       | 684    |
|  | 9.31    | 11.09   | 11.29       | 14.76  | 13.29     | 12.10  |
| 6  | 124     | 123     | 124         | 180    | 120       | 671    |
|  | 11.78   | 11.18   | 11.47       | 12.78  | 11.90     | 11.87  |
| Not at all willing (7)   | 329     | 347     | 366         | 377    | 372       | 1791   |
|  | 31.24   | 31.55   | 33.86       | 26.76  | 36.90     | 31.69  |
| Total  | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|  | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

Table 24: Willingness to move to a smaller home

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

The distribution of willingness to downsize was similar in all participant countries (Figure 15), with Lithuania reporting the lowest average willingness to move which may be related to those respondents also reporting the lowest living space per household member (Table 23)





Figure 15: Extent of willingness of respondents in all countries to live in a smaller home if readily available.

# **Borrowing and Lending**

Respondents were asked if they ever borrowed any of the following items from their neighbour: car, E-bike, bicycle, tools, electronic devices, kitchen appliances, or other smaller household items. Low levels of borrowing (less than 11%) were reported across all categories, with tools (30%) being a notable exception. Respondents from all countries reported borrowing rates for tools of 22% or higher.

| Which of the following items have<br>you borrowed at some stage from<br>your neighbours? | Country |         |             |        |           |       |  |  |  |
|--|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|--|--|
|  | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |  |  |  |
|  | Kingdom | ·       |             | -      |           |       |  |  |  |
| Car  | 78      | 89      | 110         | 99     | 74        | 450   |  |  |  |
|  | 7.41    | 8.09    | 10.18       | 7.03   | 7.34      | 7.96  |  |  |  |
| E-bike   | 30      | 42      | 29          | 45     | 34        | 180   |  |  |  |
|  | 2.85    | 3.82    | 2.68        | 3.19   | 3.37      | 3.19  |  |  |  |
| Bicycle  | 61      | 72      | 81          | 66     | 78        | 358   |  |  |  |
|  | 5.79    | 6.55    | 7.49        | 4.68   | 7.74      | 6.34  |  |  |  |
| Tools  | 307     | 432     | 445         | 294    | 223       | 1701  |  |  |  |
|  | 29.15   | 39.27   | 41.17       | 20.87  | 22.12     | 30.10 |  |  |  |
| Electronic/digital device  | 50      | 71      | 70          | 35     | 74        | 300   |  |  |  |
| <u> </u>   | 4.75    | 6.45    | 6.48        | 2.48   | 7.34      | 5.31  |  |  |  |
| Kitchen appliances   | 60      | 102     | 82          | 120    | 48        | 412   |  |  |  |
|  | 5.70    | 9.27    | 7.59        | 8.52   | 4.76      | 7.29  |  |  |  |
| Other smaller household items  | 75      | 138     | 145         | 122    | 104       | 584   |  |  |  |
|  | 7.12    | 12.55   | 13.41       | 8.66   | 10.32     | 10.33 |  |  |  |

Table 25: Level of borrowing reported by respondents by participant country



| None of these | 654   | 559   | 551   | 919   | 631   | 3314  |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|               | 62.11 | 50.82 | 50.97 | 65.22 | 62.60 | 58.64 |
| Total         | 1053  | 1100  | 1081  | 1409  | 1008  | 5651  |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row shows the independent percentage of total respondents for each item.

Respondents were then asked about their level of lending for the same items. While overall levels of lending could also be described as relatively low (15% for all categories, except for tools at 37%), respondents consistently reported slightly higher levels of lending rather than borrowing (Table 26). Such differences may be due to poor recall and social desirability biases and/or asymmetrical interactions where people may lend to many but borrow from few.

| Which of the following items have | Country |         |             |        |           |       |  |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| you lent at some stage to your    |         |         |             |        |           |       |  |
| neighbours?                       |         |         |             |        |           |       |  |
|                                   | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |  |
|                                   | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |       |  |
| Car                               | 90      | 99      | 119         | 108    | 116       | 532   |  |
|                                   | 8.55    | 9.00    | 11.01       | 7.67   | 11.51     | 9.41  |  |
| E-bike                            | 35      | 48      | 45          | 40     | 46        | 214   |  |
|                                   | 3.32    | 4.36    | 4.16        | 2.84   | 4.56      | 3.79  |  |
| Bicycle                           | 71      | 88      | 113         | 85     | 128       | 485   |  |
|                                   | 6.74    | 8.00    | 10.45       | 6.03   | 12.70     | 8.58  |  |
| Tools                             | 393     | 465     | 495         | 347    | 318       | 2018  |  |
|                                   | 37.32   | 42.27   | 45.79       | 24.63  | 31.55     | 35.71 |  |
| Electronic/digital device         | 86      | 99      | 111         | 79     | 119       | 494   |  |
|                                   | 8.17    | 9.00    | 10.27       | 5.61   | 11.81     | 8.74  |  |
| Kitchen appliances                | 98      | 137     | 112         | 178    | 95        | 620   |  |
|                                   | 9.31    | 12.45   | 10.36       | 12.63  | 9.42      | 10.97 |  |
| Other small household items       | 118     | 202     | 189         | 170    | 139       | 818   |  |
|                                   | 11.21   | 18.36   | 17.48       | 12.07  | 13.79     | 14.48 |  |
| None of these                     | 553     | 499     | 482         | 811    | 478       | 2823  |  |
|                                   | 52.52   | 45.36   | 44.59       | 57.56  | 47.42     | 49.96 |  |
| Total                             | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651  |  |

## Table 26: Level of lending reported by respondents by participant country

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row shows the independent percentage of total respondents for each item.

Respondents from Lithuania reported the highest levels of lending in the car, E-bike, bicycle, and electronic devices categories. While respondents from Italy reported the highest levels of non-engagement (none of these) in both borrowing (65%) and lending (58%), they did report the highest levels of lending in the category of kitchen appliances (13%).

# **Repair Activity**

Respondents were asked about their engagement in repair activities in the categories of car, bicycle, mobile phone, digital devices, clothing, furniture, shoes and household appliances. They were first asked if they carried out repair activities themselves before being asked if they purchased repairs in those categories. Overall, 73% of respondents reported engaging in at least one self-repair activity (Table 27). While 27% reported not engaging in any self-repair activity, this differed substantially across countries, with only 20% of



respondents from Lithuania reporting no self-repair activity compared to 33% of respondents from the United Kingdom. The most common self-repair activity reported was clothes mending (44%), with respondents from the Netherlands reporting the highest level (52%). The lowest levels of self-repair activity related to mobile phone repairs (14%) and shoe repairs (15%).

| Do you perform?                 |         |         | Country     |        |           |       |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|
|                                 | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |
|                                 | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |       |
| minor car repairs               | 265     | 278     | 237         | 340    | 330       | 1450  |
|                                 | 25.17   | 25.27   | 21.92       | 24.13  | 32.74     | 25.66 |
| bicycle repairs                 | 218     | 480     | 557         | 393    | 369       | 2017  |
|                                 | 20.70   | 43.64   | 51.53       | 27.89  | 36.61     | 35.69 |
| mobile phone repairs            | 126     | 207     | 102         | 188    | 187       | 810   |
|                                 | 11.97   | 18.82   | 9.44        | 13.34  | 18.55     | 14.33 |
| repairing other digital devices | 145     | 206     | 154         | 202    | 196       | 903   |
|                                 | 13.77   | 18.73   | 14.25       | 14.34  | 19.44     | 15.98 |
| clothes mending                 | 457     | 533     | 495         | 600    | 421       | 2506  |
|                                 | 43.40   | 48.45   | 45.79       | 42.58  | 41.77     | 44.35 |
| furniture repairs               | 263     | 449     | 312         | 447    | 356       | 1827  |
|                                 | 24.98   | 40.82   | 28.86       | 31.72  | 35.32     | 32.33 |
| shoe repairs                    | 138     | 155     | 138         | 234    | 160       | 825   |
|                                 | 13.11   | 14.09   | 12.77       | 16.61  | 15.87     | 14.60 |
| household appliance repairs     | 289     | 329     | 316         | 297    | 359       | 1590  |
|                                 | 27.45   | 29.91   | 29.23       | 21.08  | 35.62     | 28.14 |
| None of these                   | 351     | 269     | 299         | 410    | 202       | 1531  |
|                                 | 33.33   | 24.45   | 27.66       | 29.10  | 20.04     | 27.09 |
| Total                           | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651  |

## Table 27: Level of self-repair activity reported by respondents by participant country

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row shows the independent percentage of total respondents for each item.

When asked about the purchase of repair services, overall, 82% of respondents reported purchasing at least one repair service (Table 28). While 18% reported not purchasing any of the listed repair services, this again differed substantially across countries. Only 10% of respondents from the Netherlands reported no repair service purchase, compared to 28% of United Kingdom respondents. The most common repair service category reported was minor car repairs (51%), with respondents from the Dutch sample reporting the highest levels of repair service purchase across all categories, except for household appliance repair service purchase levels reported by respondents from Italy (43%).

| Table 28: Level of re | pair service p | urchase activity   | reported b   | v respondents | by participant of | country       |
|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|
| 10010 201 201 01 10   | penn oer nee p | a childre activity | - epointer a | 1             | s purcherpunct    | , o charter y |

| Do you purchase any of these repair services? | Country |         |             |        |           |       |  |  |  |
|---|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|--|--|
|   | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |  |  |  |
|   | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |       |  |  |  |
|   |         |         |             |        |           |       |  |  |  |
| minor car repairs                             | 474     | 614     | 671         | 713    | 437       | 2909  |  |  |  |
|   | 45.01   | 55.82   | 62.07       | 50.60  | 43.35     | 51.48 |  |  |  |
| bicycle repairs                               | 122     | 332     | 497         | 276    | 180       | 1407  |  |  |  |
|   | 11.59   | 30.18   | 45.98       | 19.59  | 17.86     | 24.90 |  |  |  |
| mobile phone                                  | 384     | 447     | 690         | 593    | 509       | 2623  |  |  |  |
| -   | 36.47   | 40.64   | 63.83       | 42.09  | 50.50     | 46.42 |  |  |  |



| other digital devices | 305   | 437   | 616   | 500   | 432   | 2290  |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                       | 28.96 | 39.73 | 56.98 | 35.49 | 42.86 | 40.52 |
| clothes mending       | 129   | 236   | 354   | 258   | 151   | 1128  |
|                       | 12.25 | 21.45 | 32.75 | 18.31 | 14.98 | 19.96 |
| furniture             | 159   | 186   | 320   | 224   | 174   | 1063  |
|                       | 15.10 | 16.91 | 29.60 | 15.90 | 17.26 | 18.81 |
| shoe repair           | 246   | 469   | 509   | 436   | 364   | 2024  |
| -                     | 23.36 | 42.64 | 47.09 | 30.94 | 36.11 | 35.82 |
| household appliances  | 345   | 405   | 456   | 612   | 299   | 2117  |
| **                    | 32.76 | 36.82 | 42.18 | 43.44 | 29.66 | 37.46 |
| None of these         | 300   | 161   | 107   | 311   | 160   | 1039  |
|                       | 28.49 | 14.64 | 9.90  | 22.07 | 15.87 | 18.39 |
| Total                 | 1053  | 1100  | 1081  | 1409  | 1008  | 5651  |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row shows the independent percentage of total respondents for each item

# Section 7: Digitalisation and second-hand trading

This section describes data considering the contribution of digitalisation towards engagement in CCPs more generally, and extensions to the useful lifespan of products through second-hand trading in particular. Initially reporting on variables addressing digital competency levels, the section then reports on respondents' perceived impact of digitalisation on their rate of consumption across various categories before focusing on digitalisation's role as a potential enabler of reuse activity through the medium of online second-hand trading.

# Material Conditions, Skills and Competences

Respondents were asked to self-assess the quality of their internet access on a 5-point scale ranging from 1= "Excellent" to 5= "No access" (Figure 16). Respondents from Lithuania reported the highest shares across all countries for the "Excellent", "Poor" and "No access" categories which suggests that they experience a larger level of structural inequality in terms of internet access compared to their counterparts from the other four countries.





Figure 16: Respondent rating of quality of internet access by country

While overall, 92% of respondents assess the quality of their internet access as good or better, there are a number of reasons to treat the results with caution as there is a strong possibility of some self-selection bias occurring in terms of the profile of available survey respondents. Additionally, given that the categories are exclusively subjective, responses may be skewed against the backdrop of differential historical development paths and the pace of roll-out of technological improvements in different countries.

| How would you describe the quality of your internet access? | Country |         |             |        |           |        |  |  |
|---|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|--|--|
|   | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |  |  |
|   | Kingdom | -       |             |        |           |        |  |  |
| Excellent   | 351     | 150     | 318         | 233    | 481       | 1533   |  |  |
|   | 33.33   | 13.64   | 29.42       | 16.54  | 47.72     | 27.13  |  |  |
| Very good   | 404     | 440     | 387         | 534    | 201       | 1966   |  |  |
|   | 38.37   | 40.00   | 35.80       | 37.90  | 19.94     | 34.79  |  |  |
| Good  | 237     | 422     | 347         | 490    | 218       | 1714   |  |  |
|   | 22.51   | 38.36   | 32.10       | 34.78  | 21.63     | 30.33  |  |  |
| Poor  | 50      | 84      | 27          | 126    | 85        | 372    |  |  |
|   | 4.75    | 7.64    | 2.50        | 8.94   | 8.43      | 6.58   |  |  |
| No access   | 11      | 4       | 2           | 26     | 23        | 66     |  |  |
|   | 1.04    | 0.36    | 0.19        | 1.85   | 2.28      | 1.17   |  |  |
| Total   | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |  |  |
|   | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |  |  |

Table 29: Respondent rating of internet access by country.

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists *frequencies* and second row lists *column percentages* 



Concerning smart-phone use, just under 92% of respondents reported use of a smartphone to access the internet, with only 95 of the 5,651 respondents reporting non-ownership of a smart phone (Table 30). Noticeably, the number of respondents in the United Kingdom reporting non-ownership of a smart phone was almost twice the overall mean, contrasting with the lowest level of non-ownership reported by respondents from Italy.

Table 30: Smartphone use to access the internet by country

| Do you use a smartphone to access |         |         | Country     | V.     |           |        |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| the internet?                     |         |         |             |        |           |        |
|                                   | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
|                                   | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |        |
| Yes                               | 941     | 1003    | 998         | 1272   | 924       | 5138   |
|                                   | 89.36   | 91.18   | 92.32       | 90.28  | 91.67     | 90.92  |
| No                                | 80      | 72      | 70          | 123    | 73        | 418    |
|                                   | 7.60    | 6.55    | 6.48        | 8.73   | 7.24      | 7.40   |
| I don't have a smartphone         | 32      | 25      | 13          | 14     | 11        | 95     |
| -                                 | 3.04    | 2.27    | 1.20        | 0.99   | 1.09      | 1.68   |
| Total                             | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|                                   | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

Respondents were also tasked to use a 5-point scale (1 = "Very often" to 5 = "Never") to report the frequency with which they asked others for help (Figure 17) and how often they were approached for help when solving digital/IT problems (Figure 18). The intent was to indirectly capture an indication of respondents' digital competency.



Figure 17: Frequency of asking other people for help solving digital/I.T problems.



Overall, respondents reported a slightly higher frequency of being asked for help (Table 31) rather than asking for help (Table 32), which suggests a possible recall and social desirability bias.

| Do people ask for your help when solving digital/IT problems? |         |         | Country     | 7      |           |        |
|---|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
|   | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
|   | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |        |
| Very often  | 117     | 57      | 30          | 151    | 143       | 498    |
| -   | 11.11   | 5.18    | 2.78        | 10.72  | 14.19     | 8.81   |
| Often   | 148     | 155     | 138         | 290    | 194       | 925    |
|   | 14.06   | 14.09   | 12.77       | 20.58  | 19.25     | 16.37  |
| Occasionally  | 308     | 320     | 336         | 493    | 372       | 1829   |
| ·   | 29.25   | 29.09   | 31.08       | 34.99  | 36.90     | 32.37  |
| Seldomly  | 222     | 283     | 278         | 235    | 182       | 1200   |
|   | 21.08   | 25.73   | 25.72       | 16.68  | 18.06     | 21.24  |
| Never   | 258     | 285     | 299         | 240    | 117       | 1199   |
|   | 24.50   | 25.91   | 27.66       | 17.03  | 11.61     | 21.22  |
| Total   | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|   | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

## Table 31: Frequency of being asked for help with I.T problems by country

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages



Figure 18: Frequency of others asking for your help when solving digital/I.T problems



Slightly higher rates of collaboration/exchange were reported by respondents in Italy and Lithuania, with lower levels of exchange reported in the Netherlands and Germany.

| How often do you ask other people<br>for help solving digital/IT problems? |         |         | Country     |        |          |        |
|--|---------|---------|-------------|--------|----------|--------|
|  | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuani | Total  |
|  | Kingdom | -       |             |        | а        |        |
| Very often   | 72      | 39      | 25          | 59     | 67       | 262    |
|  | 6.84    | 3.55    | 2.31        | 4.19   | 6.65     | 4.64   |
| Often  | 144     | 111     | 107         | 206    | 112      | 680    |
|  | 13.68   | 10.09   | 9.90        | 14.62  | 11.11    | 12.03  |
| Occasionally   | 346     | 309     | 368         | 504    | 359      | 1886   |
| ·  | 32.86   | 28.09   | 34.04       | 35.77  | 35.62    | 33.37  |
| Seldomly   | 297     | 378     | 388         | 433    | 327      | 1823   |
|  | 28.21   | 34.36   | 35.89       | 30.73  | 32.44    | 32.26  |
| Never  | 194     | 263     | 193         | 207    | 143      | 1000   |
|  | 18.42   | 23.91   | 17.85       | 14.69  | 14.19    | 17.70  |
| Total  | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008     | 5651   |
|  | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00   | 100.00 |

### Table 32: Frequency of others asking for I.T help by country

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

When both responses are combined (with scoring order recoded and reversed for asking for help from others) and taken as a proxy of digital competency, the distribution of the resultant 5-point scale (1 = high competency, 5 = low competency) is largely normal, with a slight leftward skew (Figure 19).







# Perceived impacts on consumption

Respondents were asked to use a 7-point scale to indicate how digitalisation has impacted their consumption in the areas of travel, energy use, media consumption and the amount of household goods. Across all categories, on average respondents reported marginal increases in levels of consumption.

However, data concerning the impact of digitalisation on the amount of travel was normally distributed, with 28% of respondents feeling that it had increased the amount of travel (1-3) and 28% reporting a decreasing effect (5-7; Table 33). There were slight differences across countries, with 34% and 38% of respondents in Italy and Lithuania respectively reporting that their amount of travel had increased compared to just 19% of respondents from Germany (Figure 20). Conversely, 30% of respondents from Germany reported that digitalisation had decreased the amount of travel they do, compared to just 24% in the Netherlands.

| How do you feel digitalisation has affected the amount you travel? | as Country        |         |             |        |           |        |
|--|-------------------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
|  | United<br>Kingdom | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
| Largely increased (1)  | 70                | 26      | 28          | 108    | 106       | 338    |
|  | 6.65              | 2.36    | 2.59        | 7.67   | 10.52     | 5.98   |
| 2  | 80                | 72      | 56          | 173    | 115       | 496    |
|  | 7.60              | 6.55    | 5.18        | 12.28  | 11.41     | 8.78   |
| 3  | 114               | 113     | 140         | 199    | 158       | 724    |
|  | 10.83             | 10.27   | 12.95       | 14.12  | 15.67     | 12.81  |
| 4  | 519               | 564     | 594         | 501    | 360       | 2538   |
|  | 49.29             | 51.27   | 54.95       | 35.56  | 35.71     | 44.91  |
| 5  | 134               | 139     | 137         | 218    | 143       | 771    |
|  | 12.73             | 12.64   | 12.67       | 15.47  | 14.19     | 13.64  |
| 6  | 63                | 86      | 67          | 118    | 64        | 398    |
|  | 5.98              | 7.82    | 6.20        | 8.37   | 6.35      | 7.04   |
| Largely decreased (7)  | 73                | 100     | 59          | 92     | 62        | 386    |
|  | 6.93              | 9.09    | 5.46        | 6.53   | 6.15      | 6.83   |
| Total  | 1053              | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|  | 100.00            | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

#### Table 33: Perceived impact of digitalisation on amount of travel by country

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages



Figure 20: Perceived impact of digitalisation on the amount of travel

Respondents were then asked to assess the impact of digitalisation on their energy consumption. Overall, 39% of respondents felt that digitalisation had increased their energy consumption (1-3) while 21% felt that it had decreased their energy use (5-7) (Table 34).

| How do you feel digitalisation has  |         |         | Country     | ,      |           |       |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|
| affected the amount your energy use |         |         | Country     |        |           |       |
| affected the amount your energy use |         |         |             |        |           |       |
| at nome:                            |         |         |             |        |           |       |
|                                     | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |
|                                     | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |       |
| Largely increased (1)               | 91      | 43      | 44          | 136    | 126       | 440   |
|                                     | 8.64    | 3.91    | 4.07        | 9.65   | 12.50     | 7.79  |
| 2                                   | 121     | 104     | 94          | 198    | 113       | 630   |
|                                     | 11.49   | 9.45    | 8.70        | 14.05  | 11.21     | 11.15 |
| 3                                   | 209     | 247     | 189         | 283    | 201       | 1129  |
|                                     | 19.85   | 22.45   | 17.48       | 20.09  | 19.94     | 19.98 |
| 4                                   | 425     | 507     | 512         | 469    | 337       | 2250  |
|                                     | 40.36   | 46.09   | 47.36       | 33.29  | 33.43     | 39.82 |
| 5                                   | 133     | 108     | 136         | 175    | 123       | 675   |
|                                     | 12.63   | 9.82    | 12.58       | 12.42  | 12.20     | 11.94 |
| 6                                   | 42      | 53      | 60          | 104    | 73        | 332   |
|                                     | 3.99    | 4.82    | 5.55        | 7.38   | 7.24      | 5.88  |
| Largely decreased (7)               | 32      | 38      | 46          | 44     | 35        | 195   |

# Table 34: Perceived impact of digitalisation on energy consumption by country



|       | 3.04   | 3.45   | 4.26   | 3.12   | 3.47   | 3.45   |
|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Total | 1053   | 1100   | 1081   | 1409   | 1008   | 5651   |
|       | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

In terms of differences reported across countries, just 30% of respondents from the Netherlands felt that digitalisation had increased their energy consumption, compared to 44% of respondents from Italy (Figure 21). There was less variation between countries in terms of respondents who reported that digitalisation had largely decreased their energy consumption, with 23% of Lithuanian respondents reporting a decrease compared to just 18% of respondents from Germany.



Figure 21: Perceived impact of digitalisation on energy consumption

With regards to media consumption, the majority of respondents (50%) reported an increase, defined as 'what you read, watch or listen to'. In contrast, only 18% felt that digitalisation had decreased their media use.



| How do you feel digitalisation has | Country |         |             |        |           |        |
|------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| affected your media consumption?   |         |         |             |        |           |        |
| · · · · · ·                        | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
|                                    | Kingdom | -       |             |        |           |        |
| Largely increased (1)              | 185     | 112     | 100         | 176    | 183       | 756    |
|                                    | 17.57   | 10.18   | 9.25        | 12.49  | 18.15     | 13.38  |
| 2                                  | 194     | 210     | 183         | 240    | 124       | 951    |
|                                    | 18.42   | 19.09   | 16.93       | 17.03  | 12.30     | 16.83  |
| 3                                  | 199     | 253     | 249         | 244    | 174       | 1119   |
|                                    | 18.90   | 23.00   | 23.03       | 17.32  | 17.26     | 19.80  |
| 4                                  | 323     | 392     | 386         | 417    | 291       | 1809   |
|                                    | 30.67   | 35.64   | 35.71       | 29.60  | 28.87     | 32.01  |
| 5                                  | 88      | 72      | 97          | 190    | 114       | 561    |
|                                    | 8.36    | 6.55    | 8.97        | 13.48  | 11.31     | 9.93   |
| 6                                  | 37      | 29      | 36          | 97     | 63        | 262    |
|                                    | 3.51    | 2.64    | 3.33        | 6.88   | 6.25      | 4.64   |
| Largely decreased (7)              | 27      | 32      | 30          | 45     | 59        | 193    |
|                                    | 2.56    | 2.91    | 2.78        | 3.19   | 5.85      | 3.42   |
| Total                              | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|                                    | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

# Table 35: Perceived impact of digitalisation on media consumption by country

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages



Figure 22: Perceived impact of digitalisation on media consumption

The distribution profile was largely similar across countries. However, there were noticeably more respondents in Italy (24%) and Lithuania (23%) who stated that they felt digitalisation had decreased their



media consumption (5-7), compared to the number of respondents in Germany (12%), the United Kingdom (14%) and the Netherlands (15%) who felt that way (Figure 22).

Finally, in terms of the perceived impact on the consumption of household goods, 35% of respondents felt that digitalisation had increased their consumption of household goods (1-3) while 21% felt that their consumption had decreased (5-7) (Table 36).

| How has digitalisation affected the amount of household goods/services |         |         | Countr      | У      |           |        |
|--|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
|  | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
|  | Kingdom | ,       |             | 5      |           |        |
| Largely increased (1)  | 93      | 38      | 32          | 115    | 137       | 415    |
|  | 8.83    | 3.45    | 2.96        | 8.16   | 13.59     | 7.34   |
| 2  | 106     | 82      | 74          | 170    | 121       | 553    |
|  | 10.07   | 7.45    | 6.85        | 12.07  | 12.00     | 9.79   |
| 3  | 172     | 184     | 169         | 279    | 178       | 982    |
|  | 16.33   | 16.73   | 15.63       | 19.80  | 17.66     | 17.38  |
| 4  | 493     | 576     | 583         | 511    | 344       | 2507   |
|  | 46.82   | 52.36   | 53.93       | 36.27  | 34.13     | 44.36  |
| 5  | 113     | 114     | 122         | 190    | 123       | 662    |
|  | 10.73   | 10.36   | 11.29       | 13.48  | 12.20     | 11.71  |
| 6  | 41      | 63      | 58          | 97     | 62        | 321    |
|  | 3.89    | 5.73    | 5.37        | 6.88   | 6.15      | 5.68   |
| Largely decreased (7)  | 35      | 43      | 43          | 47     | 43        | 211    |
|  | 3.32    | 3.91    | 3.98        | 3.34   | 4.27      | 3.73   |
| Total  | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|  | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

| Table 36: Perceived | impact of c | digitalisation of | n consumption of | household g | oods by | country |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------|---------|---------|
|                     | 1           | 0                 | 1                |             | J       |         |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists *frequencies* and second row lists *column percentages* 

While the distribution was similar across countries for those who felt that digitalisation had decreased their consumption, differences between respondents who felt consumption had increased were more pronounced. A considerably larger share of respondents in Italy (40%) and Lithuania (43%) reported increases in the consumption of household goods compared to Germany (28%) and the Netherlands (25%) (Figure 23).





Figure 23: Perceived impact of digitalisation on the amount of household goods/services purchased

# Contribution to second-hand trading

Engagement in second-hand trading can extend the useful lifespan of products and has the potential to contribute to a more circular economy by slowing the rate of extraction of raw materials and reducing associated resource consumption. Respondents in the survey were initially asked about their engagement in second-hand trading before being asked about the role of digitalisation in facilitating the re-circulation of goods by buying, selling, or the non-market acquisition and disposal of second-hand items by collecting free items or the registering online of items they wish to simply give away. Initially, participants were asked if they preferred to buy second-hand rather than new. Here, 27% of respondents (somewhat) agreed compared to 46% who rather disagreed. Figure 24 shows that the distribution was right-skewed with a greater number of respondents strongly disagreeing with the statement than those who strongly agreed.







The distribution of preference for buying second-hand was largely similar across countries (Figure 25), with marginally lower levels of preference (values 1-3) reported by respondents in Italy (23%) compared to Germany (26%), the Netherlands (27%), the United Kingdom (29%) and Lithuania (30%) (Table 37).

| I prefer to buy second-hand rather |         |         | Country     |        |           |        |
|------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| than new.                          |         |         |             |        |           |        |
|                                    | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy  | Lithuania | Total  |
|                                    | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |        |
| Agree strongly (1)                 | 94      | 64      | 72          | 73     | 108       | 411    |
|                                    | 8.93    | 5.82    | 6.66        | 5.18   | 10.71     | 7.27   |
| 2                                  | 103     | 81      | 87          | 102    | 69        | 442    |
|                                    | 9.78    | 7.36    | 8.05        | 7.24   | 6.85      | 7.82   |
| 3                                  | 110     | 137     | 133         | 148    | 122       | 650    |
|                                    | 10.45   | 12.45   | 12.30       | 10.50  | 12.10     | 11.50  |
| 4                                  | 292     | 282     | 303         | 369    | 296       | 1542   |
|                                    | 27.73   | 25.64   | 28.03       | 26.19  | 29.37     | 27.29  |
| 5                                  | 121     | 141     | 137         | 246    | 117       | 762    |
|                                    | 11.49   | 12.82   | 12.67       | 17.46  | 11.61     | 13.48  |
| 6                                  | 128     | 141     | 161         | 211    | 118       | 759    |
|                                    | 12.16   | 12.82   | 14.89       | 14.98  | 11.71     | 13.43  |
| Strongly disagree (7)              | 205     | 254     | 188         | 260    | 178       | 1085   |
|                                    | 19.47   | 23.09   | 17.39       | 18.45  | 17.66     | 19.20  |
| Total                              | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|                                    | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

| Table 37: Level of | agreement with | preference to | r buying | second-hand b | v country. |
|--------------------|----------------|---------------|----------|---------------|------------|

\*see survey note on Italian survey data







In terms of stated second-hand purchase activity, 76% of respondents reported acquiring second-hand goods online at least at some point with 24% stated that they had never acquired any second-hand goods online. However, only 16% of respondents described themselves as acquiring second-hand goods online "Very often" (4%) or "Often" (12%) with the largest group of respondents stating that they acquired second-hand goods online "Occasionally" (32%) (Table 38).

| Table 38: Rates of online second-hand good acquisition | by | country |
|--|----|---------|
|--|----|---------|

| How often<br>buy/collect/acquire | do you<br>second-hand |         | Country |             |        |           |        |  |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|--|
| goods found online?              |                       |         |         |             |        |           |        |  |
|                                  |                       | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |  |
|                                  |                       | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |        |  |
| Very often                       |                       | 72      | 34      | 30          | 48     | 70        | 254    |  |
| ·                                |                       | 6.84    | 3.09    | 2.78        | 3.41   | 6.94      | 4.49   |  |
| Often                            |                       | 143     | 137     | 112         | 161    | 123       | 676    |  |
|                                  |                       | 13.58   | 12.45   | 10.36       | 11.43  | 12.20     | 11.96  |  |
| Occasionally                     |                       | 314     | 327     | 401         | 416    | 358       | 1816   |  |
| ·                                |                       | 29.82   | 29.73   | 37.10       | 29.52  | 35.52     | 32.14  |  |
| Seldomly                         |                       | 272     | 307     | 301         | 397    | 282       | 1559   |  |
| ·                                |                       | 25.83   | 27.91   | 27.84       | 28.18  | 27.98     | 27.59  |  |
| Never                            |                       | 252     | 295     | 237         | 387    | 175       | 1346   |  |
|                                  |                       | 23.93   | 26.82   | 21.92       | 27.47  | 17.36     | 23.82  |  |
| Total                            |                       | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |  |
|                                  |                       | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |  |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages



While respondent distribution was largely similar across countries, 20% and 19% of respondents from the United Kingdom and Lithuania respectively reported that they bought second-hand goods online "very often" or "often" in contrast to 13% of respondents from the Netherlands.



Figure 26: Respondent stated frequency of acquisition of second-hand goods online by country.

Respondents were then asked to indicate how often they sold or gave away items online. Slightly higher rate of disposal versus acquisition were reported with 81% of respondents indicating that they had disposed of second-hand items online at some point with 26% of respondents reporting their frequency as "Very often" or "Often" (Table 39).

| Table 39: Rates of online | second-hand g | good disposal | by country |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------|
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------|

| How often do you sell/give away<br>unwanted items/items you no longer<br>need online? |         |         |             |        |           |       |
|---|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|
|   | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |
|   | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |       |
| Very often  | 118     | 67      | 60          | 86     | 97        | 428   |
|   | 11.21   | 6.09    | 5.55        | 6.10   | 9.62      | 7.57  |
| Often   | 223     | 194     | 234         | 258    | 155       | 1064  |
|   | 21.18   | 17.64   | 21.65       | 18.31  | 15.38     | 18.83 |
| Occasionally  | 329     | 404     | 422         | 447    | 344       | 1946  |
|   | 31.24   | 36.73   | 39.04       | 31.72  | 34.13     | 34.44 |
| Seldomly  | 184     | 235     | 190         | 293    | 254       | 1156  |
|   | 17.47   | 21.36   | 17.58       | 20.79  | 25.20     | 20.46 |
| Never   | 199     | 200     | 175         | 325    | 158       | 1057  |



|       | 18.90  | 18.18  | 16.19  | 23.07  | 15.67  | 18.70  |
|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Total | 1053   | 1100   | 1081   | 1409   | 1008   | 5651   |
|       | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

Again, respondent distribution was largely similar across countries, however 32% of respondents from the United Kingdom reported that they sold second-hand goods online "Very often" (11%) or "Often" (21%) compare to 24% of respondents from Germany (Figure 27).



Figure 27: Respondent stated frequency of disposal of second-hand goods online by country.

While 18% of respondents had reported that they never disposed of second-hand goods online, the remaining respondents were asked if offering goods online allowed them to "sell/give away things more easily than other methods e.g. flea markets, car boot sales etc.". Overall, 74% of the remaining respondents reported that offering goods online made it easier to sell/give away goods compared to 26% who answered "No" with a similar split reported across all countries (Table 40).

| Does offering goods online allow you sell/give more easily than other methods? |                   | Country      |              |              |              |               |  |
|--|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--|
|  | United<br>Kingdom | Germany      | Netherlands  | Italy*       | Lithuania    | Total         |  |
| Yes  | 598<br>70.02      | 666<br>74.00 | 701<br>77.37 | 757<br>69.83 | 672<br>79.06 | 3394<br>73.88 |  |

#### Table 40: Perceived impact of online offering on ease of good disposal by country



| No    | 256    | 234    | 205    | 327    | 178    | 1200   |
|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|       | 29.98  | 26.00  | 22.63  | 30.17  | 20.94  | 26.12  |
| Total | 854    | 900    | 906    | 840    | 850    | 4350   |
|       | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

Notably, respondents from the United Kingdom reported the lowest level of agreement (70%) with the statement of being more easily able to dispose of goods online, having previously indicated higher levels of activity in both the acquiring and disposing of goods. Respondents from Lithuania reported the highest level of agreement at (79%) (Figure 28).



Does offering goods online allow you sell/give more easily than other methods?

#### Figure 28: Share of respondent agreement with being able to dispose of goods more easily online.

Finally, respondents were asked how often they bought items that they ultimately don't use or need. Just 11% of respondents reported that this happened "Very often" or "Often" with 30% reporting that it occurred occasionally and 42% reporting that this seldomly occurred (Table 41).

| How often do you buy things you ultimately don't need/use? |                   | Country |             |        |           |       |  |
|--|-------------------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
|  | United<br>Kingdom | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |  |
| Very often   | 48                | 20      | 17          | 18     | 46        | 149   |  |

#### Table 41: Frequency of buying unwanted items by country



|              | 4.56   | 1.82   | 1.57   | 1.28   | 4.56   | 2.64   |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Often        | 109    | 73     | 67     | 150    | 82     | 481    |
|              | 10.35  | 6.64   | 6.20   | 10.65  | 8.13   | 8.51   |
| Occasionally | 287    | 287    | 404    | 426    | 304    | 1708   |
| -            | 27.26  | 26.09  | 37.37  | 30.23  | 30.16  | 30.22  |
| Seldomly     | 419    | 554    | 448    | 526    | 400    | 2347   |
|              | 39.79  | 50.36  | 41.44  | 37.33  | 39.68  | 41.53  |
| Never        | 190    | 166    | 145    | 289    | 176    | 966    |
|              | 18.04  | 15.09  | 13.41  | 20.51  | 17.46  | 17.09  |
| Total        | 1053   | 1100   | 1081   | 1409   | 1008   | 5651   |
|              | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

The remaining respondents who stated that this occurred seldomly or more often were then asked as to whether this happened less often if they bought items online, with 28% and 31% answering "Yes" and "No" respectively and 41% reporting no difference (Table 42).

Table 42: Respondents agreeing with the statement that buying items they ultimately don't need happens less often when they buy something online.

| Does this happen less often when you buy something online? | Country           |         |             |        |           |        |  |
|--|-------------------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|--|
|  | United<br>Kingdom | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |  |
| Yes  | 222               | 219     | 202         | 335    | 342       | 1320   |  |
|  | 25.72             | 23.45   | 21.58       | 29.91  | 41.11     | 28.18  |  |
| No   | 256               | 364     | 337         | 281    | 220       | 1458   |  |
|  | 29.66             | 38.97   | 36.00       | 25.09  | 26.44     | 31.12  |  |
| The same   | 385               | 351     | 397         | 504    | 270       | 1907   |  |
|  | 44.61             | 37.58   | 42.41       | 45.00  | 32.45     | 40.70  |  |
| Total  | 863               | 934     | 936         | 1120   | 832       | 4685   |  |
|  | 100.00            | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |  |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

# **Section 8: Circular Citizenship**

Even when individuals are motivated to adopt CCPs, they may encounter contextual barriers that limit their ability to do so. Rather than passively waiting for systemic changes, individuals may actively try to contribute to such changes by encouraging other actors to take steps that enhance the feasibility and appeal of circular consumption. This form of engagement is referred to as *circular citizenship*. This final section presents a summary of descriptive findings from survey responses related to circular citizenship. The aim is to assess the extent to which individuals engage in actions that seek to influence systemic factors, rather than solely modifying their own consumption behaviour.

Respondents were asked about their opinions about engaging in actions to influence distinct groups (i.e., governments, businesses, and people around them) to protect the environment by reducing the use of resources. Respondents were informed that efforts to protect the environment would include using fewer



new resources and materials, using existing products for longer, reusing materials and recycling, i.e., actions which on the balance of likelihood lend themselves towards greater levels of circularity.

With regard to actions to pressure government to protect the environment, reported action frequencies were low with 30% stating that they never engaged in such action and over 55% of respondents reporting rating the frequency of their action at a value of 5-7 on a 7-point Likert scale of "Frequently (1)" to "Never (7)" (Table 43).

| Actions to pressure the gov e.g.    |         |         | Country     | 7      |           |        |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| protesting or signing petitions etc |         |         |             |        |           |        |
|                                     | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |
|                                     | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |        |
| Frequently (1)                      | 80      | 36      | 17          | 57     | 68        | 258    |
|                                     | 7.60    | 3.27    | 1.57        | 4.05   | 6.75      | 4.57   |
| 2                                   | 82      | 78      | 37          | 94     | 65        | 356    |
|                                     | 7.79    | 7.09    | 3.42        | 6.67   | 6.45      | 6.30   |
| 3                                   | 129     | 146     | 73          | 166    | 136       | 650    |
|                                     | 12.25   | 13.27   | 6.75        | 11.78  | 13.49     | 11.50  |
| 4                                   | 204     | 216     | 227         | 311    | 287       | 1245   |
|                                     | 19.37   | 19.64   | 21.00       | 22.07  | 28.47     | 22.03  |
| 5                                   | 131     | 91      | 100         | 215    | 151       | 688    |
|                                     | 12.44   | 8.27    | 9.25        | 15.26  | 14.98     | 12.17  |
| 6                                   | 127     | 134     | 160         | 235    | 114       | 770    |
|                                     | 12.06   | 12.18   | 14.80       | 16.68  | 11.31     | 13.63  |
| Never (7)                           | 300     | 399     | 467         | 331    | 187       | 1684   |
| · ·                                 | 28.49   | 36.27   | 43.20       | 23.49  | 18.55     | 29.80  |
| Total                               | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |
|                                     | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |

## Table 43: Respondent frequency of actions to pressure the government by country

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

Respondents from the United Kingdom and Lithuania reported engaging in actions to pressure the government more frequently with 28% and 27% reporting frequency values of 1-3 while 24% and 23% of respondents reported similarly in Germany and Italy. This was in notable contrast to the 12% of respondents in the Netherlands who reported frequency values between 1-3 while 43% of respondents reported that they had never engaged in such actions.





Figure 29: Distribution of frequency of respondent actions to pressure the government by country

A similar pattern was observed when respondents recalled the frequency of their actions to influence businesses to protect the environment. Across all countries, 31% of respondents reported that they never engaged in such actions with 56% reporting a frequency value of between 5 and 7 (Table 44).

| Actions to influence businesses- e.g. investing in sustainable businesses | Country |         |             |        |           |        |  |
|---|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|--|
| 0   | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total  |  |
|   | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |        |  |
| Frequently (1)  | 74      | 22      | 18          | 52     | 71        | 237    |  |
|   | 7.03    | 2.00    | 1.67        | 3.69   | 7.04      | 4.19   |  |
| 2   | 71      | 72      | 32          | 73     | 81        | 329    |  |
|   | 6.74    | 6.55    | 2.96        | 5.18   | 8.04      | 5.82   |  |
| 3   | 117     | 138     | 75          | 178    | 142       | 650    |  |
|   | 11.11   | 12.55   | 6.94        | 12.63  | 14.09     | 11.50  |  |
| 4   | 213     | 215     | 237         | 332    | 302       | 1299   |  |
|   | 20.23   | 19.55   | 21.92       | 23.56  | 29.96     | 22.99  |  |
| 5   | 116     | 100     | 118         | 212    | 133       | 679    |  |
|   | 11.02   | 9.09    | 10.92       | 15.05  | 13.19     | 12.02  |  |
| 6   | 128     | 131     | 154         | 210    | 106       | 729    |  |
|   | 12.16   | 11.91   | 14.25       | 14.90  | 10.52     | 12.90  |  |
| Never (7)   | 334     | 422     | 447         | 352    | 173       | 1728   |  |
|   | 31.72   | 38.36   | 41.35       | 24.98  | 17.16     | 30.58  |  |
| Total   | 1053    | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651   |  |
|   | 100.00  | 100.00  | 100.00      | 100.00 | 100.00    | 100.00 |  |

| Table 44: | Respondent | frequency | of actions to | influence | businesses b | y country |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
|           |            |           |               |           |              | J J       |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages



A total of 29% of respondents from Lithuania reported frequency values of 1-3 in terms of actions to pressure businesses to protect the environment while slightly lower numbers of respondents in the United Kingdom (25%), Italy (22%) and Germany (21%) reported similarly. Again, this was in notable contrast to the 12% of respondents in the Netherlands who reported frequency values of 1-3 while 41% of respondents from the Netherlands reported that they had never engaged in such actions (Figure 30).



Figure 30: Distribution of respondent frequency of actions to pressure businesses by country

Finally, respondents were asked about the frequency of their actions to influence the people around them (e.g. family and friends) to protect the environment. Notably, a greater number of respondents reported engaging in such actions at least once, with only 22% of respondents stating that they had never engaged in such action.

| Table 45: Res | pondent free | uency of action | ns to influence pe | ople around them b | v country |
|---------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|
|               |              |                 | no vo minaemee pe  |                    | ,         |

| Actions to influence people around<br>you- e.g. inform friends and family |         |         | Country     |        |           |       |
|---|---------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|
|   | United  | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |
|   | Kingdom |         |             |        |           |       |
| Frequently (1)  | 85      | 26      | 14          | 74     | 91        | 290   |
|   | 8.07    | 2.36    | 1.30        | 5.25   | 9.03      | 5.13  |
| 2   | 102     | 83      | 44          | 147    | 88        | 464   |
|   | 9.69    | 7.55    | 4.07        | 10.43  | 8.73      | 8.21  |
| 3   | 158     | 166     | 101         | 258    | 153       | 836   |
|   | 15.00   | 15.09   | 9.34        | 18.31  | 15.18     | 14.79 |
| 4   | 236     | 234     | 258         | 364    | 315       | 1407  |
|   | 22.41   | 21.27   | 23.87       | 25.83  | 31.25     | 24.90 |
| 5   | 130     | 126     | 118         | 212    | 158       | 744   |



|           | 12.35  | 11.45  | 10.92  | 15.05  | 15.67  | 13.17  |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 6         | 120    | 126    | 178    | 153    | 104    | 681    |
|           | 11.40  | 11.45  | 16.47  | 10.86  | 10.32  | 12.05  |
| Never (7) | 222    | 339    | 368    | 201    | 99     | 1229   |
|           | 21.08  | 30.82  | 34.04  | 14.27  | 9.82   | 21.75  |
| Total     | 1053   | 1100   | 1081   | 1409   | 1008   | 5651   |
|           | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

Note: First row lists frequencies and second row lists column percentages

A total of 34% of respondents from Italy reported frequency values of 1-3 in terms of actions to encourage people around them to protect the environment, followed by 33% of respondents from both the United Kingdom and Lithuania and 25% of respondents from Germany. Again, participants from the Netherlands differed substantially, with just 15% of respondents choosing values of 1-3 and 34% reporting that they had never engaged in such actions (Figure 31).





Across the three target groups for circular citizenship behaviours (governments, businesses, and people around them), respondents from the Netherlands consistently reported the lowest average levels of engagement while conversely, participants from Lithuania reported the highest average frequency of engagement (Table 46).



|   |                   |         | Country     |        |           |       |
|---|-------------------|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|
| Mean frequency of engagement<br>on scale of "Frequently (1)" to<br>"Never (7)" of | United<br>Kingdom | Germany | Netherlands | Italy* | Lithuania | Total |
| Actions to pressure the gov<br>e.g. protesting or signing<br>petitions etc        | 4.71              | 5.04    | 5.50        | 4.82   | 4.47      | 4.91  |
| Actions to influence businesses-<br>e.g. investing in sustainable<br>businesses   | 4.85              | 5.16    | 5.46        | 4.86   | 4.34      | 4.94  |
| Actions to influence people<br>around you- e.g. inform friends<br>and family      | 4.40              | 4.89    | 5.25        | 4.25   | 4.06      | 4.56  |
| Total mean  | 4.65              | 5.03    | 5.40        | 4.54   | 4.29      | 4.79  |
| Total N   | 1053              | 1100    | 1081        | 1409   | 1008      | 5651  |

#### Table 46: Mean frequency of engagement buy country.

\*see survey note on Italian survey data

# **Concluding Summary**

The *Circular Consumption Survey* collected detailed information on respondents' engagement in several potentially high-impact CCPS across the United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, and Lithuania. While it is encouraging to see a considerable number of respondents engaging in such practices, there is also clear evidence to suggest that the majority of respondents either do not engage or engage infrequently and/or at a very low level. Low levels of engagement could, and perhaps should, be viewed as an opportunity as there is clear room for expansion in terms of both frequency and wider dispersion of CCPs such as carlessness, commoning, borrowing, lending, repairing and extending the useful life of products by engaging in second-hand markets. However, practices shape and reflect localized structural and material conditions, existing skill sets, norms, expectations, and values of those who engage, which poses a number of challenges concerning effective measures to boost their uptake.

Further analysis will focus on identifying specific cohorts of both engagers and non-engagers using socioeconomic and demographic data to better understand the factors that shape participation in CCPs. This will include examining the influence of personal values, social norms, and other potential explanatory variables that may drive or inhibit engagement. Outputs from the survey will be combined with consumption biographies from the United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands, and Italy to provide more detailed insights into the relative importance of various aspects of individual and collective (non-)engagement, including clearly identifiable enablers and barriers. These findings will contribute to the identification of high-potential groups and the development of targeted strategies to enhance participation in CCPs.



# **Appendix A: Representativeness quotas**

The following tables represent the representativeness quota targets for *Circular Consumption Survey*. It should be noted that in terms of region, while regional information was gathered in the Netherlands, Italy, & Lithuania at NUTS2 level, the representativeness quotas for all countries were set at NUTS1 level.

| Education/Training |    |                                |  |
|--------------------|----|--------------------------------|--|
| ISCED-Level        | %  |                                |  |
|                    | 19 | Primary education              |  |
| Level 0-2          | 17 | Lower secondary education      |  |
|                    |    | Upper secondary education      |  |
|                    | 40 | Post-secondary non-tertiary    |  |
| Level 3-4          |    | education                      |  |
|                    |    | Short-cycle tertiary education |  |
|                    | 41 | Bachelor's or equivalent level |  |
| Level 5-8          |    | Master's or equivalent level   |  |
|                    |    | Doctoral or equivalent level   |  |

# UNITED KINGDOM

| Age Group | %  |
|-----------|----|
| 16 - 29   | 23 |
| 30 - 39   | 16 |
| 40 - 49   | 16 |
| 50 - 59   | 16 |
| 60 - 69   | 13 |
| 70+       | 16 |

| Region                   |    |
|--------------------------|----|
| ITL1                     | %  |
| South East               | 14 |
| London                   | 13 |
| North West               | 11 |
| East England             | 9  |
| West Midlands            | 9  |
| South West               | 9  |
| Yorkshire and the Humber | 8  |
| Scotland                 | 8  |
| East Midlands            | 7  |
| Wales                    | 5  |
| North East               | 4  |
| Northern Ireland         | 3  |

| Gender | %  |
|--------|----|
| Male   | 49 |
| Female | 51 |



Office for National Statistics (ons.gov.uk) Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (nisra.gov.uk) Scotland's Census (scotlandscensus.gov.uk) Eurostat (europa.eu/eurostat)

International Territorial Levels (ITLs) have been established by the United Kingdom as a mirror to the previous Eurostat NUTS system

#### GERMANY

| Education/Training                        |    |  |
|---|----|--|
| ISCED-Level                               | %  | Description  |
|   |    | (Noch) kein allgemeiner Schulabschluss   |
| Level 0-2 23 Haupt- / Volksschulabschluss |    | Haupt- / Volksschulabschluss   |
|   | 25 | Realschul- oder gleichwertiger Abschluss (Mittel-, Handelsschule, polytechnische Oberschule) |
| L 124 40                                  |    | Fachhochschulreife (Fachabitur)  |
| Level J-4                                 | 40 | Allgemeine Hochschulreife (Abitur)   |
|   |    | Bachelorabschluss oder gleichwertiges Niveau   |
| Level 5-8                                 | 29 | Masterabschluss oder gleichwertiges Niveau   |
|   |    | Doktortitel oder gleichwertiger Abschluss  |

| Age Group | %  |
|-----------|----|
| 16 - 29   | 16 |
| 30 - 39   | 16 |
| 40 - 49   | 15 |
| 50 - 59   | 19 |
| 60 - 69   | 16 |
| 70+       | 18 |

| Region (NUTS1)      | %  |
|---------------------|----|
| Baden-Württemberg   | 13 |
| Bayern              | 16 |
| Berlin              | 5  |
| Brandenburg         | 3  |
| Bremen              | 1  |
| Hamburg             | 2  |
| Hessen              | 8  |
| Mecklenburg-        |    |
| Vorpommern          | 2  |
| Niedersachsen       | 10 |
| Nordrhein-Westfalen | 22 |
| Rheinland-Pfalz     | 5  |



| Saarland           | 1 |
|--------------------|---|
| Sachsen            | 5 |
| Sachsen-Anhalt     | 3 |
| Schleswig-Holstein | 4 |
| Thüringen          | 3 |

| Gender | %  |
|--------|----|
| Male   | 49 |
| Female | 51 |

Statistisches Bundesamt (destatis.de)

Eurostat (europa.eu/eurostat)

## **NETHERLANDS**

| Education/Training |    |  |
|--------------------|----|--|
| ISCED-Level        | %  |  |
| Level 0-2          | 24 | Basisonderwijs<br>VMBO, onderbouw HAVO/<br>VWO |
| Level 3-4          | 38 | Bovenbouw HAVO/ VWO<br>MBO                     |
| Level 5-8          | 38 | HBO<br>WO<br>Doctoraal of gelijkwaardig niveau |

| Age Group | %  |
|-----------|----|
| 16 - 29   | 22 |
| 30 - 39   | 15 |
| 40 - 49   | 14 |
| 50 - 59   | 17 |
| 60 - 69   | 15 |
| 70+       | 17 |

| Region (NUTS1) | %  |               |  |
|----------------|----|---------------|--|
| North          | 10 | Drenthe       |  |
|                |    | Friesland     |  |
|                |    | Groningen     |  |
| East           | 21 | Flevoland     |  |
|                |    | Gelderland    |  |
|                |    | Overijssel    |  |
| West           | 21 | North Holland |  |
|                |    | South Holland |  |
|                |    | Utrecht       |  |



|       |    | Zeeland       |
|-------|----|---------------|
| South | 48 | Limburg       |
|       |    | North Brabant |

| Gender | %    |
|--------|------|
| Male   | 49.7 |
| Female | 50.3 |

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (cbs.nl) Eurostat (europa.eu/eurostat)

# ITALY

| Education/Training |      |   |
|--------------------|------|---|
| ISCED-Level        | %    |   |
| Lovel 0.2          | 367  | Scuola primaria                           |
|                    | 50.7 | Scuola secondaria di primo grado          |
| I                  | 441  | Scuola secondaria di secondo grado        |
| Level 5-4          | 44.1 | Istruzione post secondaria non terziaria  |
|                    |      | Laurea triennale o titolo equivalente     |
| Lowel 5.9          | 10.2 | Laurea magistrale o titolo equivalente    |
| Level J-0          | 19.2 |   |
|                    |      | Dottorato di ricerca o titolo equivalente |

| Age Group | %  |
|-----------|----|
| 16 - 29   | 17 |
| 30 - 39   | 13 |
| 40 - 49   | 16 |
| 50 - 59   | 19 |
| 60 - 69   | 15 |
| 70+       | 20 |

| Region (NUTS1 | %  |                       |  |
|---------------|----|-----------------------|--|
| North-West    | 28 | Valle d'Aosta         |  |
|               |    | Liguria               |  |
|               |    | Piemonte              |  |
|               |    | Lombardia             |  |
| North-East    | 20 | Trentino-Alto Adige   |  |
|               |    | Veneto                |  |
|               |    | Friuli Venezia-Giulia |  |
|               |    | Emilia-Romagna        |  |
| Centre        | 21 | Toscana               |  |
|               |    | Umbria                |  |
|               |    | Marche                |  |



|         |    | Lazio      |
|---------|----|------------|
| South   | 20 | Abruzzo    |
|         |    | Molise     |
|         |    | Campania   |
|         |    | Puglia     |
|         |    | Basilicata |
|         |    | Calabria   |
| Islands | 11 | Sicilia    |
|         |    | Sardengna  |

| Gender | %  |
|--------|----|
| Male   | 49 |
| Female | 51 |

Istituto Nazionale di Statistica (istat.it) Eurostat (europa.eu/eurostat)

# LITHUANIA

| Education/Training |    |   |
|--------------------|----|---|
| ISCED-Level        | %  |   |
| Level 0.2          | 12 | Pradinis ir žemesnis  |
|                    |    | Pagrindinis (nebaigtas vidurinis)   |
|                    | 48 | Vidurinis   |
| Level 3-4          |    | Profesinis (profesinė mokykla, vidurinis su profesine kvalifikacija)  |
| Level 5-8          | 41 | Aukštesnysis (technikumas,<br>aukštesnioji mokykla) arba<br>neuniversitetinis aukštasis<br>(kolegija)                             |
|                    |    | Universitetinis aukštasis –<br>bakalauro laipsnis   |
|                    |    | Universitetinis aukštasis –<br>magistro laipsnis ar jam<br>prilygstanti profesinė kvalifikacija<br>Doktorantūros arba lygiavertis |
|                    |    | lygis   |

| Age Group | %  |
|-----------|----|
| 16 - 29   | 19 |
| 30 - 39   | 16 |
| 40 - 49   | 15 |
| 50 - 59   | 17 |
| 60 - 69   | 16 |
| 70+       | 17 |



| Region (NUTS1)                | %  |             |
|-------------------------------|----|-------------|
| Capital region                | 29 | Vilnius     |
| Central and Western Lithuania | 71 | Alytus      |
|                               |    | Kaunas      |
|                               |    | Klaipėda    |
|                               |    | Marijampolė |
|                               |    | Panevėžys   |
|                               |    | Šiauliai    |
|                               |    | Tauragė     |
|                               |    | Telšiai     |
|                               |    | Utena       |

| Gender | %  |
|--------|----|
| Male   | 46 |
| Female | 54 |

Oficialiosios statistikos portalas (osp.stat.gov.lt) Eurostat (europa.eu/eurostat)

# Appendix B: Variable names and summary labels

| Variable  | Variable Label  |
|-----------|---|
| Number    | Number  |
| time      | Survey completion time  |
| country   | Country   |
| gender    | Please state your gender.   |
| birthyear | In which year were you born?  |
| dwelling  | Which dwelling type do you live in?   |
| region_UK | Which region do you live in?  |
| region_DE | In welchem Bundesland leben Sie?  |
| region_NL | In welke regio woon je?   |
| region_IT | In quale regione vive?  |
| region_LT | Kuriame regione gyvenate?   |
| educ_UK   | What is your highest level of education?                                      |
| educ_DE   | Welchen höchsten Bildungsabschluss haben Sie?                                 |
| educ_NL   | Wat is je hoogste opleidingsniveau?   |
| educ_IT   | Qual è il suo livello di istruzione più alto?                                 |
| educ_LT   | Koks j?s? aukš?iausias išsilavinimas?   |
| hhincome  | Monthly estimated household income. (after tax and including social benefits) |
| partner   | Do you live with a partner?   |
| hhsize    | Household Size  |
| num child | Number of Children  |



| numchild_0_4    | Number of Children 0-4   |
|-----------------|--|
| numchild_5_9    | Number of Children 5-9   |
| numchild_10_17  | Number of Children 10-17   |
| numchild_18_25  | Number of Children 18-25   |
| depend_child_90 | No child under the age of 25   |
| depend_adult    | Number of adult dependants living in household                           |
| depend_adult_0  | No adult dependents living in household                                  |
| tenure          | Please describe your Tenure/Residential Status.                          |
| actvstat_UK     | What is your main activity status?                                       |
| actvstat_DE     | Wie würden Sie Ihre Hauptbeschäftigung beschreiben?                      |
| actvstat_NL     | Wat is je recente activiteitsstatus?                                     |
| actvstat_IT     | Qual è lo stato di attività recente?                                     |
| actvstat_LT     | Kokia yra naujausia j?s? aktyvumo b?sena?                                |
| residence       | How would you describe the area where your residence is located?         |
| bio_val         | It is important to me to take care of; and live in harmony with; nature. |
| alt_val         | It is important to me to help others and that others are treated fairly. |
| ego_val         | It is important to me to have wealth; possessions; influence and status. |
| hed_val         | It is important to me to have fun and have a good time                   |
| jic_val         | I like to be prepared for every eventuality in life.                     |
| UA_val_1        | I feel uneasy in unfamiliar situations.                                  |
| UA_val_2        | I prefer clear rules and guidelines.                                     |
| UA_val_3        | Society should minimise risks.   |
| UA_val_4        | I am comfortable with uncertainty.                                       |
| nocar           | No. of cars owned by household.  |
| nocar_0         | No car owned by Household  |
| carnum1_1       | Car No 1. Electric   |
| carnum1_2       | Car No 1. Hybrid   |
| carnum1_3       | Car No 1. Conventional   |
| carnum1_4       | Car No 1. Owned  |
| carnum1_5       | Car No 1. Leased   |
| carnum1_6       | Car No 1. Company Car  |
| carnum2_1       | Car No 2. Electric   |
| carnum2_2       | Car No 2. Hybrid   |
| carnum2_3       | Car No 2. Conventional   |
| carnum2_4       | Car No 2. Owned  |
| carnum2_5       | Car No 2. Leased   |
| carnum2_6       | Car No 2. Company Car  |
| carnum3_1       | Car No 3. Electric   |
| carnum3_2       | Car No 3. Hybrid   |
| carnum3_3       | Car No 3. Conventional   |
| carnum3_4       | Car No 3. Owned  |
| carnum3_5       | Car No 3. Leased   |
| carnum3_6       | Car No 3. Company Car  |
| carnum4_1       | Car No 4. Electric   |
| carnum4_2       | Car No 4. Hybrid   |


| carnum4_3    | Car No 4. Conventional   |
|--------------|--|
| carnum4_4    | Car No 4. Owned  |
| carnum4_5    | Car No 4. Leased   |
| carnum4_6    | Car No 4. Company Car  |
| carnum5_1    | Car No 5. Electric   |
| carnum5_2    | Car No 5. Hybrid   |
| carnum5_3    | Car No 5. Conventional   |
| carnum5_4    | Car No 5. Owned  |
| carnum5_5    | Car No 5. Leased   |
| carnum5_6    | Car No 5. Company Car  |
| ptrating     | How would you rate the current public transport provision in your local area?    |
| multimod     | Regular journeys- Do you sometimes combine modes of transport? (P&R- Bike etc.?) |
| carfrquse    | How often do you use your car?   |
| prknorm      | Where do you normally park your car when at home?                                |
| parkfee      | Do you pay a fee where you normally park at home? (e.g. per hour/week/year)      |
| regjour      | Would you know how to do your regular journeys if suddenly left without car?     |
| wyuscar_c    | Rate the importance of cost for you using a car.                                 |
| wyuscar_tt   | Rate the importance of travel time for you using a car.                          |
| wyuscar_cv   | Rate the importance of convenience for you using a car.                          |
| wyuscar_td   | Rate the importance of the transport of dependents for you using a car.          |
| wyuscar_lk   | Rate the importance of a lack of alternative means (e.g P.T) for you using a car |
| carlntrip_cm | In general- could you commute without using a car?                               |
| carlntrip_rs | In general- could you do your regular shopping without using a car?              |
| carlntrip_le | In general- could you do your hobbies/leisure activities without using a car?    |
| carlntrip_hl | In general- could you travel for holidays without using a car?                   |
| carlntrip_ff | In general- could you care for friends and family without using a car?           |
| nocarfut_c   | Rate the importance of cost for not owning a car in the future.                  |
| nocarfut_tt  | Rate the importance of travel time for not owning a car in the future.           |
| nocarfut_nd  | No longer needed (e.g. care duties) - Importance for not owning car in future.   |
| nocarfut_vi  | Rate the importance of viable alternatives for not owning car in the future.     |
| nocarfut_vr  | Virtual interaction removing need - Importance for not owning car in the future. |
| nocarfut_er  | Rate the importance of environmental factors for not owning car in the future.   |
| willnocar    | Would you get rid of your car if viable alternatives were available?             |
| carprev      | Did you own a car previously?  |
| nocar_c      | Importance of cost for HH's non-ownership of a car.                              |
| nocar_tt     | Importance of travel time for HH's non-ownership of a car.                       |
| nocar_cv     | Importance of convenience for HH's non-ownership of a car.                       |
| nocar_nd     | Importance of no-need to transport dependents for non-ownership of a car.        |
| nocar_vi     | Importance of availability of viable alternatives for HH's non-ownership of car. |
| nocar_sf     | Importance of safety for HH's non-ownership of a car.                            |
| nocar_er     | Importance of environmental concerns for HH's non-ownership of a car.            |
| shar_avl_cl  | Commercial Car Sharing (e.g. rental/share companies) - Available in local area.  |
| shar_avl_cy  | Community Car Sharing (e.g. car clubs) - Available in local area.                |
| shar_avl_in  | Informal Car Sharing (e.g. friends and family) - Available in local area.        |
| noshare      | No Car Sharing options available locally.  |



| share_use    | How often do you use car sharing?  |  |  |  |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| shareif      | Would you be likely to use car sharing if it was available?                    |  |  |  |
| wdshedcar    | Would you get rid of your car if adequate car sharing was available?           |  |  |  |
| onlintrv_pt  | Do you normally use online services for public transport? (train- bus etc.)    |  |  |  |
| onlintrv_pk  | Do you normally use online services for paying for parking?                    |  |  |  |
| onlintrv_cs  | Do you normally use online services for short-term car rental/ car sharing?    |  |  |  |
| onlintrv_tx  | Do you normally use online services for Taxi/Ride sharing services?            |  |  |  |
| onlintrv_mc  | Do you normally use online services for bicycle/scooter/e-bike rental.         |  |  |  |
| cycnum_1     | Number of bicycles owned by Household (All types)                              |  |  |  |
| cycnum_0     | Household does not own a bicycle.  |  |  |  |
| cycnum_s     | Number of standard bicycles owned by Household                                 |  |  |  |
| cycnum_c     | Number of cargo bicycles (electric or non-electric) owned by Household         |  |  |  |
| cycnum_e     | Number of electric bicycles owned by Household                                 |  |  |  |
| cycnum_o     | Number of other bicycles (i.e. folding bikes etc.) owned by Household          |  |  |  |
| cycling      | How often do you cycle?  |  |  |  |
| flynum_1     | Number of return flights in the last year                                      |  |  |  |
| flyno_90     | I don't fly.   |  |  |  |
| mob_pa1      | Car ownership and use cause serious environ. & soc. problems.                  |  |  |  |
| mob_pa2      | (Serious) environ. and soc. problems are due to car ownership and use.         |  |  |  |
| mob_se1      | I feel capable of living my life without owning a car.                         |  |  |  |
| mob_se2      | I feel confident that I can live my life without owning a car if I want to.    |  |  |  |
| mob_oe1      | If I don't own a car; I can help reduce environ. and soc. problems.            |  |  |  |
| mob_oe2      | I can contribute to reducing environ. & and soc. problems by not owing a car.  |  |  |  |
| mob_pn1      | I feel a personal responsibility to live my life without owning a car.         |  |  |  |
| mob_pn2      | I feel morally obliged to live my life without owning a car.                   |  |  |  |
| mob_desc_nat | In my country most people do not own a car.                                    |  |  |  |
| mob_desc_imp | Most people important to me do not own a car.                                  |  |  |  |
| mob_dyn_nat  | In my country more and more people do not own a car.                           |  |  |  |
| mob_dyn_imp  | More and more people important to me do not own a car.                         |  |  |  |
| sqmtre       | Approximately how much living space (sq. metres) does your current home have?  |  |  |  |
| shrd_sc      | Do you have use of/access to a place for leaving items neighbours might want.  |  |  |  |
| shrd_sw      | Do you have easy use of/access to a shared workspace?                          |  |  |  |
| shrd_slr     | Do you have easy use of/access to a shared laundry room?                       |  |  |  |
| shrd_sg      | Do you have easy use of/access to a shared garden?                             |  |  |  |
| shrd_pl      | Do you have easy use of/access to a to a public library?                       |  |  |  |
| shrd_cg      | Do you have local groups promoting sharing/swapping/second hand trade?         |  |  |  |
| onplat       | Are you familiar with any online 2nd-hand trading platforms (inc. local area)? |  |  |  |
| knwneig      | How well do you know your immediate neighbours in your street/building?        |  |  |  |
| ncon_cb      | Would you contact your neighbours in case of: Car breakdown?                   |  |  |  |
| ncon_ec      | Would you contact your neighbours in case of: Emergency care? (e.g. child)     |  |  |  |
| ncon_hs      | Would you contact neighbours: Care of house while away? (e.g. plants etc.)     |  |  |  |
| ncon_sc      | Would you contact your neighbours in case of: Security concerns?               |  |  |  |
| ncon_it      | Would you contact your neighbours in case of: I.T. problems?                   |  |  |  |
| cfborw_cr    | How comfortable-asking your neighbour to lend you their car?                   |  |  |  |
| cfborw_eb    | How comfortable-asking your neighbour to lend you their E-bike?                |  |  |  |



| cfborw_bi  | How comfortable-asking your neighbour to lend you their bicycle?           |
|------------|--|
| cfborw_to  | How comfortable-asking your neighbour to lend you their tools?             |
| cfborw_di  | How comfortable-asking your neighbour to lend you their electronic device? |
| cfborw_ki  | How comfortable-asking your neighbour to lend you their kitchen appliance? |
| cfborw_ot  | How comfortable-asking your neighbour to lend you other small HH items?    |
| currshr_ki | Currently share a kitchen with non-family member?                          |
| currshr_ba | Currently share a bathroom with non-family member?                         |
| currshr_bs | Currently share a basement with non-family member?                         |
| currshr_gn | Currently share a garden with non-family member?                           |
| currshr_ur | Currently share a utility room with non-family member?                     |
| currshr_eh | Currently share an entrance/hallway with non-family member?                |
| currshr_no | I currently do not share any of these spaces.                              |
| doborw_cr  | Have you ever borrowed your neighbour's car?                               |
| doborw_eb  | Have you ever borrowed your neighbour's e-bike?                            |
| doborw_bi  | Have you ever borrowed your neighbour's bicycle?                           |
| doborw_to  | Have you ever borrowed your neighbour's tools?                             |
| doborw_di  | Ever borrowed an electronic device from your neighbour?                    |
| doborw_ki  | Ever borrowed a kitchen appliance from your neighbour?                     |
| doborw_ot  | Ever borrowed other smaller household items from your neighbour?           |
| doborw_no  | I have not borrowed any of these items from my neighbour.                  |
| dolend_cr  | Have you lent your neighbour your car?                                     |
| dolend_eb  | Have you lent your neighbour your E-bike?                                  |
| dolend_bi  | Have you lent your neighbour your bicycle?                                 |
| dolend_to  | Have you lent your neighbour your tools?                                   |
| dolend_di  | Have you lent your neighbour an electronic device?                         |
| dolend_ki  | Have you lent your neighbour a kitchen appliance?                          |
| dolend_ot  | Have you lent your neighbour other smaller household items?                |
| dolend_no  | I have not lent any of these items to my neighbour                         |
| rprself_cr | Do you perform minor car repairs?  |
| rprself_bi | Do you perform bicycle repairs?  |
| rprself_mp | Do you perform mobile phone repairs?                                       |
| rprself_di | Do you perform repairs on other digital devices? (not mobile phones)       |
| rprself_cl | Do you perform clothes mending?  |
| rprself_fr | Do you perform furniture repairs?  |
| rprself_sh | Do you perform shoe repairs?   |
| rprself_ha | Do you perform household appliance repairs?                                |
| rprself_no | I don't do any of the repairs listed myself.                               |
| rprserv_cr | Do you purchase minor car repairs?   |
| rprserv_bi | Do you purchase bicycle repairs?   |
| rprserv_mp | Do you purchase mobile phone repairs?                                      |
| rprserv_di | Do you purchase repairs on other digital devices?                          |
| rprserv_cl | Do you purchase clothes mending services?                                  |
| rprserv_fr | Do you purchase furniture repair services?                                 |
| rprserv_sh | Do you purchase shoe repair services?                                      |
| rprserv_ha | Do you purchase household appliance repairs?                               |



| rprserv_no     | I don't purchase any of these repair services.                                   |
|----------------|--|
| wudshr_ki      | Willing to permanently share your kitchen with non-family member?                |
| wudshr_ba      | Willing to permanently share your bathroom with non-family member?               |
| wudshr_bs      | Willing to permanently share your basement with non-family member?               |
| wudshr_gn      | Willing to permanently share your garden with non-family member?                 |
| wudshr_ur      | Willing to permanently share your utility room with non-family member?           |
| wudshr_eh      | Willing to permanently share entrance/hallway with non-family member?            |
| wudmv          | Extent of willingness to live in a smaller home if one was readily available     |
| wudmvbe_1      | Willing to live in a smaller home - Saving on running costs.                     |
| wudmvbe_2      | Willing to live in a smaller home - Ease of moving.                              |
| wudmvbe_3      | Willing to live in a smaller home - Being able to stay in my neighbourhood.      |
| wudmvbe_4      | Willing to live in a smaller home - Lower cleaning burden.                       |
| wudmvbe_5      | Willing to live in a smaller home - Environmental factors.                       |
| wudmvbe_6      | Willing to live in a smaller home - Altruism(e.g. those in greater need).        |
| wudmvif_1      | Less willing to live in a smaller home - Cost/expense.                           |
| wudmvif_2      | Less willing to live in a smaller home - Inconvenience of moving.                |
| wudmvif_3      | Less willing to live in a smaller home - Unlikely able to stay in neighbourhood. |
| wudmvif_4      | Less willing to live in a smaller home - Unwillingness to reduce available space |
| wudmvif_5      | Less willing to live in a smaller home - Attachment to home/neighbourhood.       |
| build_pa1      | Living in a large home causes important environ. & soc. problems.                |
| build_pa2      | (Serious) environ. & social problems are due to people living in large homes.    |
| build_se1      | I feel capable of living in a small home or sharing living spaces.               |
| build_se2      | I feel confident I can live in a small home or share living spaces if I want to. |
| build_oe1      | If I live in a small home/share living space; I reduce environ. & soc. problems  |
| build_oe2      | Can contrib. to reducing env. & soc. probs. living in small home/sharing space.  |
| build_pn1      | I feel a personal responsibility to live in a small home or share living spaces. |
| build_pn2      | I feel morally obliged to live in a small home or share living spaces.           |
| build_desc_nat | Most people live in a small home or share living spaces.                         |
| build_desc_imp | Most people important to me live in a small home or share living spaces.         |
| build_dyn_nat  | More and more people live in a small home or share living spaces.                |
| build_dyn_imp  | More and more people important to me live in a small home/share living spaces.   |
| netaccq        | How would you describe the quality of your internet access?                      |
| smtphuse       | Do you use a smartphone to access the internet?                                  |
| onlinepay      | Do you personally pay bills or purchase goods and services online?               |
| dghlpgiv       | Do people ask for your help when solving digital/IT problems?                    |
| dghlpask       | How often do you ask other people for help solving digital/IT problems?          |
| sechand        | I prefer to buy second hand rather than new.                                     |
| buysec         | How often do you buy/collect/acquire second-hand goods found online?             |
| sellsec        | How often do you sell/give away unwanted items/items you no longer need online?  |
| sellbcon       | Does offering goods online allow you sell/give more easily than other methods?   |
| noneed         | How often do you buy things you ultimately don't need/use?                       |
| digneed        | Does this happen less often when you buy something online?                       |
| digicons_t     | How do you feel digitalisation has affected the amount you travel?               |
| digicons_rg    | How do you feel digitalisation has affected the amount your energy use at home?  |
| digicons_m     | How do you feel digitalisation has affected your media consumption?              |



| digicons_hg  | How has digitalisation affected the amount of household goods/services you buy?  |  |  |
|--------------|--|--|--|
| dgenable_bs  | Banking and shopping online. In the last few years has it become:                |  |  |
| dgenable_bi  | Searching for information online. In the last few years has it become:           |  |  |
| dgenable_ls  | Searching for local services online. in the last few years has it become:        |  |  |
| dgenable_bc  | Basic communication (e-mail- video/voice) in the last few years has it become:   |  |  |
| ccb_gov      | Actions to pressure the gov e.g. protesting or signing petitions etc             |  |  |
| ccb_busi     | Actions to influence businesses- e.g. investing in sustainable businesses        |  |  |
| ccb_cit      | Actions to influence people around you- e.g. inform friends and family           |  |  |
| ccb_se       | I feel capable of engaging in the actions above to influence other groups.       |  |  |
| ccb_oe       | If I engage in actions above to influence groups- I reduce env. & soc. problems. |  |  |
| ccb_pn       | I feel a personal responsibility to engage in actions above to influence others. |  |  |
| ccb_desc_nat | Most people in my country engage in the actions above to influence other groups. |  |  |
| ccb_desc_imp | Most people close to me engage in the actions above to influence other groups.   |  |  |
| ccb_dyn_nat  | More and more people in my country engage in actions to influence other groups.  |  |  |
| ccb_dyn_imp  | More and more people close to me engage in actions to influence other groups.    |  |  |
| ccb_pa       | The current level of resource use causes serious env. & soc. problems.           |  |  |
| ccb_ar       | I feel partly responsible- env. & soc. probs. arising from current resource use. |  |  |
| pweight      | Normalised Probability Weight  |  |  |



## **Appendix C:** Circular Consumption Survey descriptives

This appendix contains a summarised table of the number of observations, mean, standard deviation, min and max values for all numerical, binary and ordinal variables. Summary descriptives for strictly categorical variables (e.g. dwelling, region, tenure, and activity status) which do not provide insight have been removed. Additionally, the means and standard deviations for variables for which non-response values were coded numerically (e.g. "non-selected" = 0 or "None of these" = 90) have also been removed for multi-punch variables (see Appendix D) as responses to these questions are coded sequentially rather than binarily.

| Variable       | Obs  | Mean     | Std. Dev. | Min   | Max     |
|----------------|------|----------|-----------|-------|---------|
| time           | 5651 | 24.591   | 11.251    | 14.95 | 119.083 |
| country        | 5651 | 3.039    | 1.379     | 1     | 5       |
| gender         | 5651 | 1.514    | .5        | 1     | 2       |
| birthyear      | 5651 | 1974.401 | 17.449    | 1931  | 2008    |
| dwelling       | 5651 |          |           | 1     | 5       |
| region ŬK      | 1053 |          |           | 1     | 12      |
| region DE      | 1100 |          |           | 1     | 16      |
| region NL      | 1081 |          |           | 1     | 12      |
| region IT      | 1409 |          |           | 1     | 20      |
| region LT      | 1008 |          |           | 1     | 10      |
| educ UK        | 1053 | 4.287    | 1.837     | 1     | 8       |
| educ DE        | 1100 | 4.785    | 1.522     | 1     | 8       |
| educ NL        | 1081 | 3.859    | 1.45      | 1     | 7       |
| educ IT        | 1409 | 3.651    | 1.647     | 1     | 7       |
| educ LT        | 1008 | 4.221    | 1.566     | 1     | 8       |
| hhincome       | 5651 | 5.518    | 2.805     | 1     | 11      |
| partner        | 5651 | .623     | .485      | 0     | 1       |
| ĥhsize         | 5651 | 2.483    | 1.223     | 1     | 10      |
| num child      | 4485 | 1.642    | .951      | 1     | 8       |
| numchild 0 4   | 1064 | .558     | .655      | 0     | 5       |
| numchild 5 9   | 1042 | .607     | .654      | 0     | 3       |
| numchild 10 17 | 1154 | .906     | .746      | 0     | 4       |
| numchild 18 25 | 969  | .627     | .793      | 0     | 6       |
| depend adult   | 573  | 1.295    | .61       | 1     | 6       |
| depend adult 0 | 4485 | .872     | .334      | 0     | 1       |
| tenure         | 5651 | 2.165    | 1.182     | 1     | 5       |
| actvstat UK    | 1053 |          |           | 1     | 97      |
| actvstat DE    | 1100 |          |           | 1     | 97      |
| actvstat NL    | 1081 |          |           | 1     | 97      |
| actvstat IT    | 1409 |          |           | 1     | 97      |
| actvstat LT    | 1008 |          |           | 1     | 97      |
| residence      | 5651 | 3.14     | 1.417     | 1     | 5       |
| bio val        | 5651 | 3.157    | 1.801     | 1     | 7       |
| alt val        | 5651 | 3.098    | 1.827     | 1     | 7       |
| ego val        | 5651 | 4.156    | 1.676     | 1     | 7       |
| hed val        | 5651 | 3.252    | 1.816     | 1     | 7       |
| jic val        | 5651 | 3.224    | 1.746     | 1     | 7       |
| UA val 1       | 5651 | 3.834    | 1.705     | 1     | 7       |
| UA val 2       | 5651 | 3.169    | 1.785     | 1     | 7       |
| UA val 3       | 5651 | 3.326    | 1.707     | 1     | 7       |
| UA val 4       | 5651 | 4.37     | 1.676     | 1     | 7       |
| nocar          | 4703 | 1.458    | .687      | 1     | 5       |

#### **Descriptive Statistics**



| nocar 0               | 5651       | .168  | .374  | 0 | 1      |
|-----------------------|------------|-------|-------|---|--------|
| carnum1 1             | 4703       | .055  | .228  | 0 | 1      |
| carnum1 2             | 4703       | .219  | .598  | 0 | 2      |
| carnum1 3             | 4703       | 2.204 | 1.225 | 0 | 3      |
| carnum1 4             | 4703       | .912  | .283  | 0 | 1      |
| carnum1 5             | 4703       | .102  | .421  | 0 | 2      |
| carnum1 6             | 4703       | .081  | .481  | 0 | 3      |
| carnum2 1             | 1755       | .048  | .214  | 0 | 1      |
| carnum2 2             | 1755       | .143  | .489  | 0 | 2      |
| carnum2 3             | 1755       | 2.348 | 1.131 | 0 | 3      |
| carnum2.4             | 1755       | 886   | 318   | Ő | 1      |
| carnum <sup>2</sup> 5 | 1755       | .000  | 382   | 0 | 2      |
| carnum <sup>2</sup> 6 | 1755       | .002  | .502  | 0 | 3      |
| carnum <sup>2</sup> 1 | 300        | 047   | 211   | 0 | 1      |
|                       | 300        | .047  | .211  | 0 | 1      |
|                       | 300        | .007  | .52   | 0 | 2      |
|                       | 200        | 2.433 | 2.7   | 0 | )<br>1 |
| carnum5 4             | 300<br>200 | .84   | .307  | 0 | 1      |
| carnum <sub>5</sub> 5 | 300<br>200 | .107  | .435  | 0 | 2      |
| carnum3 6             | 300        | .267  | .835  | 0 | 3      |
| carnum4 1             |            | .039  | .195  | 0 | 1      |
| carnum4 2             |            | .117  | .428  | 0 | 2      |
| carnum4 3             | 77         | 2.312 | 1.127 | 0 | 3      |
| carnum4 4             | 77         | .883  | .323  | 0 | 1      |
| carnum4 5             | 77         | .039  | .253  | 0 | 2      |
| carnum4 6             | 77         | .221  | .754  | 0 | 3      |
| carnum5 1             | 24         | .083  | .282  | 0 | 1      |
| carnum5 2             | 24         | .167  | .565  | 0 | 2      |
| carnum5 3             | 24         | 2.083 | 1.248 | 0 | 3      |
| carnum5 4             | 24         | .833  | .381  | 0 | 1      |
| carnum5 5             | 24         | .042  | .204  | 0 | 1      |
| carnum5 6             | 24         | .375  | 1.013 | 0 | 3      |
| ptrating              | 5651       | 3.842 | 1.735 | 1 | 7      |
| multimod              | 5651       | .381  | .486  | 0 | 1      |
| carfrquse             | 4703       | 1.575 | .817  | 1 | 5      |
| prknorm               | 4703       |       |       | 1 | 3      |
| parkfee               | 4703       | .148  | .355  | 0 | 1      |
| regiour               | 4703       | .825  | .38   | Ő | 1      |
| wviiscar c            | 4703       | 3.106 | 1.68  | 1 | 7      |
| wyuscar tt            | 4703       | 2 595 | 1 677 | 1 | 7      |
| wyuscar cy            | 4703       | 2.469 | 1 692 | 1 | 7      |
| wyuscar td            | 4703       | 3 25  | 1.022 | 1 | 7      |
| wyuscar lk            | 4703       | 3 116 | 1.74  | 1 | 7      |
| carlatria cm          | 4703       | 3.976 | 2 107 | 1 | 7      |
| carlatria rs          | 4703       | 3.863 | 2.107 | 1 | 7      |
| carletrie le          | 4703       | 3.805 | 2.037 | 1 | 7      |
| camping h             | 4703       | J.04  | 2.04  | 1 | 7      |
| carintrip m           | 4703       | 4.5   | 2.04  | 1 | 7      |
| carintrip II          | 4703       | 4.55  | 1.935 | 1 | / 7    |
| nocarrut c            | 4/03       | 5.146 | 1.793 | 1 | /      |
| nocartut tt           | 4/03       | 3.152 | 1.855 | 1 | /      |
| nocartut nd           | 4/03       | 5./5/ | 1.889 | 1 |        |
| nocartut vı           | 47/03      | 3.275 | 1.799 | 1 | 7      |
| nocartut vr           | 4703       | 4.576 | 1.868 | 1 | 7      |
| nocarfut er           | 4703       | 3.71  | 1.813 | 1 | 7      |



| willnocar     | 4703 | 4.242          | 1.988  | 1 | 7   |
|---------------|------|----------------|--------|---|-----|
| carprev       | 948  | .402           | .491   | 0 | 1   |
| nocar c       | 948  | 2.922          | 1.924  | 1 | 7   |
| nocar tt      | 948  | 3.89           | 1.92   | 1 | 7   |
| nocar cv      | 948  | 3.787          | 1.925  | 1 | 7   |
| nocar nd      | 948  | 3.771          | 2.006  | 1 | 7   |
| nocar vi      | 948  | 3.371          | 1.934  | 1 | 7   |
| nocar sf      | 948  | 3.635          | 1.961  | 1 | 7   |
| nocar er      | 948  | 3.671          | 1.938  | 1 | 7   |
| shar avl cl   | 5651 | .277           | .447   | 0 | 1   |
| shar avl cv   | 5651 | .194           | .592   | 0 | 2   |
| shar avl in   | 5651 | .616           | 1.212  | Õ | 3   |
| noshare       | 5651 |                |        | Õ | 90  |
| share use     | 2558 | 3 954          | 1 231  | 1 | 5   |
| shareif       | 3093 | 5.007          | 1.201  | 1 | 7   |
| wdshedcar     | 2636 | 5 215          | 1.905  | 1 | 7   |
| onlintry nt   | 5651 | 4 105          | 2 188  | 1 | 7   |
| onlintry pl   | 5651 | 4.585          | 2.100  | 1 | 7   |
| onlintry os   | 5651 | 5 473          | 2.177  | 1 | 7   |
| onlinetary ty | 5651 | 5.003          | 2.067  | 1 | 7   |
| onlintry ma   | 5651 | 5.093          | 2.007  | 1 | 7   |
|               | 2642 | 5.557<br>2.22E | 1.955  | 1 | /   |
| cycnum I      | 304Z | 2.235          | 1.335  | 1 | 9   |
| cycnum 0      | 5651 | .350           | .479   | 0 | 1   |
| cycnum s      | 3267 | 1.9            | 1.1/5  | 0 | 9   |
| cycnum c      | 949  | .116           | .418   | 0 | 6   |
| cycnum e      | 1652 | .908           | .902   | 0 | 5   |
| cycnum o      | 960  | .336           | .802   | 0 | 6   |
| cycling       | 3642 | 2.764          | 1.266  | 1 | 5   |
| flynum 1      | 2484 | 2.767          | 3.431  | 1 | 50  |
| flyno 90      | 5651 |                |        | 0 | 90  |
| mob pa1       | 5651 | 4.128          | 1.758  | 1 | 7   |
| mob pa2       | 5651 | 4.342          | 1.763  | 1 | 7   |
| mob se1       | 5651 | 4.416          | 2.041  | 1 | 7   |
| mob se2       | 5651 | 4.308          | 2.016  | 1 | 7   |
| mob oe1       | 5651 | 4.221          | 1.911  | 1 | 7   |
| mob oe2       | 5651 | 4.343          | 1.911  | 1 | 7   |
| mob pn1       | 5651 | 4.952          | 1.88   | 1 | 7   |
| mob pn2       | 5651 | 5.139          | 1.844  | 1 | 7   |
| mob desc nat  | 5651 | 5.37           | 1.621  | 1 | 7   |
| mob desc imp  | 5651 | 5.417          | 1.75   | 1 | 7   |
| mob dyn nat   | 5651 | 4.972          | 1.669  | 1 | 7   |
| mob dyn imp   | 5651 | 5.388          | 1.711  | 1 | 7   |
| sqmtre        | 5651 | 107.349        | 74.139 | 8 | 500 |
| shrd sc       | 5651 | .174           | .38    | 0 | 1   |
| shrd sw       | 5651 | .152           | .359   | 0 | 1   |
| shrd slr      | 5651 | .188           | .391   | 0 | 1   |
| shrd sg       | 5651 | .274           | .446   | 0 | 1   |
| shrd pl       | 5651 | .617           | .486   | 0 | 1   |
| shrd cg       | 5651 | .3             | .458   | 0 | 1   |
| onplat        | 5651 | .537           | .499   | 0 | 1   |
| knwneig       | 5651 | 2.261          | .926   | 1 | 4   |
| ncon cb       | 5651 | 2.668          | 1.08   | 1 | 4   |
| ncon ec       | 5651 | 2.71           | 1.125  | 1 | 4   |
|               |      |                |        |   |     |



| ncon hs    | 5651 | 2.472 | 1.131 | 1 | 4      |
|------------|------|-------|-------|---|--------|
| ncon sc    | 5651 | 2.344 | 1.031 | 1 | 4      |
| ncon it    | 5651 | 3.004 | 1.029 | 1 | 4      |
| cfborw cr  | 5651 | 3.323 | .948  | 1 | 4      |
| cfborw eb  | 5651 | 3.265 | .963  | 1 | 4      |
| cfborw bi  | 5651 | 3.047 | 1.047 | 1 | 4      |
| cfborw to  | 5651 | 2 464 | 1.086 | 1 | 4      |
| cfborw di  | 5651 | 2 995 | 1.000 | 1 | 4      |
| cfborw ki  | 5651 | 2.993 | 1.071 | 1 | 4      |
| cfborw ot  | 5651 | 2 749 | 1.071 | 1 | 4      |
| currshr ki | 5651 | 2.742 | 1.072 | 0 | т<br>1 |
| currshr be | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 1      |
| currshi ba | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 2      |
|            | 5051 |       |       | 0 | 3      |
| currshr gn | 5051 |       |       | 0 | 4      |
| currshr ur | 5051 |       |       | 0 | 5      |
| currshr eh | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 6      |
| currshr no | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 90     |
| doborw cr  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 1      |
| doborw eb  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 2      |
| doborw bi  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 3      |
| doborw to  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 4      |
| doborw di  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 5      |
| doborw ki  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 6      |
| doborw ot  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 7      |
| doborw no  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 90     |
| dolend cr  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 1      |
| dolend eb  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 2      |
| dolend bi  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 3      |
| dolend to  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 4      |
| dolend di  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 5      |
| dolend ki  | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 6      |
| dolend of  | 5651 |       |       | Ő | 7      |
| dolend no  | 5651 |       |       | Ő | 90     |
| rprself cr | 5651 |       |       | Ő | 1      |
| rprself bi | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 2      |
| rprself mp | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 2      |
| rprod di   | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 5      |
| rprealf al | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 4      |
| ipisell ci | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 5      |
| rprseif fr | 5051 |       |       | 0 | 0 7    |
| rprself sn | 5651 |       |       | 0 | /      |
| rprself ha | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 8      |
| rprself no | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 90     |
| rprserv cr | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 1      |
| rprserv bi | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 2      |
| rprserv mp | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 3      |
| rprserv di | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 4      |
| rprserv cl | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 5      |
| rprserv fr | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 6      |
| rprserv sh | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 7      |
| rprserv ha | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 8      |
| rprserv no | 5651 |       |       | 0 | 90     |
| wudshr ki  | 5651 |       |       | 1 | 90     |
| wudshr ba  | 5651 |       |       | 1 | 90     |



| wudshr bs      | 5651 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
|----------------|------|-------|-------|---|---------|
| wudshr gn      | 5651 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| wudshr ur      | 5651 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| wudshr eh      | 5651 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| wudmv          | 5651 | 4.764 | 2.031 | 1 | 7       |
| wudmvbe 1      | 1582 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| wudmvbe 2      | 1582 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| wudmvbe 3      | 1582 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| wudmvbe 4      | 1582 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| wudmybe 5      | 1582 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| wudmybe 6      | 1582 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| wudmvif 1      | 4069 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| wudmvif 2      | 4069 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| wudmvif 3      | 4069 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| wudmvif 4      | 4069 |       |       | 1 | 00      |
| wudmvif 5      | 4069 |       |       | 1 | 90      |
| build pa1      | 4009 | 1 920 | 1 702 | 1 | 90<br>7 |
| build par      | 5051 | 4.039 | 1.702 | 1 | 7       |
| build paz      | 5051 | 4.982 | 1.//1 | 1 | 7       |
| build sel      | 5651 | 4.634 | 1.927 | 1 | / _     |
| build se2      | 5651 | 4.542 | 1.924 | 1 | /       |
| build oel      | 5651 | 4.863 | 1.828 | 1 | 7       |
| build oe2      | 5651 | 4.971 | 1.82  | 1 | 7       |
| build pn1      | 5651 | 5.265 | 1.781 | 1 | 7       |
| build pn2      | 5651 | 5.366 | 1.736 | 1 | 7       |
| build desc nat | 5651 | 4.694 | 1.677 | 1 | 7       |
| build desc imp | 5651 | 5.141 | 1.739 | 1 | 7       |
| build dyn nat  | 5651 | 4.558 | 1.724 | 1 | 7       |
| build dyn imp  | 5651 | 5.122 | 1.737 | 1 | 7       |
| netaccq        | 5651 | 2.199 | .951  | 1 | 5       |
| smtphuse       | 5651 |       |       | 1 | 3       |
| onlinepay      | 5651 | 2.051 | 1.051 | 1 | 5       |
| dghlpgiv       | 5651 | 3.297 | 1.22  | 1 | 5       |
| dghlpask       | 5651 | 3.463 | 1.059 | 1 | 5       |
| sechand        | 5651 | 4.49  | 1.801 | 1 | 7       |
| buvsec         | 5651 | 3.543 | 1.111 | 1 | 5       |
| sellsec        | 5651 | 3.239 | 1.178 | 1 | 5       |
| sellbcon       | 4594 | .739  | .439  | 0 | 1       |
| noneed         | 5651 | 3.619 | .952  | 1 | 5       |
| digneed        | 4685 | 0.007 | .,    | 1 | 3       |
| digicons t     | 5651 | 3,999 | 1.432 | 1 | 7       |
| digicons rg    | 5651 | 3 684 | 1 383 | 1 | 7       |
| digicons m     | 5651 | 3 359 | 1.503 | 1 | 7       |
| digicons ha    | 5651 | 3 753 | 1.352 | 1 | 7       |
| dgenable bs    | 5651 | 2 526 | 1.557 | 1 | 7       |
| dgenable bi    | 5651 | 2.520 | 1.537 | 1 | 7       |
| dgenable le    | 5651 | 2.437 | 1.52  | 1 | 7       |
| dgenable be    | 5651 | 2.720 | 1.505 | 1 | 7       |
| agenable be    | 5051 | 2.332 | 1.313 | 1 | 7       |
|                | 5051 | 4.91  | 1.010 | 1 | 7       |
| CCD DUS1       | 2021 | 4.938 | 1.798 | 1 | /       |
| CCD CIT        | 5651 | 4.559 | 1.700 | 1 | /       |
| ccd se         | 5651 | 4.338 | 1.709 | 1 | /       |
| ccb oe         | 5651 | 4.308 | 1./13 | 1 | 7       |
| ccb pn         | 5651 | 4.486 | 1./52 | 1 | 7       |



| ccb desc nat | 5651 | 4.468 | 1.587 | 1    | 7     |
|--------------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| ccb desc imp | 5651 | 4.664 | 1.679 | 1    | 7     |
| ccb dyn nat  | 5651 | 4.242 | 1.593 | 1    | 7     |
| ccb dyn imp  | 5651 | 4.627 | 1.676 | 1    | 7     |
| ccb pa       | 5651 | 3.623 | 1.759 | 1    | 7     |
| ccb ar       | 5651 | 4.098 | 1.755 | 1    | 7     |
| pweight      | 5651 | 1     | .208  | .401 | 1.871 |



# **Appendix D: Questionnaire**

Appendix D below provides the complete order and structure and of the *Circular Consumption Survey* in the English language which was released in the United Kingdom. This was the base version from which the survey in all other languages was translated. All questions presented to respondents are highlighted in blue with the response type and question screening conditions (if any) highlighted in grey above each question. It should be noted that while the **response numbers** described in the middle column "Response No." can be used to interpret the screening conditions, they **should not be used for coding purposes** as some variable names and value labels (codes) have been altered in the process of data cleaning. **All data processing and interpretation should be made with reference to the** *Circular Consumption Survey* **codebook** accompanying the published data.

| Variable name | Response<br>No. | Questions and Section Titles   |
|---------------|-----------------|--|
|               |                 |  |
|               |                 | Language: English  |
|               |                 |  |
|               |                 | Section 0: Screening   |
|               |                 | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch   |
| gender        |                 | Please state your gender.  |
|               | 01              | male   |
|               | 02              | female   |
|               | 03              | diverse  |
|               | 99              | prefer not to say  |
|               |                 | Response type & Conditions: Numeric input, check routine 4 numbers, years 1906-2006              |
| age           |                 | In which year were you born?   |
|               | 01              |  |
|               |                 | Question Type: Single Punch  |
| dwelling      |                 | Which dwelling type do you live in?  |
|               | 1               | Detached house   |
|               | 2               | Semi-detached house  |
|               | 3               | Terraced house   |
|               | 4               | Apartment  |
|               | 5               | Other (e.g. Mobile Home/Trailer, Boathouse, Dormitory, Adjacent Housing/Bedsit, Tiny House etc.) |
|               |                 | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch   |
| region        |                 | Which region do you live in?   |
|               | 01              | East England   |
|               | 02              | East Midlands  |
|               | 03              | London   |
|               | 04              | North East   |
|               | 05              | North West   |
|               | 06              | Northern Ireland   |



|          | 07 | Scotland   |
|----------|----|--|
|          | 08 | South East   |
|          | 09 | South West   |
|          | 10 | Wales  |
|          | 11 | West Midlands  |
|          | 12 | Yorkshire and the Humber   |
|          | 13 |  |
|          | 14 |  |
|          | 15 |  |
|          | 16 |  |
|          | 17 |  |
|          | 18 |  |
|          | 19 |  |
|          | 20 |  |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch                                     |
| educ     |    | What is your highest level of education?                                     |
|          | 01 | Primary education  |
|          | 02 | Lower secondary education  |
|          | 03 | Upper secondary education  |
|          | 04 | Post-secondary non-tertiary education  |
|          | 05 | Short-cycle tertiary education   |
|          | 06 | Bachelor's or equivalent level   |
|          | 07 | Master's or equivalent level   |
|          | 08 | Doctoral or equivalent level   |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch                                     |
| hhincome |    | Monthly estimated household income (after tax and including social benefits) |
|          | 01 | Below 500 GBP  |
|          | 02 | 500-999 GBP  |
|          | 03 | 1,000-1,499 GBP  |
|          | 04 | 1,500-1,999 GBP  |
|          | 05 | 2,000-2,499 GBP  |
|          | 06 | 2,500-2,999 GBP  |
|          | 07 | 3,000-3,499 GBP  |
|          | 08 | 3,500-3,999 GBP  |
|          | 09 | 4,000-4,999 GBP  |
|          | 10 | 5,000-5,999 GBP  |
|          | 11 | More than 6,000 GBP  |
|          |    | Section 1: Sociodemographics. Please complete the following:                 |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch                                     |
| partner  |    | Do you live with a partner? (married or unmarried)                           |



|              | 01 | yes  |
|--------------|----|--|
|              | 00 | no   |
|              |    | Response type & Conditions: Numeric input  |
| hhsize       |    | How many people - including yourself - currently live in your household?   |
|              | 01 |  |
|              |    | Response type & Conditions: only if hhsize > 1 Numeric   |
| no_child     |    | How many children under the age of 25 currently live in your household?  |
|              | 01 | No child   |
|              | 02 | 1 child  |
|              | 03 | 2 children   |
|              | 04 | 3 children   |
|              | 05 | 4 children   |
|              | 06 | 5 children   |
|              | 07 | 6 children   |
|              | 08 | 7 children or more   |
|              |    | Response type & Conditions: only if nochild Code2-8, numeric input   |
| depend_child |    | What age is / are your child / children?<br>Please enter the number of children per age group.   |
|              | 01 | child / children under 5 years of age  |
|              | 02 | child / children aged 5 to under 10 years  |
|              | 03 | child / children aged 10 to under 18 years   |
|              | 04 | child / children aged 18 to 25 years   |
|              | 90 | No child under the age of 25   |
|              |    | Response type & Conditions: Only if hhsize > 1 Numeric   |
| depend_adult |    | Do adult dependants live in your household, e.g. older<br>people, people with disabilities, special needs or people<br>who are otherwise unable to live independently? |
|              | 01 | yes: person(s)   |
|              | 00 | no   |
|              |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch   |
| tenure       |    | Please describe your Tenure/Residential Status.  |
|              | 01 | Owner with no outstanding mortgage   |
|              | 02 | Owner with outstanding mortgage  |
|              | 03 | Tenant with rent at market rate  |
|              | 04 | Tenant with rent at reduced rate   |
|              | 05 | Tenant, Rent free  |
|              |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch   |
| actvstat     |    | What is your main activity status?   |



|           | 01 | Employed   |
|-----------|----|--|
|           | 02 | Unemployed   |
|           | 03 | Retired  |
|           | 04 | Unable to work due to long-standing health problems                                |
| _         | 05 | Student, pupil   |
|           | 06 | Fulfilling domestic tasks  |
|           | 07 | Compulsory military or civilian service  |
|           | 97 | Other  |
|           |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch   |
| residence |    | How would you describe the area where your residence is located?                   |
|           | 01 | A big city   |
|           | 02 | The suburbs or outskirts of a big city   |
|           | 03 | A large town   |
|           | 04 | A small town   |
|           | 05 | Rural Area or village  |
|           |    | Section 2: Values & Uncertainty  |
|           |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row, statements<br>in rows, randomize |
|           |    | To what extent do you agree with the following statements                          |
| bio_val   | 01 | It is important to me to take care of, and live in harmony with, nature            |
| alt_val   | 02 | It is important to me to help others and that others are treated fairly            |
| ego_val   | 03 | It is important to me to have wealth, possessions, influence, and status           |
| hed_val   | 04 | It is important to me to have fun and have a good time                             |
| jic_val   | 05 | I like to be prepared for every eventuality in life                                |
| UA_val_1  | 06 | I feel uneasy in unfamiliar situations   |
| UA_val_2  | 07 | I prefer clear rules and guidelines  |
| UA_val_3  | 08 | Society should minimise risks  |
| UA_val_4  | 09 | I am comfortable with uncertainty  |
|           |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns                                     |
|           | 01 | Fully agree (1)  |
|           | 02 |  |
|           | 03 |  |
|           | 04 |  |
|           | 05 |  |
|           | 06 |  |
|           | 07 | Fully disagree (7)   |
|           |    | Section 3: Mobility  |
|           |    | Response type & Conditions: Numeric, maximum of 5                                  |



| nocar                       |    | How many cars does your household have? (including leased and company-cars)   |
|-----------------------------|----|---|
|                             | 01 | car(s)  |
|                             | 00 | No car  |
|                             |    | Response type & Conditions: S per row, only if in nocar Code 1<br>was mentioned; show following questions depending on<br>number of cars in nocar                                       |
| carnum1-5                   |    | For each car, please indicate the type and the ownership status:  |
|                             |    | Type: Electric / Hybrid / Conventional  |
|                             |    | Ownership status: Owned / Leased / Company Car  |
|                             |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch  |
| ptrating                    |    | How would you rate the current public transport provision in your local area?   |
|                             | 01 | Very Good (1)   |
|                             | 02 |   |
|                             | 03 |   |
|                             | 04 |   |
|                             | 05 |   |
|                             | 06 |   |
|                             | 07 | Very Poor (7)   |
|                             |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch  |
| multimod                    |    | For your regular journeys do you sometimes combine<br>different modes of transport (e.g. such as park and ride<br>systems, cycling or other active travel and public transport<br>use)? |
|                             | 01 | Yes   |
|                             | 00 | No  |
|                             |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch, only if nocar =<br>Code 1   |
| carfrquse (if nocar = $0$ ) |    | How often do you use your car?  |
|                             | 01 | Daily   |
|                             | 02 | Weekly  |
|                             | 03 | Monthly   |
|                             | 04 | Rarely  |
|                             | 05 | Never   |
|                             |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch, only if nocar =<br>Code 1   |
| prknorm (if nocar = 0)      |    | Where do you normally park your car when at home?   |
|                             | 01 | private space   |
|                             | 02 | semi-private/shared   |



|                        | 03 | public (e.g. on-street parking)  |
|------------------------|----|--|
|                        |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch, only if nocar =<br>Code 1  |
| parkfee (if nocar = 0) |    | Do you pay a fee where you normally park your car when<br>at home (e.g. per hour/week/month/year).   |
|                        | 01 | Yes  |
|                        | 00 | No   |
|                        |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch, only if nocar =<br>Code 1  |
| regjour (if nocar = 0) |    | If you suddenly had to do your regular journeys without the<br>use of a car, would you know how to do this? (i.e. through<br>public transport, cycling, walking other modes, car<br>sharing, etc.) |
|                        | 01 | Yes  |
|                        | 00 | No   |
|                        |    | Response type & Conditions: only if nocar = Code 1, Single<br>Punch per row, statements in row randomize   |
| (if nocar = 0)         |    | Rate the importance of the following reasons for you using a car   |
| wyuscar_c              | 01 | Cost   |
| wyuscar_tt             | 02 | Travel time  |
| wyuscar_cv             | 03 | Convenience  |
| wyuscar_td             | 04 | Transport of dependents  |
| wyuscar_lk             | 05 | Lack of alternative means (e.g. no public transport route)   |
|                        |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns   |
|                        | 01 | Very Important (1)   |
|                        | 02 |  |
|                        | 03 |  |
|                        | 04 |  |
|                        | 05 |  |
|                        | 06 |  |
|                        | 07 | Not at all important (7)   |
|                        |    | Response type & Conditions: only if nocar = Code 1, Single<br>Punch per row, statements in row randomize   |
| (if nocar = 0)         |    | In general, could you do the following tasks without using a car?  |
| carlntrip_cm           | 01 | Commuting  |
| carlntrip_rs           | 02 | Regular shopping   |
| carlntrip_le           | 03 | Hobbies & leisure activities   |
| carlntrip_hl           | 04 | Travelling for holidays  |
| carlntrip_ff           | 05 | Care for friends and family  |
|                        |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns   |
|                        | 01 | Very easily (1)  |



| 1                           | 02 |  |
|-----------------------------|----|--|
|                             | 03 |  |
|                             | 04 |  |
|                             | 05 |  |
|                             | 06 |  |
|                             | 07 | With great difficulty (7)  |
|                             |    | Response type & Conditions: only if nocar = Code 1, Single<br>Punch per row, statements in row randomize |
| (if nocar = 0)              |    | How important are the following factors for not owning a car in the future?                              |
| nocarfut_c                  | 01 | Cost   |
| nocarfut_tt                 | 02 | Travel time  |
| nocarfut_nd                 | 03 | Car no longer needed (e.g. for dependents)   |
| nocarfut_vi                 | 04 | Viable alternatives become available   |
| nocarfut_vr                 | 05 | Virtual interaction removes the need for travel  |
| nocarfut_er                 | 06 | Environmental reasons  |
|                             |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns   |
|                             | 01 | Very Important (1)   |
|                             | 02 |  |
|                             | 03 |  |
|                             | 04 |  |
|                             | 05 |  |
|                             | 06 |  |
|                             | 07 | Not at all important (7)   |
|                             |    | Response type & Conditions: only if nocar = Code 1, Single<br>Punch                                      |
| willnocar (if nocar = $0$ ) |    | Would you get rid of your car if viable alternatives were available?                                     |
|                             | 01 | Definitely Yes (1)   |
|                             | 02 |  |
|                             | 03 |  |
|                             | 04 |  |
|                             | 05 |  |
|                             | 06 |  |
|                             | 07 | Definitely Not (7)   |
|                             |    | Response type & Conditions: only if nocar = Code 0, Single<br>Punch                                      |
| carprev (if nocar = 1)      |    | Did you own a car previously?  |
|                             | 01 | Yes  |
|                             | 00 | No   |
|                             |    | Response type & Conditions: only if nocar = Code 0, Single<br>Punch per row, statements in row randomize |



| (if nocar = 1)             |    | How important are the following factors for your household's non-ownership of a car? |
|----------------------------|----|--|
| nocar_c                    | 01 | Cost   |
| nocar_tt                   | 02 | Travel time  |
| nocar_cv                   | 03 | Convenience  |
| nocar_nd                   | 04 | No need to transport dependents (children, elderly relatives etc.)                   |
| nocar_vi                   | 05 | Viable alternatives available  |
| nocar_sf                   | 06 | Safety   |
| nocar_er                   | 07 | Environmental concerns   |
|                            |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns                                       |
|                            | 01 | Very Important (1)   |
|                            | 02 |  |
|                            | 03 |  |
|                            | 04 |  |
|                            | 05 |  |
|                            | 06 |  |
|                            | 07 | Not at all important (7)   |
|                            |    | Response type & Conditions: Multi Punch  |
|                            |    | Are any of the following car sharing options available in your local area?           |
| shar_avl_cl                | 01 | Commercial (e.g. rental companies/agencies)  |
| shar_avl_cy                | 02 | Community (e.g. car clubs)   |
| shar_avl_in                | 03 | Informal (e.g friends and family)  |
| noshare                    | 90 | None [Conditions: Single Punch]  |
|                            |    | Response type & Conditions: only if share_avl = Code 1-3,<br>Single Punch            |
| share_use (If noshare = 0) |    | How often do you use car sharing?  |
|                            | 01 | Daily  |
|                            | 02 | Weekly   |
|                            | 03 | Monthly  |
|                            | 04 | Rarely   |
|                            | 05 | Never  |
|                            |    | Response type & Conditions: only if noshare ==0, Single Punch                        |
| shareif (If noshare = 1)   | -  | Would you be likely to use car sharing if it was available?                          |
|                            | 01 | Yes, very likely (1)   |
|                            | 02 |  |
|                            | 03 |  |
|                            | 04 |  |
|                            | 05 |  |
|                            | 06 |  |



|   | 07 | No, very unlikely (7)   |
|---|----|---|
|   |    | Response type & Conditions: only if nocar = 0 & noshare = 1,<br>Single Punch  |
| wdshedcar<br>(if nocar = $0 \&$ noshare = $1$ ) |    | Would you get rid of your car if adequate car sharing was available?          |
|   | 01 | Yes, very likely (1)  |
|   | 02 |   |
|   | 03 |   |
|   | 04 |   |
|   | 05 |   |
|   | 06 |   |
|   | 07 | No, very unlikely (7)   |
|   |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row, statements in row randomize |
|   |    | Do you normally use online services for any of the following activities?      |
| onlintrv_pt                                     | 01 | Using public transport (e.g. train, bus, tram etc)                            |
| onlintrv_pk                                     | 02 | Paying for parking  |
| onlintrv_cs                                     | 03 | Short-term car rental/ car sharing  |
| onlintrv_tx                                     | 04 | Taxi/Ride sharing services  |
| onlintrv_mc                                     | 05 | bicycle/scooter/e-bike rental   |
|   |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns                                |
|   | 01 | Yes, very often (1)   |
|   | 02 |   |
|   | 03 |   |
|   | 04 |   |
|   | 05 |   |
|   | 06 |   |
|   | 07 | No, very seldomly (7)   |
|   |    | Response type & Conditions: Numeric   |
| cycnum  |    | How many bicycles are owned by your household?                                |
|   | 01 | bicycle(s)  |
|   | 00 | Household does not own a bicycle.   |
|   |    | Response type & Conditions: Only if cycum = Code 01,<br>Numeric               |
|   |    | Please select the number of bicycles owned by your household by type:         |
| cycnum_s  | 02 | Standard ( drop down numeric)   |
| cycnum_c  | 03 | Cargo (Electric or non electic) (drop down numeric)                           |
| cycnum_e  | 04 | Electric (drop down numeric)  |
| cycnum_o  | 05 | Other (drop down numeric)   |
|   |    | Response type & Conditions: Only if cycum = Code 01, Single<br>Punch          |



| cycling      |    | How often do you cycle?   |
|--------------|----|---|
|              | 01 | Daily   |
|              | 02 | Weekly  |
|              | 03 | Monthly   |
|              | 04 | Rarely  |
|              | 05 | Never   |
|              |    | Response type & Conditions: Numeric, Single Punch   |
|              |    | How many return flights did you make in the last 12 months?                                 |
| flynum       | 01 | [drop down numeric 1-9 and 10 and more]   |
| flyno        | 90 | I don't fly. [Single Punch]   |
|              |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row, statements in row randomize               |
|              |    | Please indicate to which extent you agree with the following statements.                    |
| mob_pa1      | 01 | Car ownership and use cause serious environmental and social problems.                      |
| mob_pa2      | 02 | (Serious) environmental and social problems are due to car<br>ownership and use.            |
| mob_se1      | 03 | I feel capable of living my life without owning a car.                                      |
| mob_se2      | 04 | I feel confident that I can live my life without owning a car if I want to                  |
| mob_oe1      | 05 | If I don't own a car, I can help reduce environmental and social problems.                  |
| mob_oe2      | 06 | I think I can contribute to reducing environmental and social problems by not owning a car. |
| mob_pn1      | 07 | I feel a personal responsibility to live my life without owning a car.                      |
| mob_pn2      | 08 | I feel morally obliged to live my life without owning a car.                                |
| mob_desc_nat | 09 | In the UK most people do not own a car.   |
| mob_desc_imp | 10 | Most people important to me do not own a car.   |
| mob_dyn_nat  | 11 | In the UK more and more people do not own a car.  |
| mob_dyn_imp  | 12 | More and more people important to me do not own a car.                                      |
|              |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns  |
|              | 01 | Fully agree (1)   |
|              | 02 |   |
|              | 03 |   |
|              | 04 |   |
|              | 05 |   |
|              | 06 |   |



|          | 07 | Fully disagree (7)  |
|----------|----|---|
|          |    | Section 4: Living Spaces, Sharing and Repair  |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Numeric   |
| sqmtre   |    | Approximately how much living space (in square meter)   |
|          |    | does your current home have?  |
|          | 01 | m <sup>2</sup>  |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row  |
|          |    | Do you have use of/have easy access to any of the following in your residential area?         |
| shrd_sc  | 01 | Swap corner (a place for leaving items your neighbours might want/need)                       |
| shrd_sw  | 02 | Shared workspace  |
| shrd_slr | 03 | Shared laundry room   |
| shrd_sg  | 04 | Shared garden   |
| shrd_pl  | 05 | Public Library  |
| shrd_cg  | 06 | Community groups promoting sharing/swapping/second-hand trade                                 |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns  |
|          | 01 | Yes   |
|          | 00 | No  |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch  |
| onplat   |    | Are you familiar with any online second-hand trading platforms, including in your local area? |
|          | 01 | Yes   |
|          | 00 | No  |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch  |
| knwneig  |    | How well do you know your immediate neighbours in your street/building                        |
|          | 01 | Very Well (1)   |
|          | 02 |   |
|          | 03 |   |
|          | 04 | Not at all well (4)   |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row, statements<br>in row randomize              |
|          |    | How likely would you be to contact your neighbours for help with the following?               |
| ncon_cb  | 01 | Car breakdown   |
| ncon_ec  | 02 | Emergency care (e.g. of child)  |
| ncon_hs  | 03 | Care of house while away (e.g. watering plants)   |
| ncon_sc  | 04 | Security concerns   |
| ncon_it  | 05 | I.T. problems   |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns  |
|          | 01 | Very likely (1)   |



|               | 02 |   |
|---------------|----|---|
|               | 03 |   |
|               | 04 | Not at all likely (4)   |
|               |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row, statements<br>in row randomize  |
|               |    | How comfortable would you be asking your neighbour to lend you the following items?   |
| cfborw_cr     | 01 | Car   |
| cfborw_eb     | 02 | E-bike  |
| cfborw_bi     | 03 | Bicycle   |
| cfborw_to     | 04 | Tools   |
| cfborw_di     | 05 | Electronic/digital device   |
| cfborw_ki     | 06 | Kitchen appliances  |
| cfborw_ot     | 07 | Other small household items (e.g. utensils cookware etc)  |
|               |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns  |
|               | 01 | Very comfortable (1)  |
|               | 02 |   |
|               | 03 |   |
|               | 04 | Not at all comfortable (4)  |
|               |    | Response type & Conditions: Multi Punch   |
|               |    | Do you share the following spaces with a non-family<br>member (e.g. tenant, housemate, neighbour, or other)?<br>(Tick all that apply) |
| currshr_ki    | 01 | Kitchen   |
| currshr_ba    | 02 | Bathroom  |
| currshr_bs    | 03 | Basement  |
| currshr_gn    | 04 | Garden  |
| currshr_ur    | 05 | Utility room  |
| currshr_eh    | 06 | Entrance/hallway  |
| currshr_no    | 90 | None of these [Response type & Conditions: Single Punch]  |
|               |    | Response type & Conditions: Multi Punch   |
|               |    | Which of the following items have you borrowed at some stage from your neighbours? (Tick all that apply)                              |
| doborw_cr     | 01 | Car   |
| doborw_eb     | 02 | E-bike  |
| doborw_bi     | 03 | Bicycle   |
| doborw_to     | 04 | Tools   |
| doborw_di     | 05 | Electronic/digital device   |
| <br>doborw_ki | 06 | Kitahan appliances  |
|               | 00 | Kitchen appliances  |



| doborw_no  | 90       | None of these [Response type & Conditions: Single Punch]  |
|------------|----------|---|
|            |          | Response type & Conditions: Multi Punch   |
|            |          | Which of the following items have you lent at some stage<br>to your neighbours? (Tick all that apply) |
| J_1        | 01       |   |
| dolend_cr  | 01       | Car   |
| dolend_eb  | 02       | E-bike  |
| dolend_bi  | 03       | Bicycle   |
| dolend_to  | 04       |   |
| dolend_di  | 05       | Electronic/digital device   |
| dolend_kı  | <u> </u> | Kitchen appliances  |
| dolend_ot  | 07       | Other small household items (e.g. utensils cookware etc)  |
| dolend_no  | 90       | None of these [Response type & Conditions: Single Punch]  |
|            |          | Response type & Conditions: Multi Punch   |
|            |          | Which of the following repair activities do you personally carry out? (Tick all that apply)           |
| rprself_cr | 01       | minor car repairs   |
| rprself_bi | 02       | bicycle repairs   |
| rprself_mp | 03       | mobile phone repairs  |
| rprself_di | 04       | repairing other digital devices (tablets, laptop etc.)  |
| rprself_cl | 05       | clothes mending   |
| rprself_fr | 06       | furniture repairs   |
| rprself_sh | 07       | shoe repairs  |
| rprself_ha | 08       | household appliance repairs   |
| rprself_no | 90       | None of these [Response type & Conditions: Single Punch]  |
|            |          | Response type & Conditions: Multi Punch   |
|            |          | Which of the following repair services do you purchase?<br>(Tick all that apply)                      |
| rprserv_cr | 01       | minor car repairs   |
| rprserv_bi | 02       | bicycle repairs   |
| rprserv_mp | 03       | mobile phone  |
| rprserv_di | 04       | other digital devices (tablets, laptop etc.)  |
| rprserv_cl | 05       | clothes mending   |
| rprserv_fr | 06       | furniture   |
| rprserv_sh | 07       | shoe repair   |
| rprserv_ha | 08       | household appliances  |
| rprserv_no | 90       | None of these [Response type & Conditions: Single Punch]  |
|            |          | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row, statements<br>in row randomize                      |



(tenant, housemate, neighbour, or other)? wudshr\_ki 01 Kitchen wudshr\_ba 02 Bathroom wudshr\_bs 03 Basement 04 Garden wudshr\_gn 05 Utility room wudshr\_ur wudshr\_eh 06 Entrance/hallway Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns 01 Very willing (1) 02 03 04 05 06 07 Not at all willing (7) 90 Not applicable Response type & Conditions: Single Punch To what extent would you be willing to live in a smaller home if one was readily available in your area? 01 Very willing (1) 02 03 04 05 06 07 Not at all willing (7) Response type & Conditions: only if wudmv Code 1-3, Single

Where applicable, would you be willing to permanently share the following spaces with a non-family member

|                                  |    | Punch per row, statements in row randomize  |
|----------------------------------|----|---|
| wudmvbe (if wudmv = 1,2 or<br>3) |    | Please rate the importance of the following factors (if applicable) for being more willing to live in a smaller home. |
|                                  | 01 | Saving on running costs   |
|                                  | 02 | Ease of moving  |
|                                  | 03 | Being able to stay in my neighbourhood  |
|                                  | 04 | Lower cleaning burden   |
|                                  | 05 | Environmental factors   |
|                                  | 06 | Altruism (e.g. wanting those in greater need to have sufficient space)  |
|                                  |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns  |

wudmv



|                                    | 01 | Very Important (1)   |
|------------------------------------|----|--|
|                                    | 02 |  |
|                                    | 03 |  |
|                                    | 04 |  |
|                                    | 05 |  |
|                                    | 06 |  |
|                                    | 07 | Not at all important (7)   |
|                                    | 90 | Not applicable   |
|                                    |    | Response type & Conditions: only if wudmv Code 4-7, Single<br>Punch per row, statements in row randomize       |
| wudmvif (if wudmv = 4,5,6 or<br>7) |    | Rate the importance of the following factors (if applicable) for being less willing to live in a smaller home. |
|                                    | 01 | Cost/expense   |
|                                    | 02 | Inconvenience of moving  |
|                                    | 03 | Unlikely to be able to stay in neighbourhood   |
|                                    | 04 | Unwillingness to reduce available space  |
|                                    | 05 | Emotional attachment to home/neighbourhood   |
|                                    |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns   |
|                                    | 01 | Very Important (1)   |
|                                    | 02 |  |
|                                    | 03 |  |
|                                    | 04 |  |
|                                    | 05 |  |
|                                    | 06 |  |
|                                    | 07 | Not at all important (7)   |
|                                    | 90 | Not applicable   |
|                                    |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row, statements in row randomize                                  |
|                                    |    | Please indicate to which extent you agree with the following statements.                                       |
| build_pa1                          | 01 | Living in a large home causes important environmental and social problems.                                     |
| build_pa2                          | 02 | (Serious) environmental and social problems are due to people living in large homes.                           |
| build_se1                          | 03 | I feel capable of living in a small home or sharing living spaces.   |
| build_se2                          | 04 | I feel confident that I can live in a small home or share living spaces if I want to.                          |
| build_oe1                          | 05 | If I live in a small home or share living spaces, I reduce<br>environmental and social problems.               |



| build_oe2      | 06 | I think I can contribute to reducing environmental and social problems by living in a small home or sharing living spaces. |
|----------------|----|--|
| build_pn1      | 07 | I feel a personal responsibility to live in a small home or share living spaces.   |
| build_pn2      | 08 | I feel morally obliged to live in a small home or share living spaces.   |
| build_desc_nat | 09 | In the UK, most people live in a small home or share living spaces.  |
| build_desc_imp | 10 | Most people important to me live in a small home or share living spaces.   |
| build_dyn_nat  | 11 | In the UK, more and more people live in a small home or share living spaces.   |
| build_dyn_imp  | 12 | More and more people important to me live in a small home or share living spaces.  |
|                |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns   |
|                | 01 | Fully agree (1)  |
|                | 02 |  |
|                | 03 |  |
|                | 04 |  |
|                | 05 |  |
|                | 06 |  |
|                | 07 | Fully disagree (5)   |
|                |    | Section 5: Digitalisation and second-hand trading  |
|                |    |  |
|                |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch   |
| netaccq        |    | How would you describe the quality of your internet access   |
|                | 01 | Excellent  |
|                | 02 | Very good  |
|                | 03 | Good   |
|                | 04 | Poor   |
|                | 05 | No access  |
|                |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch   |
| smtphuse       |    | Do you use a smartphone to access the internet?  |
|                | 01 | Yes  |
|                | 02 | No   |
|                | 03 | I don't have a smartphone  |
|                |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch   |
| onlinepay      |    | Do you personally pay bills or purchase goods and services online?   |
|                | 01 | Very often   |
|                | 02 | Often  |



|          | 03 | Occasionally  |
|----------|----|---|
|          | 04 | Seldomly  |
|          | 05 | Never   |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch  |
| dghlpgiv |    | Do people ask for your help when solving digital/IT problems? E.g. setting up and connecting networked devices, installing software, syncing or transferring data etc.  |
|          | 01 | Very often  |
|          | 02 | Often   |
|          | 03 | Occasionally  |
|          | 04 | Seldomly  |
|          | 05 | Never   |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch  |
| dghlpask |    | How often do you ask other people for help solving<br>digital/IT problems? E.g. installing and setting up apps<br>on your phone, syncing or transferring data, resetting<br>passwords, changing the settings on your devices. etc |
|          | 01 | Very often  |
|          | 02 | Often   |
|          | 03 | Occasionally  |
|          | 04 | Seldomly  |
|          | 05 | Never   |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch  |
| sechand  |    | To what extent do you agree with the following statement:"I prefer to buy second-hand rather than new"  |
|          | 01 | agree Strongly (1)  |
|          | 02 |   |
|          | 03 |   |
|          | 04 |   |
|          | 05 |   |
|          | 06 |   |
|          | 07 | Strongly Disagree (7)   |
|          |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch  |
| buysec   |    | How often do you buy/collect/acquire second-hand goods found online?  |
|          | 01 | Very often  |
|          | 02 | Often   |
|          | 03 | Occasionally  |
|          | 04 | Seldomly  |
|          | 05 | Never   |



|                                 |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch   |
|---------------------------------|----|--|
| sellsec                         |    | How often do you sell/give away unwanted items or items  |
|                                 |    | you no longer need online?   |
|                                 | 01 | Very often   |
|                                 | 02 | Often  |
|                                 | 03 | Occasionally   |
|                                 | 04 | Seldomly   |
|                                 | 05 | Never  |
|                                 |    | Response type & Conditions: only if sellsec Code 1-4, Single<br>Punch  |
| sellbcon (if sellsec != "never" |    | Does offering goods online allow you to sell/give away<br>things more easily than other methods e.g. flea markets,<br>car boot sales etc.? |
|                                 | 01 | Yes  |
|                                 | 00 | No   |
|                                 |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch   |
| noneed                          |    | How often do you buy things you ultimately don't need/use?   |
|                                 | 01 | Very often   |
|                                 | 02 | Often  |
|                                 | 03 | Occasionally   |
|                                 | 04 | Seldomly   |
|                                 | 05 | Never  |
|                                 |    | Response type & Conditions: Only if noneed Code 1-4, Single<br>Punch   |
| digneed (if noneed != "never"   |    | Does this happen less often when you buy something online?   |
|                                 | 01 | Yes  |
|                                 | 02 | No   |
|                                 | 03 | The same   |
|                                 |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row, statements in row randomize  |
|                                 |    | How do you feel digitalisation has affected the following:   |
| digicons_e                      | 01 | The amount you travel  |
| digicons_f                      | 02 | The amount of energy you use at home   |
| digicons_m                      | 03 | Your media consumption (i.e. what you read, watch or listen to)  |
| digicons_hg                     | 04 | The amount of household goods/services you buy   |
|                                 |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns   |
|                                 | 01 | Largely increased (1)  |
|                                 | 02 | 0.7 *******(7  |
|                                 | 03 |  |
| 1                               | 1  |  |



|             | 04 |   |
|-------------|----|---|
|             | 05 |   |
|             | 06 |   |
|             | 07 | Largely decreased (7)   |
|             |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row, statements<br>in row randomize  |
|             |    | In the last few years has it become harder or easier for you to do the following online?  |
| dgenable_bs | 01 | Banking & online shopping   |
| dgenable_bi | 02 | Searching for information   |
| dgenable_ls | 03 | Finding local services  |
| dgenable_bc | 04 | Basic communication (e-mail, video/voice calling etc.)  |
|             |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns  |
|             | 01 | Much Easier (1)   |
|             | 02 |   |
|             | 03 |   |
|             | 04 |   |
|             | 05 |   |
|             | 06 |   |
|             | 07 | Much Harder (7)   |
|             |    | Section 6: Circular Citizenship   |
|             |    | Response type & Conditions: Text, own page  |
|             |    | Finally, we would like to understand your opinions about<br>engaging in actions (i.e doing things) to influence other groups<br>(other people, governments, businesses) to protect the<br>environment by reducing the use of resources.<br>This includes using fewer new resources and materials, using<br>existing products for longer, reusing materials and recycling.<br>With other groups we mean the government, businesses, and<br>people around you, such as your friends and family. |
|             |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row, statements<br>in row randomize  |
|             |    | Please indicate how often you engage in the following<br>actions that aim to urge other actors to reduce the use of<br>resources.   |
| ccb_gov     | 01 | Actions to pressure the government, e.g. protesting, signing petitions, emailing officials, participating in public assemblies or hearings.   |



| ccb_busi     | 02 | Actions to influence businesses, e.g. investing in sustainable<br>businesses, giving input for product/service design, speaking up<br>in the organisation you work for.   |
|--------------|----|---|
| ccb_cit      | 03 | Actions to influence people around you, e.g. inform friends and family why and how to reduce the use of resources, or motivating them to change their behaviour   |
|              |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns  |
|              | 01 | Frequently (1)  |
|              | 02 |   |
|              | 03 |   |
|              | 04 |   |
|              | 05 |   |
|              | 06 |   |
|              | 07 | Never (7)   |
|              |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row, statements<br>in row randomize  |
|              |    | Next, please indicate to which extent you agree with the<br>following statements about these actions to influence other<br>groups (government, businesses, and people around you,<br>such as your friends and family) |
| ccb_se       | 01 | I feel capable of engaging in the actions above to influence other groups.  |
| ccb_oe       | 02 | If I engage in the actions above to influence other groups, I reduce environmental and social problems.   |
| ccb_pn       | 03 | I feel a personal responsibility to engage in the actions above to influence other groups.  |
| ccb_desc_nat | 04 | In the UK, most people engage in the actions above to influence other groups.   |
| ccb_desc_imp | 05 | Most people close to me engage in the actions above to influence other groups.  |
| ccb_dyn_nat  | 06 | In the UK, more and more people engage in the actions above to influence other groups.  |
| ccb_dyn_imp  | 07 | More and more people close to me engage in the actions above to influence other groups.   |
|              |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns  |
|              | 01 | Fully agree (7)   |
|              | 02 |   |
|              | 03 |   |
|              | 04 |   |
|              | 05 |   |
|              | 06 |   |
|              | 07 | Fully disagree (1)  |



|        |    | Response type & Conditions: Single Punch per row, statements in row randomize                              |
|--------|----|--|
|        |    | Lastly, please indicate to which extent you agree with the following statements.                           |
| ccb_pa | 01 | The current level of resource use causes serious environmental and social problems.                        |
| ccb_ar | 02 | I feel partly responsible for environmental and social problems arising from the current use of resources. |
|        |    | Response type & Conditions: Answers in columns   |
|        | 01 | Fully agree (7)  |
|        | 02 |  |
|        | 03 |  |
|        | 04 |  |
|        | 05 |  |
|        | 06 |  |
|        | 07 | Fully disagree (1)   |
|        |    | Response type & Conditions: End of Interview   |

### References

- DRUCKMAN, A., CHITNIS, M., SORRELL, S. & JACKSON, T. 2011. Missing carbon reductions? Exploring rebound and backfire effects in UK households. Energy Policy, 39, 3572-3581.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION. 2025. About Eurobarometer [Online]. Available: https://europa.eu/eurobarometer/about/eurobarometer [Accessed 24/02/2025].
- EUROPEAN DATA PROTECTION BOARD 2020. Guidelines 04/2020 on the use of location data and contact tracing tools in the context of the COVID-19 outbreak.
- EUROPEAN UNION 2018. REGULATION (EU) 2016/679 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation).
- EUROPEAN UNION 2019. Regulation (EU) 2019/1700 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 October 2019 establishing a common framework for European statistics relating to persons and households, based on data at individual level collected from samples (IESS).
- EUROPEAN UNION 2021. Standardised key social variables Implementing guidelines available at: <u>https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/54431/1966394/Standardised-key-social-variables.pdf</u> accessed 01/02/2024.
- EUROSTAT 2010. An assessment of survey errors in EU-SILC. In: EUROSTAT (ed.).
- EUROSTAT 2023. Average household size Online data code: ilc\_lvph01.
- EUROSTAT 2024a. Population by educational attainment level, sex and age (%) main indicators Online data code: edat\_lfse\_03.
- EUROSTAT 2024b. Regional population statistics by age and gender Online data code: demo\_r\_d2jandemo\_r\_d2jan.



EUROSTAT 2025. Life expectancy by age and sex 2023- Data code: demo\_mlexpec.

- GREALIS, E. & RAU, H. 2023. Circular consumption conceptual framework and research design (CircEUlar Deliverable 4.1). CircEUlar Project Funded by the European Union under grant agreement No. 101056810.
- HONG, M., STEEDLE, J. T. & CHENG, Y. 2020. Methods of Detecting Insufficient Effort Responding: Comparisons and Practical Recommendations. *Educ Psychol Meas*, 80, 312-345.
- HUBER, A. 2022. Does Sharing with Neighbours Work? Accounts of Success and Failure from Two German Housing Experimentations. *Housing, Theory and Society,* 39, 1-31.
- JOHANSSON-TORMOD, F. & KLEVMARKEN, A. 2022. Explaining the Size and Nature of Response in a Survey on Health Status and Economic Standard. *IJM*, 15, 63-77.
- OFFICE FOR NATIONAL STATISTICS 2025. Families and households in the UK: 2023.
- VALSTYBES DUOMENU AGENTURA (STATE DATA AGENCY) 2024. The results of the Survey "Pensions and participation in labour market" have been presented.

## For more information: http://circeular.org

#### And follow us on:

LinkedIn: <u>https://www.linkedin.com/company/circeular</u> BlueSky: <u>https://bsky.app/profile/circeular.bsky.social</u>



The CircEUlar project is funded by the European Union

UK Research and Innovation

This work has received funding from the Swiss State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (SERI).

#### **Project funded by**



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft Confédération suisse Confederazione Svizzera Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Confederation

Federal Department of Economic Affairs, Education and Research EAER State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation SERI

