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**Synthesis Report**
This report moves towards an understanding of what makes an effective model for reward and recognition schemes intended to encourage household waste-related behaviour change by drawing on all three phases of the research. It draws out key practical implications for those involved in developing, delivery or implementation of waste-related reward and recognition schemes.

**Phase 1 Report: Scoping review of evidence on the use of reward and recognition schemes in enhancing recycling and waste prevention behaviours**
This report would be of most use for those interested in the detail of the evidence available specifically related to waste-related behaviours.

It presents the findings from the Phase 1 of the project - a scoping literature review - which identified and synthesised existing evidence on the role of reward and recognition schemes in changing household waste behaviours.

**Phase 2 Report: Scoping review of evidence on the use of reward and recognition schemes in enhancing non-waste behaviours**
This report, on the evidence from a literature with widened scope, would be of most use to those interested in the wider evidence about the effectiveness of reward and recognition schemes in changing behaviour.

There is a brief summary of cross-cutting findings, drawing out lessons applicable to household waste-related behaviour change. The main body of the report consists of a series of mini-reviews summarising the evidence identified in each behavioural area, which were: health, education, volunteering and sustainable use of: food, water, transport and energy, volunteering.

**Phase 3 Report: Case studies and focus groups exploring waste-related reward and recognition schemes**
This report would be of most use for those looking for descriptions and participant experiences of real-world reward and recognition schemes to understand strengths and
weaknesses of potential models. Five case studies were developed, complemented by focus groups involving participants of some of the case study schemes.
Key findings from case studies and focus groups for waste-related reward and recognition schemes

While the case studies provide valuable insights, it should be noted that no robust evaluation data was available for any of the five schemes considered. Addressing this lack of evaluation data is a key learning point from the case studies and the broader project. Evaluations should also consider the longevity of scheme impacts, considering how engagement varies during an ongoing scheme and also what happens to behaviours when schemes come to an end.

Neither case studies nor focus groups are designed to produce generalisable results, but provide insight into how people view and experience initiatives on the ground, which can be invaluable in terms of designing and delivery of schemes.

While the schemes studied appear to be associated with behaviours such as increased recycling participation or tonnages it is not clear which elements of the schemes, e.g. communications, infrastructure or rewards, or other external changes are responsible for the changes observed. The mechanisms by which schemes work would benefit from further research.

Lessons from the case studies include:
1. The reference point used for community competitions should be considered. Community-based schemes require participants to connect with the defined community.
2. There can be a need for communications that appeal to diverse community groups, perhaps combining non-English language publications with more intensive outreach efforts for groups that face more specific barriers to participation; a finding supported in the focus groups.
3. Incentives worked most effectively when they appealed to the interests of those targeted. Manchester’s Golden Ticket scheme appears to have worked in areas where people indicated that educational attainment was important to them, so they were interested in helping local schools by collecting the Tickets.
4. There appears to be value in involving children in schemes and building on existing communities (in the case of the Golden Ticket scheme, within primary schools), and using carefully designed incentive schemes to encourage healthy competition between schools or neighbourhoods.

Lessons from the focus groups include:
1. *Generally the participants liked the concept of rewards* and it seems the reward schemes changed the nature of the relationship between the focus group participants and the council, making them more predisposed to engage in the scheme.
2. *Choice was essential.* Each focus group had a mix of participants, some who felt more motivated by community-based rewards and those calling for more appealing rewards for individuals.
3. *Prize draw models carried little appeal.* Some participants suggested including the option within a wider selection of rewards. Most participants preferred the idea of a
guaranteed reward, even if something small or something larger they had to work towards through building up points.

4. **Feedback was vital for participants.** In contrast to the scoping reviews, focus group participants did not call for feedback in terms of waste diverted from landfill or increased recycling tonnage. They wanted to know the positive community or benefits of their actions or understand where their recycling goes and what it is used for.

5. **Schemes need to be designed in a way that is seen as fair.** Concerns were raised that weight-based schemes reward those who consume more and therefore can recycle more, not those who consciously try to reduce their waste and recycle. Similar concerns were raised by those involved in communal schemes that the rewards are not proportional to their actual recycling effort.

6. **Rewards had a greater behavioural effect when combined with complementary interventions.** As highlighted in both scoping reviews, rewards are more effective as part of a wider package of measures. Participants in all six focus groups emphasised the importance of improved education, communications and outreach, and supporting infrastructure to make it easier for them to recycle. In particular, the disparity between materials that can technically be recycled and those which the local council will actually collect was highlighted as a constraint.

7. **Participants wanted to see their efforts matched by government and industry.** Though not a new finding, common frustrations mentioned by all groups concerned the barriers to recycling, reuse and repair resulting from irresponsible industry practices.

8. **Participants were keen to engage in discussions about recycling and waste prevention.** This may be an artefact of self-selection bias in the recruitment process, but all focus group participants were very open and keen to discuss their views and experiences of waste.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This technical report is the third of three that present the full findings of the Defra-commissioned project ‘Review of evidence on the use of reward and recognition schemes in enhancing recycling and waste prevention behaviours’ (EV0528), which was conducted by Policy Studies Institute. This report covers the method and findings of the five case studies and six supplementary focus groups conducted in Phase 3 of the project.

The key objective of the project was to assess critically and summarise the existing evidence about the role of reward and recognition schemes in influencing behaviour, in particular, recycling and waste prevention behaviours. The central research question for the project was: **How effective, and cost-effective, are reward and recognition schemes in changing behaviour?**

The project sought to explore the context in which rewards and recognition schemes have been administered to understand what works for which behaviours, with whom, when and in conjunction with which other policy tools. Where possible, the cost-effectiveness of reward and recognition schemes was explored.

**Case study method and limitations**

Having developed a database of past, existing and future reward schemes five schemes were selected for further research. To enable methodological triangulation multiple data sources were used within each case study, including: documentary analysis, telephone interviews and email correspondence with scheme representatives, and secondary analysis of scheme monitoring and/or cost data where possible. Most of the limitations of the case studies relate to the quality of data available. Notably, none of the case study schemes had been subject to rigorous evaluation with matched control groups and few schemes were long-term.

**Focus group method and limitations**

Six focus groups were conducted to explore three schemes explored in the Case Study analysis. These were: 1) the Golden Ticket community reward scheme in Manchester (Case Study 4), 2) the Recyclebank reward scheme targeting individuals in Windsor and Maidenhead, Berkshire (Case Study 5) and, 3) the Recyclebank community-based incentive scheme ‘I Recycled’ in Lambeth, London.

Whilst a careful and systematic analysis has been undertaken on the primary data collected during the focus groups, it is important to highlight the limitations associated with this phase of primary research. Most notably, just six focus groups were undertaken and the groups included only those who are currently recycling. We cannot comment on the perspectives of those who have not engaged in the reward schemes, or why they may not have done so. This means the findings cannot be generalised to the wider population. However, we did gain valuable insights into the scheme attributes that are encouraging engagement amongst those who previously reported recycling very little, and about the scheme perceptions and experiences of conscientious recyclers.

**Summary of the case studies and achievements**

**Case study 1: Recycling Reward Scheme, Ealing, London** - A community competition with prizes of £20,000 to the local wards with the highest and most improved rates of recycling.
• £80,000 total prize money awarded to five local wards;
• No overall increase in recycling participation rate across the Borough but significant increases in some wards;
• 2608 fewer tonnes of waste sent to landfill compared with the same period the year before, equating to £231,100 savings in landfill tax.

Case study 2: Feedback on Food Waste Recycling Trial, Oldham - A Randomised Control Trial to explore the impact of street-based feedback on participation in food waste recycling.

• Feedback had a small but positive impact on participation in the food waste scheme (increased 2.8%), though the longevity of this increase is not clear;
• Feedback had a greater impact on small streets (8-30 households) and where the participation baseline was low;
• The effect of the feedback was cumulative. Receiving a frowning face twice (to show below average performance) had the greatest impact.

Case study 3: Marks and Spencer/Oxfam Clothes Exchange - An incentive scheme which awards individuals with Marks and Spencer vouchers for recycling unwanted clothes through Oxfam.

Since the outset of the scheme, promotional material from Marks and Spencer indicates:

• Over half a million Marks and Spencer customers have donated clothes to Oxfam;
• Voucher redemption rates in Marks and Spencer are close to 50%;
• Over £1.8million has been raised for Oxfam;
• Nearly 3 million garments (over 1,400 tonnes) have been diverted from landfill.

Case study 4: Golden Tickets Recycling Scheme, Manchester - A community incentive scheme which awards households with vouchers for local schools.

It is difficult to determine the influence of the scheme as a significant service change was introduced towards the end of the scheme but:

• Approximately 2300 households included in scheme and five schools in the two areas;
• During the pilot, two participating primary schools collected a combined total of 5759; Golden Tickets, securing awards of £1020 and £1055 respectively
• Some indications of increased participation rates possibly due to pester power of children

Case study 5: Recyclebank, Windsor and Maidenhead, and Halton - An incentive scheme which rewards households for recycling, with points that can be used at local shops and leisure facilities.

• At least 61,000 households covered by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead scheme, and a further 55,000 in Halton, Cheshire;
• Increased recycling participation rates across both pilot schemes, coupled with increases in tonnage of recyclables collected;
• In total, Recyclebank has 14 national reward partners and over 300 local reward partners, providing reported benefits to local economies.

Conclusions from the focus groups conclusions relevant to designing and implementing future waste-related reward and recognition schemes:

9. **Generally the participants liked the concept of rewards;** low to medium recyclers did report greater recycling effort as a result of the reward schemes though many participants were yet to redeem the points they had collected. For these types of individuals, including appealing rewards in a wider package of measures intended to influence behaviour could tip them into the habit of recycling. For high recyclers, the self-reported behavioural impact of rewards was limited, but no adverse impacts were identified, nor any indication of motivational crowding out. High recyclers tended to see the rewards as ‘something for nothing’ and positive recognition of their efforts. Whilst many of these participants were yet to redeem any rewards, it seems the reward scheme changed the nature of the relationship between the focus group participants and the Council, making them more predisposed to engage in the scheme.

10. **Choice was essential.** Each focus group, be it with new or existing recyclers, included a mix of participants who felt more motivated by community-based rewards and those calling for more appealing rewards for individuals. Many participants appreciated community or charity rewards for providing an additional societal benefit to their recycling efforts (particularly for smaller charities and local causes), but most felt there should be options for both individual and community rewards. With respect to individual rewards, participants indicated a lack of interest in rewards tied to minimum spends or those trying to encourage them to go to places they would not normally visit. Participants called for a wider variety of rewards to choose from, including: reductions in council tax bills (perhaps the most frequently volunteered suggestion); rewards linked to transport, such as reduced fares or free passes; rewards linked to leisure time, be it free gym passes and swimming sessions or days out for the family; or rewards linked to improvements in local recycling service provision, for example being given a free green bin.

11. **Prize draw models carried little appeal for participants.** Some participants suggested including the option within a wider selection of rewards, depending on the nature of the prize and the odds of winning. Most participants preferred the idea of a guaranteed reward, even if something small or something larger they had to work towards through building up points over time.

12. **Feedback was vital.** Unlike much of the discussion about feedback in the two scoping reviews completed earlier in the project, focus group participants did not call for feedback in terms of waste diverted from landfill or increased recycling tonnage. They wanted to know the positive community benefits of their actions (how many Golden Tickets had the schools collected? What equipment had they bought?) or to see where their recycling goes, what is it used to produce and what quantity of resources were saved. In part, the latter type of feedback stems from participants’ desire for reassurance that their recycling is not being sent to landfill or exported to be dealt with elsewhere; a concern emerging from perceptions that their carefully separated recycling
is being dumped together, or in response to documentaries or media images related to waste.

13. **Schemes need to be designed in a way that is seen as fair.** In part this relates to how the rewards are determined; for example, concerns were raised that weight-based schemes would reward those who consume more and therefore can recycle more rather than those who consciously try to reduce their waste and recycling. Similarly, concerns were raised by those involved in communal schemes that the rewards received are not proportional to their actual recycling effort since they just receive rewards based on the total weight of communal recycling. On a different note, participants felt the online system of claiming rewards may work against those who are less computer literate or without regular access to the internet, and suggested a system based on individual reward ‘swipe cards’ may be fairer from this perspective.

14. **Rewards appeared to have a greater behavioural effect when combined with complementary interventions.** As highlighted in both scoping reviews, rewards are more effective as part of a wider package of measures intended to encourage recycling and waste prevention participation. Participants in all six focus groups emphasised the importance of improved education (from school onwards), communications and outreach, and supporting infrastructure to make it easier for them to recycle. In particular, a key constraint highlighted by both new and existing recyclers was the disparity between materials that can technically be recycled and those which the local council will actually collect. For existing recyclers, this leads to frustration as they cannot recycle all that they would like to, whilst for new recyclers, it leads to confusion and anxiety about what can and cannot be recycled. The importance of supporting infrastructure was particularly apparent in discussions with the new and existing recyclers in Maidenhead; both groups highlighted the importance of the new blue Recyclebank wheelie bin in encouraging increased recycling, in part because it has made recycling much easier and less time-consuming (all materials go in one bin) and in part because they are no longer discouraged when they see all their recycling being emptied into the same van.

15. **Participants wanted to see their efforts matched by government and industry.** Though not a new finding, common frustrations mentioned by all groups concerned the barriers to recycling, reuse and repair resulting from wasteful industry practices.

16. **Participants were keen to engage in discussions about recycling and waste prevention.** This may be an artefact of self-selection bias in the recruitment process, but all focus group participants were very open and keen to discuss their views and experiences of waste.
1 INTRODUCTION

This technical report is the third of three that present the full findings of the Defra-commissioned project ‘Review of evidence on the use of reward and recognition schemes in enhancing recycling and waste prevention behaviours’ (EV0528), which was conducted by Policy Studies Institute. The report covers the method and findings of the case studies and focus groups conducted in Phase 3 of the project that explored waste-related reward and recognition schemes.

The content of the project’s three technical reports, technical annex and Synthesis Report is outlined in the ‘
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WHICH REPORT?

The findings from this research project are presented in five reports. This page is intended to guide you towards the report that will be of greatest use for you. There is a synthesis, or summary report, looking across the whole project. This is supported by a detailed report on the findings from each of the three phases of the research, each of which presents a brief method statement and an explanation of the underlying theory.

In addition there is a technical annex which provides a detailed method. It includes materials relevant to the context or delivery of the project which would be required to repeat the approaches used, but which are too lengthy or detailed for inclusion in the main reports, for example, the scoping review search strategies and focus group topic guide.

Synthesis Report
This report moves towards an understanding of what makes an effective model for reward and recognition schemes intended to encourage household waste-related behaviour change by drawing on all three phases of the research. It draws out key practical implications for those involved in developing, delivery or implementation of waste-related reward and recognition schemes.

Phase 1 Report: Scoping review of evidence on the use of reward and recognition schemes in enhancing recycling and waste prevention behaviours
This report would be of most use for those interested in the detail of the evidence available specifically related to waste-related behaviours.

It presents the findings from the Phase 1 of the project - a scoping literature review - which identified and synthesised existing evidence on the role of reward and recognition schemes in changing household waste behaviours.

Phase 2 Report: Scoping review of evidence on the use of reward and recognition schemes in enhancing non-waste behaviours
This report, on the evidence from a literature with widened scope, would be of most use to those interested in the wider evidence about the effectiveness of reward and recognition schemes in changing behaviour.

There is a brief summary of cross-cutting findings, drawing out lessons applicable to household waste-related behaviour change. The main body of the report consists of a series of mini-reviews summarising the evidence identified in each behavioural area, which were: health, education, volunteering and sustainable use of: food, water, transport and energy, volunteering.

Phase 3 Report: Case studies and focus groups exploring waste-related reward and recognition schemes
This report would be of most use for those looking for descriptions and participant experiences of real-world reward and recognition schemes to understand strengths and weaknesses of potential models. Five case studies were developed, complemented by focus groups involving participants of some of the case study schemes.
Key findings from case studies and focus groups for waste-related reward and recognition schemes

While the case studies provide valuable insights, it should be noted that no robust evaluation data was available for any of the five schemes considered. Addressing this lack of evaluation data is a key learning point from the case studies and the broader project. Evaluations should also consider the longevity of scheme impacts, considering how engagement varies during an ongoing scheme and also what happens to behaviours when schemes come to an end.

Neither case studies nor focus groups are designed to produce generalisable results, but provide insight into how people view and experience initiatives on the ground, which can be invaluable in terms of designing and delivery of schemes.

While the schemes studied appear to be associated with behaviours such as increased recycling participation or tonnages it is not clear which elements of the schemes, e.g. communications, infrastructure or rewards, or other external changes are responsible for the changes observed. The mechanisms by which schemes work would benefit from further research.

Lessons from the case studies include:

5. The reference point used for community competitions should be considered. Community-based schemes require participants to connect with the defined community.
6. There can be a need for communications that appeal to diverse community groups, perhaps combining non-English language publications with more intensive outreach efforts for groups that face more specific barriers to participation; a finding supported in the focus groups.
7. Incentives worked most effectively when they appealed to the interests of those targeted. Manchester’s Golden Ticket scheme appears to have worked in areas where people indicated that educational attainment was important to them, so they were interested in helping local schools by collecting the Tickets.
8. There appears to be value in involving children in schemes and building on existing communities (in the case of the Golden Ticket scheme, within primary schools), and using carefully designed incentive schemes to encourage healthy competition between schools or neighbourhoods.

Lessons from the focus groups include:

17. Generally the participants liked the concept of rewards and it seems the reward schemes changed the nature of the relationship between the focus group participants and the council, making them more predisposed to engage in the scheme.
18. Choice was essential. Each focus group had a mix of participants, some who felt more motivated by community-based rewards and those calling for more appealing rewards for individuals.
19. Prize draw models carried little appeal. Some participants suggested including the option within a wider selection of rewards. Most participants preferred the idea of a guaranteed reward, even if something small or something larger they had to work towards through building up points.
20. Feedback was vital for participants. In contrast to the scoping reviews, focus group participants did not call for feedback in terms of waste diverted from landfill or increased recycling tonnage. They wanted to know the positive community or benefits of their actions or understand where their recycling goes and what it is used for.
21. Schemes need to be designed in a way that is seen as fair. Concerns were raised that weight-based schemes reward those who consume more and therefore can recycle more, not those who consciously try to reduce their waste and recycle. Similar concerns were raised by those involved in communal schemes that the rewards are not proportional to their actual recycling effort.
22. Rewards had a greater behavioural effect when combined with complementary interventions.

As highlighted in both scoping reviews, rewards are more effective as part of a wider package of measures. Participants in all six focus groups emphasised the importance of improved education, communications and outreach, and supporting infrastructure to make it easier for them to recycle. In particular, the disparity between materials that can technically be recycled and those which the local council will actually collect was highlighted as a constraint.

23. Participants wanted to see their efforts matched by government and industry. Though not a new finding, common frustrations mentioned by all groups concerned the barriers to recycling, reuse and repair resulting from irresponsible industry practices.

24. Participants were keen to engage in discussions about recycling and waste prevention. This may be an artefact of self-selection bias in the recruitment process, but all focus group participants were very open and keen to discuss their views and experiences of waste.

’ section at the beginning of the report. This report should be read in conjunction with the Synthesis Report and other technical reports to gain a full understanding of the project’s findings.

1.1 RESEARCH AIMS

The overall aims of the project were to:

- Identify and synthesise the existing evidence on the role of reward and recognition schemes in changing waste prevention and recycling behaviours (Phase 1);
- Draw transferable lessons where appropriate from the evidence on the role of reward and recognition schemes in changing non-waste pro-environmental behaviours (relating to sustainable transport, energy, water and food consumption) and those relating to health, education and volunteering (Phase 2);
- Identify and capture learning from recent waste-related reward and recognition schemes which are not yet reported on within the literature, presented as five concise case studies (Phase 3);
- Understand participants’ perceptions of, and reported responses to, such schemes, through six focus groups (Phase 3);
- Highlight future research needs and policy opportunities for testing and building on the insights gained from past and current reward and recognition schemes.

The Phase 1 scoping review was supplemented by five exploratory case studies which were developed in Phase 3, and sought to:

a. Capture learning from current or recent reward schemes which is not yet available within the published literature;

b. Understand the extent to which these schemes are being evaluated and opportunities for an improved approach to evaluation in future schemes.

c. Understand the potential for reward schemes to motivate positive waste behaviours (where monitoring and/or evaluation data is available), focusing on: whether the schemes have resulted in the desired outcomes; critical success factors; and lessons for future scaling up or replication of such schemes.

The aims of the focus groups carried out in Phase 3 were two-fold:

a. To build on and explore further some of the findings emerging from the case study analysis;
b. To gain initial insights in relation to research gaps identified in the Phase 1 scoping review, with a view to informing future pilot interventions intended to enhance engagement in recycling and waste prevention behaviours.
The overarching research question kept in mind throughout each phase of the project was:

**How effective and cost-effective are reward and recognition schemes in changing behaviour?**

In this phase of primary research the central research question was:

**What are the perceptions, and reported responses to, rewards amongst participants of recent recycling reward schemes?**

Beneath this lay a number of more specific questions:

- **Scheme perceptions and impact**: How do participants perceive these reward-based schemes? To what extent do participants report changing their behaviour in response to rewards?
- **Reward type**: Is there a clear preference for individual or community rewards? How do perceptions of probabilistic (e.g. prize draw-based) rewards compare to guaranteed rewards (e.g. vouchers, cash, gifts)? Do any rewards appeal across the board?
- **Critical success factors**: What context-specific issues (for example, relating to communications or service provision) help or hinder the success of reward schemes?
- **Secondary effects**: are there any adverse outcomes of offering rewards? For example, do individual reward schemes encourage greater consumption amongst participants or are rewards just seen as a cash replacement? Is there any evidence of ‘motivational crowding out’ amongst those already classified as high recyclers? Is there any evidence of interventions targeting recycling leading to greater self-reported participation in (or at least awareness of) wider waste prevention or non-waste related pro-environmental behaviours (i.e. spillover effects)?

**1.3 THIS REPORT**

This technical report is intended to cover all aspects of the work conducted in the Phase 3 case studies and focus groups.

This section has places this phase of the project in the context of the overall project, its aims and the research questions it was intended to address

Section Error! Reference source not found. outlines the overall methodology of the project and details the methods used in the Phase 3 case studies and focus groups and discusses their limitations.

Section 3 brings together all the information collected on the case study schemes. This section includes specific comments on the case study schemes made by participants in the focus groups.

The work to develop a typology of reward and recognition schemes is documented in section 4.

Cross cutting findings from the focus groups related to the project’s research questions are given in section 5.

---

1 As discussed in the Phase 1 Report, Frey’s theory of ‘motivational crowding out’ suggests that extrinsic incentives can serve to ‘crowd out’ or undermine intrinsic motivations, primarily when: (a) the external incentive lowers an individual’s level of self-determination (i.e. their sense of competence, autonomy and personal commitment), such that intrinsic motivation is substituted by extrinsic control; or (b) an individual’s internal motivations for participating are ignored or overlooked by the incentive-based intervention (Frey and Jegen, 2001).
A phased approach was adopted in this project, as illustrated in Figure 1 below, with the findings of the first phase determining the nature of activities undertaken in the second. In this section, we summarise the methods used in case studies and focus groups and discuss their limitations.

Figure 1: Overall project structure

2.1 CASE STUDIES METHOD

Which schemes?

Having developed a database of past, existing and future reward schemes\(^1\) (see Annex 3 of the Technical Annex), criteria were developed to identify five schemes for further research. Whilst we had hoped to capture learning from a range of different types of schemes in the case studies (including those offering individual and community rewards), relatively few examples of reward and recognition schemes could be found that related to non-recycling behaviours; those that were identified related largely to recycling. We found no examples of reward or recognition schemes that encourage people to repair items.

Initial contact was made with representatives of current schemes in order to determine: (a) willingness of scheme coordinators to allow the scheme to feature as a case study; (b) availability of, and willingness to share, scheme data (relating to, for example, participation rates, vouchers awarded and redeemed, waste diverted, cost data etc.); (c) interest of key scheme representatives in

---

\(^1\) Drawing on the sources identified through the Phase 1 review, correspondence with relevant organisations, and snowballing.
taking part in a telephone interview in order to discuss the success (or otherwise) of the scheme, any particularly effective (and less effective) scheme attributes, and key lessons for future schemes etc.

Following these conversations and in liaison with Defra, five schemes were chosen for further research, including:

- Case study 1: Recycling Reward Incentive Scheme, Ealing, London
- Case study 2: Feedback on Food Waste Recycling Trial, Oldham
- Case study 3: Marks and Spencer/Oxfam Clothes Exchange
- Case study 4: Manchester Golden Ticket Recycling
- Case study 5: Recyclebank (Windsor and Maidenhead, Berkshire and Halton, Cheshire).

**Why case studies?**

Case studies are described by Yin (2003: 1) as ‘the preferred strategy when “how” or “why” questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real life context’. Since the research team was not directly involved in implementing or evaluating the five schemes, this case study method was deemed appropriate for gaining initial insights from the schemes into the potential of reward-based interventions to influence recycling behaviour.

**Case study methods**

Multiple data sources were used within each case study to enable methodological triangulation, including: documentary analysis, telephone interviews and email correspondence with scheme representatives, and secondary analysis of scheme monitoring and/or cost data where possible (for example, in Ealing and Oldham – see Annexes 4a and 4b in the Technical Annex, respectively, for an explanation of the secondary analyses undertaken).

Whilst these sources did provide valuable insights into how the schemes were intended to work, there was no robust evaluation data available for any of the case study schemes, which unfortunately limited the potential to draw robust reliable conclusions (these limitations are discussed further below).

The case study analysis began in Phase 1 and was refined and completed in Phase 3.

**2.2 CASE STUDY LIMITATIONS**

Most of the limitations relate to the quality of data available for use within the case studies. Notably, none of the case study schemes had been subject to rigorous evaluation with matched control groups and few schemes were long-term. The data provided by scheme representatives was often incomplete or provided without contextual methodological details (such as sample size, composition or monitoring methods). In some cases, no monitoring data was available; only secondary reports written for other purposes. In other cases, the final monitoring was underway but not yet complete. It was not possible in any of the schemes to gauge accurately whether changes in observed recycling performance since the introduction of the scheme were directly attributable to the scheme, or part of a longer-term trend. None of the co-ordinators of the completed schemes had gone back to measure current recycling performance, and therefore no conclusions could be drawn regarding the longevity of effect of such schemes. Few schemes were able to provide the data necessary to do a

---

3 An issue which is being addressed in Defra’s recently commissioned Reward and Recognition pilots.
robust cost-effectiveness calculation. Finally, all case studies sought to include at least one interview with scheme representatives to try to understand the reasons behind any observed trends in the data, but much of the information provided in the interviews appeared to be based on anecdotal experiences, rather than robust qualitative research.

In addition to these broad limitations, we have also sought to flag up specific issues within each case study report where appropriate and have included sub-sections within each case study report highlighting the sources used.

Nonetheless, while the case studies (and the long-list of schemes used to identify the case studies) were not intended to be representative or comparable, but they do provide valuable insights concerning:

- the diversity of schemes underway;
- the types of partnerships forged to implement these schemes and the different motivations of those involved;
- the importance of introducing a more robust, systematic evaluation element into any future reward and/or recognition scheme; and
- factors that may be contributing to scheme success (or otherwise) that could usefully be verified or challenged by more robust research in the future.

2.3 FOCUS GROUPS METHOD

Why focus groups?

The advantage of focus groups in this context is that they ‘allow for a variety of views to emerge, while group dynamics can often allow for the stimulation of new perspectives’ (Gray, 2009: 223). As highlighted by Finch and Lewis (2003: 172), the stronger social setting of a focus group (as opposed to a questionnaire or individual interview) ensures conversation ‘reflects the social constructions – normative influences, collective as well as individual self-identity, shared meanings – that are an important part of the way in which we perceive, experience and understand the world around us’. This is important as recycling behaviour tends to be strongly affected by prevailing social norms (Tucker and Douglas, 2006).

Focus group composition and discussion themes

In light of the research gaps, identified in Phase 1 six focus groups were undertaken with participants engaged in recent recycling-related reward and recognition schemes, focusing on those included in the Phase 1 Case Study Analysis: the Golden Ticket community reward scheme in Manchester, and the Recyclebank reward schemes targeting individuals in Windsor and Maidenhead and, more recently, Lambeth. These schemes captured a diversity of possible rewards, and were sufficiently recent (and ongoing, in the case of Recyclebank) to gain participant perspectives that are less likely to be compromised by recall bias⁴.

The focus groups were conducted within each scheme area and each consisted of 7-10 participants who were recruited to ensure appropriate group composition, in terms of demographics and recycling habits. For each scheme: (i) one group was held with new recyclers i.e. non or low recyclers who report significant increases in recycling participation as a result of the reward scheme in question; and (ii) another was held with existing recyclers who already recycled conscientiously prior to the reward schemes.

⁴This is a type of systematic bias which occurs when the way a respondent answers a question is affected not just by the correct answer, but also by the (completeness or otherwise of) the respondent’s memory.
to the scheme. These groups were chosen to allow consideration of how perceptions of, and reported responses to, the scheme vary between low and medium-to-high recyclers, and potentially to explore the existence of any ‘motivational crowding out’ effects.

Each focus group lasted 90 minutes. The full topic guide for each focus group is presented in Annex 5 of the Technical Annex (though the scheme-specific section of the guide was tailored for each scheme in question). The themes covered may be broadly summarised as:

- Perceptions of the scheme;
- Positive and negative aspects of the scheme;
- Attitudes to individual versus community rewards;
- Appeal of the specific rewards provided and whether or not they are used as a cash replacement;
- The degree to which the scheme has raised awareness/interest in wider waste prevention behaviours, such as repair, reduce and reuse;
- How participants would modify or redesign the scheme to encourage sustained behaviour change.

**Analysis**

All focus groups were recorded and transcribed in full (with the exception of the first Lambeth group, where technical difficulties compromised the first half of the recording), and the transcripts analysed using the qualitative analysis software, Nvivo 9. This enabled each transcript to be subjected to rigorous grounded and systematic open and axial analysis, following Crang’s (1997) system of thematic ‘open’ and ‘axial’ coding. Open coding involves the identification of themes and topics that emerge from the data, and axial coding is the process of linking or organising these ‘open codes’ into themes and sub-themes, whilst engaging more deeply with the data collected.

### 2.4 FOCUS GROUP LIMITATIONS

Whilst a careful and systematic analysis was undertaken on the primary data collected during the focus groups, it is important to highlight the limitations associated with this phase of primary research. Firstly, just six focus groups were undertaken. The groups included only those who are currently recycling and therefore we cannot comment on the perspectives of those who have not engaged in the reward schemes, or why they may not have done so. This means the findings cannot be generalised to the wider population. However, we did gain valuable insights into the scheme attributes that are encouraging engagement amongst those who previously reported recycling very little, and about the scheme perceptions and experiences of conscientious recyclers.

Secondly, given the tendency for drop-outs amongst focus group participants, Protel Fieldwork were asked to recruit ten people per group, with the expectation that only 6-8 of those recruited would actually attend. In reality, in three focus groups all ten participants attended; this is a large group to manage and can result in reduced contribution to discussion amongst quieter individuals. We sought to prevent this through sensitive facilitation and by breaking into smaller groups during each session at appropriate opportunities.

Thirdly, the limited duration of these reward schemes constrained the extent to which the research was able to explore the impact of rewards on longer-term behaviour change. Similarly, additional research methods, perhaps based on longer-term participant observation and repeated interactions, would be needed to fully understand the implications of rewards for consumption patterns (i.e. to
minimise the risk of social desirability bias, common in research that relies on self-reported behaviours).

Finally, the quality of focus group discussions can be undermined by the tendency for participants to report attitudes and behaviours deemed to be socially desirable (i.e. social desirability bias), rather than discussing their actual attitudes and practices\(^5\). This is a particular risk in the focus group setting due to the group dynamics at play. In an effort to minimise this risk, the focus group topic guides were designed in a way that followed up direct questions about participants’ personal behaviours with further probes to check for any inconsistencies in responses.

\(^5\) Such actual behaviours could only be measured using more resource-intensive approaches such as direct participant observation or taking objective measures of household recycling.
In this section, we have synthesised all the information gathered for each of the five case studies. Included are specific comments made on the case study schemes from the supplementary focus groups, where these are available (Case Study 4, Case Study 5 (Windsor and Maidenhead only) and Recyclebank Lambeth). Cross cutting findings from the focus groups related to the project’s research questions are given in section 5.

Five case studies from Phase 1 were chosen for further research (as discussed above in section 2.1). These were:

- Case study 1: Recycling Reward Incentive Scheme, Ealing, London
- Case study 2: Feedback on Food Waste Recycling Trial, Oldham
- Case study 3: Marks and Spencer/Oxfam Clothes Exchange
- Case study 4: Manchester Golden Ticket Recycling
- Case study 5: Recyclebank (Windsor and Maidenhead, Berkshire and Halton, Cheshire).

The full case studies are presented below. The limitations noted in section 2.2 should be borne in mind when reading them. While the case studies (and the long-list of schemes used to identify the case studies) were not intended to be representative or comparable, they do provide valuable insights concerning:

- the diversity of schemes underway;
- the types of partnerships forged to implement these schemes and the different motivations of those involved;
- the importance of introducing a more robust, systematic evaluation element into any future reward and/or recognition scheme; and
- factors that may be contributing to scheme success (or otherwise) that could usefully be verified or challenged by more robust research in the future.
3.1 CASE STUDY 1: RECYCLING REWARD SCHEME, EALING, LONDON

A community competition with prizes of £20,000 to the local wards with the highest and most improved rates of recycling

- £80,000 total prize money awarded to five local wards;
- No overall increase in recycling participation rate across the Borough but significant increases in some wards;
- 2608 fewer tonnes of waste sent to landfill compared with the same period the year before, equating to £231,100 savings in landfill tax.

3.1.1 HOW IT WORKED

In November 2010, the London Borough of Ealing launched its Recycling Reward Incentive Scheme, to promote participation in doorstep recycling collections. All of the 23 electoral wards in the Borough were eligible to take part. A total of £80,000 in prize money was available, with one award of £20,000 to the ward with the highest overall participation rate and three awards of £20,000 to the wards that improved the most over the competition’s six-month period. The awards were based on participation monitoring rather than the weight of recycling collected. Baseline participation monitoring took place in September 2010 and again in April 2011, and participation was measured according to the standard WRAP recycling participation metric. The results of the competition, and the names of the winning wards, were announced in May 2011 through a feature article in the quarterly ‘Around Ealing’ Council magazine (but no feedback was given to participants during the scheme itself).

The prize money has been awarded to local ward forums, which are led by three locally-elected councillors. Every ward in the Borough already receives an annual £40,000 budget so the prize money will see this increase to £60,000. Anyone is able to attend the forum’s quarterly meetings, which means local people will have a say in how their prize money will be spent. Although the scheme was intended to reward four wards, two wards achieved the same increase in participation and as such have shared their £20,000 equally. This means five wards have benefited. At the time of writing, the four prize-winning wards had not decided how to spend their prize money (this will be announced in the next edition of the ‘Around Ealing’ magazine) but it looks likely that at least one ward (Southfields) plans to invest in more recycling facilities (with some discussion around the installation of a ‘Recycling-on-the-Go’ unit) and wider community assets (e.g. an eco-area within the grounds of a local school).

The scheme was promoted heavily by the Council, particularly prior to its launch and towards the end of the scheme. During the sixth-month period, communications activities included: articles in four separate issues of the Council’s magazine ‘Around Ealing’ (delivered to all households); advertising wraps and feature articles included in the local newspaper (March 2011); ward forum newsletter articles; regular press releases to the local media; lamppost banners through the Borough; schools information packs (including recycling progress chart and stickers); and a leaflet drop to all kerbside properties. In addition, Ealing hosted seven roadshows (in each of the town centres in the Borough) to promote the scheme. Officers from the Recycling Team attended the

---

6 WRAP’s guidance on monitoring and evaluation is available at: [http://www.wrap.org.uk/content/monitoring-and-evaluation-guidance](http://www.wrap.org.uk/content/monitoring-and-evaluation-guidance)
roadshows to promote the scheme and to answer questions about the Council’s recycling services and provide give-aways and freebies to promote recycling.

The scheme was a manifesto commitment of the Labour Party, which came into office at Ealing in May 2010 (previously it had been Conservative). The scheme was funded by Ealing Civic Improvement Fund (ECIF). Despite being implemented during a period of significant funding cuts (therefore risking accusations of unnecessary spending), the scheme was apparently well-received at the road show events.

3.1.2 WHAT INFLUENCE HAS THE SCHEME HAD?

Whilst not rigorously evaluated, the monitoring data available suggests variable changes in recycling participation across the wards engaged in the scheme, with participation increasing in some wards and decreasing in others. For example, the ward of South Acton, which had the most improved recycling rates, saw its green box, food waste and plastics participation increase by 8.1%, 12.5% and 6.2% respectively (an overall increase in recycling participation of 6.10%). Of the 23 wards in Ealing, recycling participation increased in 12 wards by an average of 2.3%. However, the average changes in recycling participation rate across all the wards in the Borough was actually a decrease; in 10 wards, participation rates decreased (by as much as 6.2% in one ward, and by an average of 6.2% across all 10 wards). However, it must be noted that the lack of control groups or a counterfactual limits the extent to which any changes in participation within or across wards can be attributed to the scheme itself as opposed to wider external factors that may be acting to influence recycling. Furthermore, data limitations and differences in data collection methods between 2009 and 2011 have hindered efforts to gain an accurate indication of whether the observed changes in participation are due to the scheme or part of an ongoing trend in recycling participation across in the Borough (see Annex 4a in the Technical Annex).

From November 2010 to March 2011 (the communications campaign period for the Recycling Rewards Scheme) there was an increase of 370 tonnes in the amount of kerbside recycling collected (green box, food waste and plastic) compared with the same period the year before. In addition to recycling tonnages increasing, overall waste arisings fell by 2238 tonnes from November 2010 to March 2011 compared with the same period the year before. Though not explicitly explored with participating residents, this may be due to an increased overall awareness of waste minimisation and sustainable waste practices, as part of the Recycling Rewards communication campaign. The average recycling rate over the Recycling Rewards campaign period (November 2010 to March 2011) was 37.4%, an increase of 1.2% on the same period the previous year.

In total, 2608 fewer tonnes of waste were sent to landfill from November 2010 to March 2011 (the Recycling Rewards communications campaign period), compared with the same period the year before. This equates to £231,148.30 savings in landfill tax (2607.72 tonnes multiplied by £88.64 per tonne of waste sent to landfill).

Drawing on cost data (the £80,000 reward money, together with a £30,000 budget for communications) and figures indicating a reduction in waste sent to landfill of 2608 tonnes during the scheme period, the cost-benefit figure for the scheme is £42 per tonne of waste averted.

Although participation rates in the food waste recycling service decreased slightly from September 2010 to April 2011, an additional 332 tonnes were collected between November 2010 and March

---

7 In using this figure, this cost-benefit calculation accounts for the significant reductions in waste arising resulting not only from increased recycling but also from increased awareness of the need for waste prevention more broadly.
2011 compared with the year before. The Council representative interviewed supposed the increase in tonnage may be due to the introduction of kitchen caddies in July 2010. It is unclear why the food waste scheme participation rate is down; whilst we could speculate that residents are *producing* less food waste to be recycled, the Council suspect it may be because the free caddy liners provided in July 2010 may have run out and not yet been replaced by residents such that they are no longer *setting out* their food waste (however, there is no robust data to be able to confirm or refute this and it could be due to a range of other factors, such as financial/general economic climate/food waste awareness).

The Council does not have data to explain why the scheme had a greater impact in some wards than others. They are not aware of any specific activities that took place in the wards that did well in the scheme, and noted that no other local campaigns or infrastructural changes were implemented at the same time as the scheme. However, they did provide ward-based ACORN data highlighting that the lowest-performing wards (Southall Green, Southall Broadway and Dormers Wells) tend to be less affluent, more ethnically diverse and more transient, i.e. the communications approach adopted by the scheme may not have been the most effective for encouraging participation amongst these groups. It was suggested by the Council that future schemes could benefit from providing non-English language publications, advertising in publications other than ‘Around Ealing’ and undertaking more intensive face-to-face outreach work (though it is not clear whether this would be cost-effective). In contrast, the highest performing wards (e.g. Elthorne, Hobbayne, Northfields) include more of the types of individuals who are thought to be more likely to engage in waste prevention and recycling behaviours (Cox et al., 2010b) i.e. middle-to-high income, living in larger properties, and in some cases more pro-environmental. Even amongst the ‘best improver’ wards that did not have particularly high recycling participation rates prior to the scheme (such as South Acton, Northolt Mandeville and Southfields), the resident profile includes more ‘educated urbanites’, ‘aspiring singles’, ‘starting out’ and ‘young professionals’ (though still with low income, multi-ethnic groups).

### 3.1.3 KEY LESSONS

- The reference point used for community competitions is important. Ealing used electoral wards as the basis of their competition because of existing recycling collections but, on reflection, felt ward-based schemes might not have appealed to all residents. Community-based schemes require participants to connect with the defined community.
- Indicates a need for communications that appeal to diverse community groups, perhaps combining non-English language publications with more intensive face-to-face outreach efforts for groups that face more specific barriers to participation; a finding mirrored in our focus group discussions.

### 3.1.4 SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS

Personal correspondence with London Borough of Ealing (via telephone and email).


Recycling participation data shared by the London Borough of Ealing.

Whilst recycling participation data was made available by the London Borough of Ealing to explore differences in rates pre- and post-scheme implementation, changes in data collection methods from past years hindered efforts to understand whether the differences observed were just part of a
longer-term ongoing trend towards increased recycling in the Borough, or whether they represented a significant deviation from this trend. Furthermore, no qualitative work has been undertaken by the Council to explore the factors underlying the wide variation in participation between wards. Therefore, many of the suggested causes are based on anecdotal evidence which may best be interpreted as hypotheses to be explored in further research.
3.2 CASE STUDY 2: FEEDBACK ON FOOD WASTE RECYCLING TRIAL, OLDHAM

A Randomised Control Trial to explore the impact of street-based feedback on participation in food waste recycling

- Feedback had a small but positive impact on participation in the food waste scheme (increased 2.8%), though the longevity of this increase is not clear;
- Feedback had a greater impact on small streets (8-30 households) and where the participation baseline was low;
- The effect of the feedback was cumulative. Receiving a frowning face twice (to show below average performance) had the greatest impact.

3.2.1 HOW IT WORKED

During the autumn of 2009, the University of Manchester – in collaboration with Oldham City Council and a local recycling charity – ran a Randomised Control Trial (RCT). The trial, which was part of an ESRC-funded project, asked whether the use of tailored feedback could be used to encourage participation in a kerbside food waste recycling scheme. The rationale for the trial was that most people underestimate the extent to which their peers engage in pro-social behaviour and compare their own behaviour to these under-estimates.

Recycling participation rates were monitored for a three-week period, to establish a baseline recycling rate. Households were then randomly assigned\(^8\) to two groups based on collection rounds, existing recycling participation\(^9\) and street size; a control group (which received no feedback and consisted of 5009 households in 159 streets) and a treatment group (which did receive feedback and included 4073 households in 159 streets). A total of 9082 properties located in 318 streets were included in the trial\(^10\).

Each house in the treatment group then received a postcard which provided feedback on how their street was performing compared to the average for their neighbourhood\(^11\). Those on a street with a participation rate that was above the average received a smiley face and those on streets that were below average received a frown. Feedback was provided twice during the study, and participation rates were measured over the three-week periods following the postcard distribution.

The research team was responsible for monitoring and producing the feedback, whilst the recycling charity, which ran the kerbside collection scheme, delivered the postcards. The majority of the

---

\(^8\) Randomly assigning households to a control or treatment group does not guarantee that the two groups are ‘matched’, only that differences observed are more likely to be due to chance or the intervention.

\(^9\) Following WRAP guidance, any participant who set out a food waste caddy at least once over the three-week monitoring period was deemed to be participating.

\(^10\) Recognising that households are clustered in streets, the researchers noted the need for the street sample size to account for the likelihood of correlation within the clusters. They estimated that at least 93 streets would be needed with an average of 60 households in each street for each group to gain 80% of statistical power; a figure exceeded in the final sample (see Nomura et al., 2011, for further discussion of this).

\(^11\) N.B. Whilst participation data was collected on a household-by-household basis, the feedback presented focused on the average performance of each street in comparison to the *neighbourhood average*. 
scheme costs (approximately £15,000 in total) were met by the research team, with a small contribution from Oldham Council.

3.2.2 WHAT WERE THE RESULTS OF THE TRIAL?

The use of a control group and the randomised nature of the trial enabled the research team to undertake more robust statistical analysis of the results than that undertaken in the other case studies (whilst acknowledging the short duration of the trial). House, street and area variables were all included in the analysis (to see how geographical area impacted on the results), and deprivation levels and the proportion of single person households were also considered.

The results of the trial found that providing feedback had a modest positive impact on participation in the food waste collection scheme, with an effect size of 2.8%. The trial suggested that the impact of the feedback was cumulative; the first postcard had no significant effect but the cumulative effect of two feedback cards was significant. The impact was greater on streets that were small (with between 8 and 30 households) and where the baseline was low. The trial also found that feedback works equally well whether it is positive or negative, provided a consistent message is delivered; the effect was greatest on households that received either two smiley feedback cards or two frowning cards.

It should be noted that, whilst the study design and data collection were rigorous, the trial was only short, lasting for a total of eight weeks. Therefore, while the results are robust, it is not clear whether the increased participation caused by the feedback was sustained in the long-term.

Another valuable finding was that the ‘frown’ feedback cards appeared to have had a detrimental effect amongst households that were participating in food waste recycling on otherwise on low performing streets. Given the lack of qualitative research with individual households within the trial, the research team is unable to conclude precisely why this is the case; in a paper summarising the trial (currently under peer-review), the team hypothesises (drawing on social norm theory) that it may be because such participants were discouraged to learn that others in their street were not also taking part (i.e. they felt their personal efforts were being undermined by the lack of effort on the part of their neighbours) and perhaps lowered their performance to adhere to the prevailing recycling norm. Further research would be needed to explore this further.

In addition, the research team found that the feedback had a positive impact on contamination rates. On the reverse of the feedback postcards, information was included about how to participate in the scheme and how to use the bins correctly, including information about ensuring plastic carrier bags were not used as bin liners. The trial found that contamination rates decreased over time and was particularly useful as a means of providing feedback to those who might be using the scheme for the first time. One member of the research team suggested that the provision of the feedback itself could be more effective if delivered continuously to remind the residents about recycling or with other incentives. The team suggested local authorities could consider setting a target for residents to reach in terms of food waste recycling participation, and promise a small (1%) council tax rebate if the target is met.

Efforts have been made to calculate the cost-effectiveness of the feedback intervention but this should be interpreted with caution due to data limitations (see Annex 4b for a full discussion of these).
3.2.3 KEY LESSONS

- In this study, normative feedback did produce a positive impact on participation but the impact was small. There is some indication that the impact was greater on streets that were small (i.e. streets with between 8 and 30 households\(^{12}\)) and where the baseline was low, but this requires further research in a longer-term trial.

- The impact of the feedback was cumulative; receiving the same face twice had the greatest impact on household food waste recycling participation. However, the trial only explored the short-term impact of feedback so the longevity of the reported impact is not clear.

- Feedback cards with a frown face appeared to have had a detrimental effect on those who were already participating in the scheme but who were on otherwise low performing streets, though the research team was only able to speculate on the reason for this.

3.2.4 OTHER FEEDBACK RESEARCH PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin Cam, University of Newcastle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An interdisciplinary project exploring the use of ‘Bin Cam’, a kitchen bin which photographs the waste inside. Images of the bin’s contents are automatically uploaded to a Facebook application. Researchers at the University of Newcastle are seeing whether feedback and peer pressure can be used to encourage students to recycle more of their waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See: <a href="http://di.ncl.ac.uk/bincam/">http://di.ncl.ac.uk/bincam/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARM, University of Kingston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHARM is considering the ways in which a ‘social norm’ approach can encourage pro-social behaviours, such as the promotion of healthy lifestyles and reduced energy use. The project is employing a range of digital technologies – including mobile phones, energy monitors and GPS – to provide social norm feedback to community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See: <a href="http://www.projectcharm.info/">http://www.projectcharm.info/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.5 SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS


Personal correspondence (email and telephone) with research team.

As discussed above, this case study was informed by the findings of a Randomised Control Trial. While the results were robust, the short-term nature of the trial in a small geographical area hinders efforts to understand the long-term effects of the feedback intervention, and its cost-effectiveness and transferability to other contexts over time.

---

\(^{12}\) This definition of ‘small’ was identified in personal correspondence with the research team.
3.3 CASE STUDY 3: MARKS AND SPENCER/OXFAM CLOTHES EXCHANGE

An incentive scheme which awards individuals with Marks and Spencer vouchers for recycling unwanted clothes through Oxfam

Since the outset of the scheme, promotional material from Marks and Spencer indicates:

- Over half a million Marks and Spencer customers have donated clothes to Oxfam;
- Voucher redemption rates in Marks and Spencer are close to 50%;
- Over £1.8million has been raised for Oxfam;
- Nearly 3 million garments (over 1,400 tonnes) have been diverted from landfill.

3.3.1 HOW IT WORKS

The Marks and Spencer/Oxfam Clothes Exchange was implemented across the UK in January 2008, following a six-month trial period in which selected ‘audit stores’ found the scheme to be popular, operationally efficient and meeting its objectives (according to personal correspondence with Marks and Spencer). The scheme aims to close the loop between garment sales and their reuse and recycling.

Customers who include at least one item of Marks and Spencer clothing in their donations to Oxfam (and more recently, Marks and Spencer soft furnishings) may request a Marks and Spencer voucher worth £5 to use against their next purchase of over £35 worth of clothing, homeware or beauty products at Marks and Spencer. The Clothes Exchange therefore offers a triple win: it encourages loyalty and raises funds for Oxfam through the reselling of the clothes that customers return; it reduces the number of textiles sent to landfill; and customers receive money off when they shop at Marks and Spencer.

3.3.2 WHAT INFLUENCE HAS THE SCHEME HAD?

In the first 12 months of the scheme, an internal report by Marks and Spencer claims that the Clothes Exchange was able to cost-effectively: (a) divert 3 million garments from landfill; (b) raise £1.8million for Oxfam; (c) save £2.5million for Marks and Spencer customers; and (d) encourage voucher redemption rates for Marks and Spencer products (and correspondingly higher basket sales) that were dramatically higher than those observed for other marketing offers (which does raise questions about the risk of such voucher schemes enhancing consumption). Whilst the scheme has not been able to track whether new customers have been attracted to Marks and Spencer as a result of the vouchers, Marks and Spencer suggests that a complete range of customers are redeeming the vouchers.

According to Oxfam, the scheme has helped enhance donor loyalty to Oxfam at a time when donations have been falling. This decline is in part attributed to the economic recession (with people holding on to clothes for longer and buying less), partly to the shift towards cheaper clothing purchases that are not designed to last, and in part due to the rising value of ‘rag’ and second-hand textiles, such that many competing schemes have emerged over the last few years (many legitimate but also an increasing number of ‘bogus’ collections, including both door-to-door collections and textile bank donations).

The volume and quality of donations have varied since the start of the scheme, but it is not clear to what extent these variations may be attributed to aspects of the scheme itself or to the external
factors discussed above (such as the general trend towards lower quality textiles with the rise of ‘fast fashion’). In relation to the scheme itself, it was highlighted that at its outset regular donors had a greater number of Marks and Spencer items to give, usually offering their highest quality items initially and over time bringing in the lower quality goods (though this observation appears to be based on anecdotal evidence). Apparently, no regional variation has been observed in either the quality or quantity of donations.

Oxfam suggested a significant driver of fluctuations in donation volumes appears to be the season or time of the month; some people save up their donations until spring or autumn when they can use the voucher towards purchases as they are updating their wardrobe. Similarly, since the vouchers can only be redeemed in the same month in which they are issued, regular donors often bring in items at the beginning of the month to allow time to find something they would like to purchase in Marks and Spencer.

Significant marketing accompanied the launch of the scheme, which was important in raising awareness at its outset. Activities included extensive PR from both organisations, coupled with high profile advertising featuring two of the ‘M&S girls’, Laura Bailey and Myleene Klass. Emphasis was placed on ensuring the initiative felt ‘fun, fresh and fashionable’ rather than ‘fusty and worthy’. Whilst limited marketing has occurred since the early stages of the scheme, the Marks and Spencer décor has been refreshed twice since the launch and the complementary Oxfam décor three times. These subsequent activities are not thought to have driven significant changes in actual donations, but serve to enhance awareness and remind people of the scheme.

3.3.3 KEY LESSONS

- Clear support from both organisations’ board leadership was seen as critical to the scheme’s success and sustainability, together with effective management and coordination between the two organisations through the development of a core operating team;
- The scheme relied on the widespread accessibility of both Oxfam and Marks and Spencer stores, together with brand recognition and the effectiveness of Oxfam’s clothing recycling system. Oxfam’s ‘Wastesavers’ facility ensures any donated items that cannot be resold within the store to which it is donated are not wasted, but rather are sorted into three streams: garments for sale in other Oxfam stores, garments for sale in developing countries, and textile waste for recycling.

3.3.4 SIMILAR SCHEMES

**Monsoon Clothes For Life**

Clothing retailer Monsoon offers customers a £10 voucher when they take old items of Monsoon clothing into any store. The voucher can be spent on any item of clothing, and is redeemable on purchases of £50 or more. The clothes are sold to a third party recycler, and the money raised is donated to charity, Newlife. See: [http://www.monsoon.co.uk/corporate-responsibility+culture/clothes-for-life/](http://www.monsoon.co.uk/corporate-responsibility+culture/clothes-for-life/)

3.3.5 SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS

This case study was reliant on secondary sources provided by Marks and Spencer and Oxfam, with no primary data sets made available and no information about the research methods or data collection processes used. We are therefore unable to assure the quality or robustness of conclusions made. The main sources used included:
Telephone interviews with Charity Retail Association and Oxfam.

Email correspondence with, and an internal report provided by, Marks and Spencer.

Telephone interviews with three Textile Recycling Association members.

The following websites:

http://www.oxfam.org.uk/
http://plana.marksandspencer.com/
http://www.charityretail.org.uk/
http://www.textile-recycling.org.uk/
3.4 CASE STUDY 4: GOLDEN TICKETS RECYCLING SCHEME, MANCHESTER

A community incentive scheme which awards households with vouchers for local schools

3.4.1 HOW IT WORKS

Manchester City Council launched its Golden Ticket Recycling Scheme, intended to run from January to May/June 2011, to encourage participation in household recycling. Every time householders put their recycling bin out for collection with the correct materials inside, they were rewarded with a ‘Golden Ticket’ which was attached to the bin’s handle. The tickets were then collected by primary schools, either directly (by children taking them into their schools) or indirectly via local collection points (such as local libraries and community centres). Feedback was provided to both children and parents through scheme ‘totalisers’, which were placed within each school and light up to indicate the number of vouchers collected (see Figure 2).

At the end of the scheme, the schools were able to exchange the tickets for money which could be used to buy equipment (such as books, new technology or sporting equipment) or spent directly within the school.

The scheme operated in two areas within Manchester – Longsight and Sharston (in Wythenshaw) – with the precise operational areas determined by school catchment areas and bin rounds (the scheme included approximately 2300 households overall). Within Longsight, three primary schools benefited from the scheme, with the tickets used to reward food waste recycling (due to the very low rates of food waste recycling previously observed in the area). In Sharston, two schools took part, with the tickets used to reward the recycling of dry recyclables (paper, cardboard, cartons - tetrapak, glass bottles and jars, plastic bottles, tins and cans).

As well as encouraging participation through the collective incentive of rewards for schools, the scheme sought to promote friendly competition between children at the schools in each area, to further drive participation.

The scheme was implemented following a three-month pilot scheme (the ‘Golden Star’ Recycling Reward Scheme) which operated in the Old Moat area of Fallowfield in Manchester between March and June 2010. Manchester Council had a budget of £10,000 to implement the new scheme (including funding the rewards) but, upon the scheme’s completion in May 2011, had spent just £5,035.

3.4.2 WHAT INFLUENCE HAS THE SCHEME HAD?

Given the limited data available, it is difficult to determine the influence of the scheme in the two new catchment areas (the data is confounded as a significant service change was introduced towards the end of the scheme; an alternate weekly collection). However, the decision to roll-out the scheme was based on the Council judging the trial in Old Moat to have been a success. During the pilot, the two participating primary schools collected a combined total of 5759 Golden Tickets, securing them...
awards of £1020 and £1055 respectively. Whilst recycling tonnage data did not show an increase during the pilot period, a representative from Manchester City Council has indicated that the participation rates did increase; it seems that households were putting their bins out more often (suspected by the Council to have resulted from the pester power of children) but, since the allocation of rewards was not weight-based, households may not have been putting any more recycling into their bins.

Whilst no quantitative data is available to explore whether participation rates vary according to participants’ links to the schools, the two focus groups with participants in the Sharston scheme highlight the participation of: (a) households with children at the schools; (b) households who have friends or family with children at the schools; (c) those without links to the schools but who still expressed willingness to help the schools by participating in the scheme. The scheme was of less interest to focus group participants who lived further away from the schools, particularly those without links to the schools or a strong sense of community in the local area.

Although it is not possible to compare the findings from Sharston and Longsight due to the different types of materials included in each scheme (food waste in Longsight, dry recycling in Sharston), early results indicated different levels of success in the two areas. Council officers report that in Sharston the scheme has had a positive impact on recycling participation rates, and the Council has noticed an increase in requests for recycling containers. In Longsight, however, the scheme has had less of an impact. Though not systematically evaluated, the Council suspects these differences may result from a number of contextual differences between the two areas: (a) in Longsight, many large families live in small terraced houses with limited space for separate food waste bins (unlike in Sharston where more households have their own gardens); and (b) local schools are more over-populated in Longsight and, at least amongst some groups, there are particular challenges in encouraging parents to keep their children in school beyond the age of 11. However, the lack of reliable evaluation data and the different types of materials collected by each scheme makes it difficult to draw reliable conclusions concerning the differences in recycling participation observed between the two areas.

Both reward schemes have now finished but the Council is considering the merit of using the scheme in Longsight as a ‘hook’ for going into schools to raise greater awareness of the need for recycling and waste prevention. This is seen as important in the Longsight area, since the introduction in May 2011 of the alternate weekly collection is proving particularly unpopular there.

### 3.4.3 PARTICIPANT VIEWS: PERCEPTION OF SCHEME

Both new and existing recyclers in the Sharston focus groups spoke positively about the Golden Ticket scheme, including a number of participants without any link to the participating schools.

The top-of-mind details volunteered about the scheme by both groups were much the same, focusing on: the distribution of ‘gold labels’ for recycling properly, the promise of computers, sports equipment and books for schools, and the excitement of the children involved; ‘there’s a little boy in our road who used to be out at 8am when the bin men came, in his pyjamas, hoping for the bin men to give him an extra ticket!’ Those who didn’t have children in the participating schools reported collecting tickets for nieces, nephews, grandchildren or the children of friends and neighbours. A couple of the existing recyclers would gather up the tickets from the households on their street and take them into the schools directly.

There was a sense amongst participants in both groups (but particularly the existing recyclers) that the scheme was something positive because it involved the children in recycling and engaged the
wider community; ‘a bit of community spirit, you do it, send them on, the school obviously benefited from it so I think it was good’. The existing recyclers noted improvements in their perceptions of the scheme over time as they saw the effects it was having on the local children: ‘you realised what a success it was really because literally every Monday or Tuesday when the bins were out, the kids would all be coming in and they’d all be like “got my tickets!”’.

The scheme triggered a competition to collect as many tickets as possible, both between residents and amongst the school children; ‘well I had a race because I live in a square, right, so me and my neighbour, we’re the ones that bring the bins in after the bin men had been, so it was a race who got the stickers first, me or the kids going to school. I won most times’ (new recycler, pensioner, Sharston). Whilst the competition element nurtured children’s interest in the scheme, participants in both focus groups highlighted the risk of this approach, such as children trying to ‘pinch’ tickets from other people’s bins, and pressure placed on families to distribute tickets equally between nieces, nephews, children, grandchildren at the school. However, participants felt these adverse effects primarily resulted from an additional promise made by the schools to give individual prizes to the children who brought in the most tickets rather than from the scheme itself; whilst this promise of an individual reward did motivate the children (‘because the kids want more gold stars than what their friends have’ – existing recycler), it also raised complaints that some families knew more people in the local area and so could collect more tickets from their social networks, and concerns that children coming in without a ‘big wad of tickets’ could be stigmatised.

Only one focus group participant, a new recycler and young professional, expressed limited interest in the scheme; he had no connection (direct nor indirect) to the schools, and he did not live in particularly close proximity, and so school-based rewards were not particularly pertinent for him. Similarly, another new recycler highlighted that school-based rewards may not be sufficient to engage those with limited time and competing priorities:

‘I just think that if you were like, you know, a young professional and, you know, by the time you came home it was 8 o’clock at night and then you’re up again in the morning and if you’ve got a busy lifestyle…most people, a lot of people, they don’t speak to their neighbours, they don’t even know who the next door neighbours are...say you had a load [of Golden Tickets] building up and then it’s just like “oh they’re doing my head in, I need to tidy up”, you just end up throwing them away sometimes…I do think they can just be a pest and then they end up going in the recycle bin’ [new recycler, Sharston].

The primary criticism raised by both groups was the lack of publicity and feedback about the Golden Ticket scheme. At the scheme outset, the schools sent out letters to parents, and participants living in the Peel Estate mentioned receiving a newsletter from the local Home Watch but others were not aware of the scheme until the Golden Tickets began appearing on their bins. More importantly, all participants also felt they should have been better informed of the outcomes of the scheme, not necessarily in terms of the impacts on recycling participation but rather in terms of the specific benefit of the scheme for the two local schools. This was particularly apparent amongst the new recyclers, as illustrated by the following collection of quotations:

‘If you know they’ve got computers you’ll think “well, great”’

‘I wanted to know if it had been a positive story, then we’ll all carry on doing it won’t we, you know’

http://www.peel-estate.net/Peel-Estate.net/Welcome.html
‘You’re putting stuff in but you don’t even know what the school got’

‘They had between May and July to say like, “your area collected however many Golden Tickets and it bought two computers, five hundred…whatever”, nobody’s done that’

‘Did they get a little pocket calculator or did they get like a state of the art computer, laptop, you know? Until people have been told what’s happened, what’s the point?’

‘You need to have the feedback. They bring these things in and they just fizzle out, you don’t hear anything about them again. Especially something like this which is quite important, important for the school and important for the environment so, you know, and we’re not getting the end result’

‘They took the trouble to tell you about it in the first place so they should take the trouble to let you know how it’s going, which if anything will encourage you’.

The existing recyclers discussed this to a lesser extent but still made the point that ‘if they do it again, it would be nice for them to publish exactly what people benefited from the last scheme, explain it, if they published exactly what St Elizabeth School and Peel Hall Primary School, what they actually got out of it’. The importance of feedback was also apparent in discussions held by the other groups, as discussed in Section 5.5.3.

3.4.4 PARTICIPANT VIEWS: INFLUENCE OF SCHEMES ON BEHAVIOUR

As expected from the recruitment screening process, there was a clear difference between the perceived impact of the scheme on the recycling behaviour of the new and existing recycler focus groups in Sharston. With the exception of the one new recycler without any specific connections with the participating schools, all participants in the new recycler group felt the scheme had encouraged some increases in their recycling effort; ‘it made me recycle more, definitely’, but they noted that this was not true for everyone in their area; ‘it made me do more but I know how many on my little cul de sac have still got golden tickets dangling from their wheelie bins now and it’s four months after’. Furthermore, when asked if their recycling effort had dropped back since the end of the scheme, most indicated that they had carried on doing it, arguing that ‘it’s a state of mind’, ‘it’s just habit and all’. However, this only seemed to apply to the dry recyclables; when asked if the scheme had made them think more about food waste (which was not explicitly included in the scheme), the general consensus was no, which indicates a lack of spillover. However, a couple of participants did indicate that the introduction of the alternate weekly collection at the end of the scheme had forced them to recycle more of their food waste; ‘now that your black bin is only getting emptied every fortnight you want it keep it as low as you can, so therefore to get rid of the other stuff into the other bins you’re distributing it out, which is keeping your black bin down a bit’. However, this shift to an alternate weekly collection was not very popular, with concerns raised about the impact on larger families. One participant commented ‘well why not reward us by emptying our black bin every week, like we used to have, that would suit me fine, you know, because I mean that is a health risk’.

The impact of the scheme on recycling appears more complex for the existing recyclers. Most said that the scheme hadn’t influenced their personal recycling behaviour, largely because they were already at ‘saturation point’, setting out everything that could be collected locally. However, they still considered the scheme to be important as it was giving something back to the community:

‘It’s not costing you anything is it, to help out, and you’re recycling anyway so why not help the local school, I think it’s a great idea’
'We were already doing the recycling, it's just the ticket added a little bit of a bonus to it'

'It didn’t affect the way I recycled, but I just thought it was a great incentive to give something back to a local school, to be quite honest with you, so even though my children didn’t happen to go there, but obviously I live within that area, I still wanted to do it because it’s, you can help’.

This group also noted the scheme’s positive impacts on those who do not tend to recycle:

‘where we live in our estate, they were very much for it because they want to take the tickets into school so all the neighbours wanted to get the tickets for the kids and it was like this big thing to get these golden tickets, I know that they were really keen at that point to get the brown bins out so you got your tickets’

‘people were more inclined to recycle and do things rather than throw it in the black bin, to get the golden tickets for the kids’.

In contrast to the rest of the group, who seemed to have been conscientious recyclers prior to the scheme, one mother commented that she never used to recycle frequently but that she started doing so after the scheme was introduced ‘because I wanted to sort of set an example to her [her daughter] as well, I wasn’t going to be the only one that, she was going in school and she was like “my mum’s not recycling”, so I did it more for that reason as well’. Similarly, another participant suggested the scheme had increased her sense of guilt for not recycling the little things as she felt she was denying the school its benefits, ‘maybe before the odd little thing I didn’t recycle, so that [the scheme] kind of did motivate me more’.

Given these findings, it is clear that Frey’s theory of motivational crowding out was not apparent amongst this group; rather than the rewards undermining any intrinsic motivation to recycle, they were just seen as an added ‘bonus’; an added community benefit from their efforts. However, given the small sample size, we cannot comment on whether this would be the case for the wider population of existing recyclers.

A further finding from the discussions with existing recyclers concerns the links made with other recycling behaviours. When asked whether the Golden Ticket scheme had also increased their food waste recycling (despite it not being included in the scheme), a number of participants said they were already recycling or composting their food waste. However, one participant commented that she had increased her food waste recycling as ‘you’d feel silly’ doing one and not the other (this may reflect the phenomena of ‘cognitive dissonance’; the idea that people seek to be consistent across related behaviours to conform to a particular self- or social identity, Thørgersen, 2004; Whitmarsh and O’Neill, 2010). Another participant said she had stopped printing spare copies of documents for meetings since the scheme, emailing attendees the documents in advance with a warning that spare copies would not be available. Other than this, none of the participants felt the scheme had made them think about other waste prevention behaviours or pro-environmental behaviours more widely (which many indicated they were doing anyway) as they felt the impact and scope of the scheme was limited to recycling.

3.4.5 KEY LESSONS

- School-based incentives worked best in areas where educational attainment appeared to be is important to people, meaning they were interested in helping local schools by collecting the Tickets.
There was value in involving children in schemes and building on existing communities (in this case, within primary schools), and using carefully designed incentive schemes to encourage healthy competition between schools or neighbourhoods.

3.4.6 SIMILAR SCHEMES

**London 2012 Sport into Schools**

A partnership between LMB Textile Recycling, Wastebuster, and Sports Traider, this new scheme aims to inspire children to encourage their family to reuse or recycle unwanted clothing rather than disposing of it. Textiles donated to textile banks placed in participating schools are rewarded with points which may be exchanged for new sports equipment and coaching. Participating schools also receive free membership to the Wastebuster education programme including cross-curricular films, activities, waste reduction toolkits, news and information and child-led schemes of work – to support schools working towards all levels of Eco-schools accreditation. See:

http://www.wastebuster.co.uk/sport-into-schools

3.4.7 SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS

No monitoring or robust evaluation data was made available for the actual scheme (the value of the data was considered by the Council to be limited due to the confounding influence of the alternate weekly collection roll-out in May 2011), which significantly limits the reliability of conclusions drawn about the scheme, many of which rely on anecdotal evidence from the Council.

The following data sources have been used provide an indication of the scheme’s aims but further research is required to explore its impact on recycling:

Telephone interviews with Manchester City Council (MCC).

Secondary analysis of pilot scheme data provided by MCC.

Two focus groups in Sharston (specific comments relevant to this study are reported above in sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4.

MCC website:

http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/500152/environmental_campaigns/5034/golden_tickets_recycling_scheme/1
3.5 CASE STUDY 5: RECYCLEBANK, WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD, AND HALTON

An incentive scheme which rewards households for recycling, with points that can be used at local shops and leisure facilities

- At least 61,000 households covered by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead scheme, and a further 55,000 in Halton, Cheshire;
- Increased recycling participation rates across both pilot schemes, coupled with increases in tonnage of recyclables collected;
- In total, Recyclebank has 14 national reward partners and over 300 local reward partners, providing reported benefits to local economies.

3.5.1 INTRODUCTION

Recyclebank first began operating in Philadelphia in the United States in 2005 and now operates in more than 20 states, servicing more than two million scheme members. There are three Recyclebank schemes currently operating in the UK. The oldest of these has been running in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM), Berkshire where it was launched in June 2010 following a trial period, while a second scheme was rolled out in Halton, Cheshire in August 2010. In May 2011, the London Borough of Lambeth launched a Recyclebank scheme, ‘I Recycled’, which operates in a different way to the other two schemes and is focused on community estates. This case study focuses primarily on the RBWM and Halton schemes.

3.5.2 HOW IT WORKS

Both the RBWM and Halton schemes operate by providing reward points to participants in exchange for the collection of dry recyclables. All locally collected recyclables (paper, cardboard, plastic bottles, glass bottles and jars, and metals) are placed in a large single blue wheelie bin, which has been embedded with a Radio Frequency Identification Device (RFID). This chip enables individual bins to be linked to households, using encrypted coding, but does not allow for any further identification, such as what is in the householder’s bin. Waste collection vehicles are fitted with scanners and scales, allowing them to capture the weight of the materials collected. This data is then sent to a central database. Once a household has activated their account online, points are awarded based on the weight of the recyclables collected.

Participants claim rewards based on the number of points they collect. In both RBWM and Halton, over 100 local partners redeem Recyclebank points, including retailers (of products such as fashion, beauty, food and drink, and home wares), pharmacies, ‘professional services’ (e.g. dry cleaners), restaurants, and entertainment venues. Points can also be donated to schools as part of Recyclebank’s Green Schools Programme at certain periods during the year.

In addition to this individual household model, there is a community scheme for residents who, for various reasons, do not have access to an individual blue wheelie recycling bin, for example those who live in flats with access only to communal recycling facilities. In this community scheme, residents activate an online account, log in to indicate when they have recycled, and then receive an average number of points calculated on the basis of the total weight of recycling in the communal bin and the number of individuals with access to the bin who report recycling that week.
Recyclebank charges local authorities for the schemes in one of two ways: i) a flat subscription fee levied on all households (regardless of whether the household activates their account) or ii) as a percentage of the landfill diversion savings. Local reward partners do not pay to be involved in the scheme but are responsible for covering the costs of the rewards they offer. National partners (such as Marks and Spencer) pay additional sponsorship fees in exchange for exposure on websites, printed materials and in press releases. The costs of the scheme are largely dependent on existing infrastructure and the scheme model. Both the RBWM and Halton schemes rely on RFID technology which meant both schemes involved a significant upfront investment in infrastructure. In the case of RBWM, this included £900k on new bins and approximately £350k on weighing equipment but the Borough reports these are costs that would have been incurred during infrastructure improvements, regardless of the specific scheme implemented. In the example of Halton the implementation costs were much lower as the Council had already introduced increased capacity in the Borough six months before the scheme started. As a result, the technical costs of implementation were retrofitting RFID tags to wheelie bins, and truck technology. Alternate scheme models are possible which do not depend on weighing collected materials (see details of ‘I Recycled’, below). In addition, RBWM has spent c. £195k on publicity and subscriptions to Recyclebank during the course of the pilot.

As part of this case study we have included some detail of a new scheme ‘I recycled, Lambeth’, because it is based on the Recyclebank model but with some modification. Some of our focus groups included participants in this scheme, so we have included it in an extended “Similar Schemes” section at the end of this case study.

### 3.5.3 WHAT INFLUENCE HAS THE SCHEME HAD?

Recyclebank has recently released performance figures for its first year of operation in both the RBWM and Halton. The press release\(^{14}\) notes that every household across the RBWM is now recycling nearly 50kg more dry recycling than last year (+21%), whilst every Halton household has contributed the equivalent of over 30kg (+33%) on last year\(^{15}\). According to the press release, and drawing on Waste Data Flow data published by Defra\(^{16}\), these figures represent a year-on-year improvement in the proportion of waste sent for recycling of +5.8% in the RBWM and +7.3% in Halton (compared to a national improvement rate in recycling, reuse and composting of just 1.5%). In terms of scheme participation, over 60% of the RBWM’s residents have signed up to the scheme, and over 50% of Halton’s residents have joined.

While the monitoring data suggests positive impacts of the two schemes, some uncertainties do remain about causation and the wider impact of the schemes. Notably, there is a lack of clarity regarding which components of the Recyclebank model cause participation rates to increase. In the US, commentators attribute the scheme’s success to the fact it makes recycling easier (by introducing a single bin) as well as the introduction of the reward scheme (Telker, 2008); this finding also emerged during our two focus groups with scheme participants in Maidenhead. However, it should be noted that a single bin system was only introduced in RBWM (Halton having already switched to a single bin system six months prior to the scheme). In addition, Recyclebank reports that one of the benefits of the scheme is the ‘more fluid communication’ (London Assembly, 2011a: 24) it allows with participants. It is almost impossible to distinguish the relative impact of this communication


\(^{15}\) Note, these figures represent an average across every household in the Borough, not just those who have activated a Recyclebank account.

(which has the potential to be consistent and sustained, if someone logs on to their online account regularly) from the impact of the rewards themselves.

Critics of the Recyclebank model question whether a scheme which encourages consumption (through the offering of vouchers or other salient rewards) can meet waste reduction targets, as a result of potential rebound effects. In their submission to the London Assembly’s Environment Committee, Recyclebank report that scheme participants are using the coupons and vouchers ‘in lieu of cash’ though the evidence to support this relates to the use of vouchers by consumers in general, not research related specifically to Recyclebank vouchers. What is clear is that simply by issuing the vouchers the schemes are intended to appeal to participants’ desire to consume. This is captured in the submission from RBWM to the London Assembly, when the Borough describes the communications component of the scheme: ‘messages not only have to be relational to the achievements or actions made by the members, but also need to speak to the self-serving side of the rewards scheme … Essentially, the scheme makes it OK to be selfish, taking the guilt out of greed’. Despite this, there is no evidence to either confirm or disprove the concern that voucher-based schemes lead to increases in consumption. Many of our focus group participants indicated that they tend not to use vouchers linked to a minimum spend or those for places they would not visit anyway, but this finding is based on a small sample (just four focus groups, two in Maidenhead and two in Lambeth).

It is not clear how successfully the Recyclebank model can promote waste avoidance, when implemented according to the weight-based model used in RBWM and Halton. Although there is a cap on the number of points a household can claim per month, there is no direct incentive to reduce waste (whether this is recyclable or not), and certainly a small number of participants in our Maidenhead focus groups discussed the potential to collect Argos catalogues (or other heavy items) just to increase the weight of the bin. In RBWM, the cap is 450 points which equates to approximately 81.8kg of recyclables per month, or 981kg a year. Current figures suggest the average household in the UK produces 1036kg waste per year (2009/10), of which 411kg is recycled (Defra, 2011). Recyclebank is, however, currently trialling a waste reduction programme in Philadelphia.

3.5.4 PARTICIPANT VIEWS OF THE SCHEMES

The two following subsections present specific comments made on the schemes by participants at the focus groups exploring them. The first covers Recyclebank (RBWM) and the second, I recycled, Lambeth. There are placed here so the specific learning is not lost in the cross cutting reporting of the focus groups in section 5.

Perceptions of the Windsor and Maidenhead Recyclebank scheme were broadly positive amongst focus group participants, with no-one able to identify any negative outcomes of the scheme; ‘the reward scheme’s probably good, have an incentive to recycle rather than being forced to recycle’ [new recycler]. One comment made by one of the existing recyclers (with agreement indicated amongst other participants) concerned the timing of the scheme:

‘Another thing that made me very positive about it is it came out here at a time when other councils in the country were introducing fines and things like that, very negative, and I thought “that’s good for Windsor, to have some sort of incentive scheme rather than a punishment scheme”, so that made me feel sort of warm towards the whole thing and that’s why I got actively involved in it’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead].
In a similar vein, another existing recycler said ‘a lot of people are jealous of the blue bin in other parts of the country!’.

When asked about top-of-mind scheme details, the points and rewards were mentioned by participants in both groups (though few existing recyclers had yet redeemed their points), as well as the publicity generated by being the first Council to operate the Recyclebank scheme. However, it was notable that in both groups, the blue bin seemed to be more positively discussed than the rewards themselves, largely because it replaced a system deemed to require more time and effort:

‘Ours was more the delivery of the blue bin that sort of encouraged us to recycle more than we were before because everything goes in one bin, like you say, it doesn’t get blown around the garden and it’s got bigger capacity than those two trays that you had to take out, soaked or snow on it, or everything like that’ [existing recycler]

‘It’s also easier with the blue bin as opposed to the boxes, so it’s good that you’ve got one bin’ [new recycler].

Whilst perceptions were generally positive, there was much discussion about the need to improve the rewards themselves, which is discussed further in section 5.4, and to provide offline mechanisms for redeeming points (primarily for those who are less computer literate or without easy access to the internet). This was also discussed amongst the Lambeth focus group participants (see below).

3.5.5 INFLUENCE OF SCHEME ON PERSONAL RECYCLING BEHAVIOUR

This section discusses the extent to which participants felt the schemes had actually influenced their personal recycling behaviour (whilst recognising that the limitations of focus groups for understanding actual behaviours rather than behaviours perceived by participants to be socially desirable).

As with the Golden Tickets scheme, the new and existing recyclers reported different responses to the introduction of the RBWM Recyclebank scheme. Generally the new recyclers felt that they have been recycling more since the start of the scheme, but this was in part because of the increased ease of recycling with the one blue bin. One participant commented; ‘everyone has the blue bin, it’s just whether you bother to register for the points’. When asked whether they would continue to recycle at the same rate should the rewards be removed, participants tended to think they would, in part because the blue bin had made it easier to do so.

A tension noted by one new recycler was that ‘I think the scheme makes you want to recycle a bit more but then it makes you more aware of what you can and can’t do’. Whilst this is useful as participants were learning more about recycling, it also left them frustrated that the Local Council would not accept a wider range of materials, particularly those marked as recyclable on product labels (e.g. various types of plastics).

However, there are three key differences between the RBWM Recyclebank and Golden Ticket schemes which should be borne in mind when thinking about how the impacts of the two schemes vary: (a) Recyclebank RBWM has been running for significantly longer and is ongoing; (b) the rewards are primarily given to the individual rather than community causes (though there are certain periods in the year when points can be donated to schools); (c) the roll-out of Recyclebank RBWM also included a significant infrastructure change – the shift from multiple colour-coded recycling bins to one large blue bin for all the locally-collected recyclables.
Within the new recycler group, the points acquired seemed to be driving the behaviour of some participants more than others. Three participants were sharing ‘tricks’ for earning more points without necessarily increasing their recycling efforts:

‘I’ve got some neighbours who go to Argos and put them [Argos catalogues] straight in the recycling’

‘I leave the whole thing open...whoever designed it, there’s no holes in the bottom so when I get all the cardboard back from work, I put cardboard in there and when it rains, it sinks down even more and then you get more, so never shut the lid! Also baked bean tins, leave them upright!’

‘Before you might think, “can it can’t it” and just put it in the normal bin, but now you think, “that’s nice and heavy!”’

The existing recyclers raised concerns about this type of scheme abuse, but felt this must be avoided through the reward cap: ‘they might fill their bins with heavy stuff and abuse it, so that must have been thought out in the process’. They also felt that people wouldn’t go to those kind of lengths for the types of rewards available at present (which they did not personally find appealing – see Section 7.6).

The key message coming from the existing recyclers is that the rewards have little impact on their recycling (with many yet to redeem points for rewards), but that it is the blue bin that has really made their life easier:

‘I think the whole aspect of rewards is pretty marginal really, I only collect them if I get an email saying I’ve got 500 points or something, “might as well have those”, I’m not thinking “what can I do with my next lot of points”. You’re not thinking “I should recycle more”, as you’re just doing it anyway, you just carry on as normal’

‘The rewards are a nice thing to have but they’re not driving us really’

‘So it wasn’t necessarily the rewards that incentivised us, it was our conscience and the ease of it’

‘When they said “you’re going to get rewarded for recycling”, the sort of feel good factor goes up and you think “oh great”, you carry on recycling even if you don’t cash the rewards in’

‘I joined up because I recycle anyway, doesn’t matter what the points are’

‘We’ve registered but we’re not using the points so that’s definitely not the incentive’

The group did feel the scheme (be it the rewards or the blue bin) has increased recycling amongst those who did not previously recycle; ‘everyone uses it down our road, Sunday night comes for us, they’re always out, everybody’s using it [the blue bin], how full it is I don’t know’.

The quotations above mirror the reflections of the existing recyclers engaged in the Golden Ticket scheme; the rewards may not be driving behaviour but they are valued as ‘something for nothing’. Again, this conflicts with Frey’s ‘motivational crowding out’ theory; the reward scheme does not appear to be diminishing the intrinsic motivation of existing recyclers in any way.

Only the new recyclers were asked whether the scheme had made them think more about other pro-environmental behaviours, which triggered discussions about behaviours such as reducing water and energy use. However, there was general agreement that the scheme itself did not affect these and
participants did not think the scheme needs to expand to include these: ‘it’s there anyway though isn’t it? If you use less, they’re not going to give you money, they’re just not charging you as much’.

3.5.6 SIMILAR SCHEMES

Local Green Points
This is a new incentive tool, operated by local authorities to stimulate a holistic approach to sustainable living. Green points are awarded to people for recycling, reducing waste, reducing carbon emissions, and getting involved in community volunteering. Rewards include (but are not limited to): discounts or full payment for eco-products and services; free or discounted access to council-owned health facilities; and discounts or payments for other accredited goods and services that are relevant to the needs of the individual or the community:
http://www.localgreenpoints.com/

I Recycled, Lambeth
In May 2011, the London Borough of Lambeth launched a modified community-based incentive scheme called I Recycled. The scheme relies on self-reporting, rather than a weight-based system, and participants can report online, by phone or using an iPhone app. For every week that participants report they receive 10 points, and additional rewards are shared equally at the end of every month based on the total weight of all recycling collected across the Borough. At present, the scheme is restricted to households with shared recycling containers.

3.5.7 PARTICIPANT VIEWS OF THE SCHEMES

The Lambeth scheme is much more recent than the RBWM scheme, which was reflected in focus group participants’ responses, with many only just familiarising themselves with the scheme after receiving a leaflet or visit from Recyclebank representatives. The Lambeth scheme works slightly differently to that in RBWM; in Lambeth, participants are not given their own blue wheelie bin or any changes to their personal recycling infrastructure. Instead, they just need to remember to click ‘I recycled’ online, once a week, when they add their recycling bags to the communal estate recycling bins. Bearing this is in mind, it is perhaps unsurprising that the top-of-mind details volunteered by participants about the scheme concerned the points, the need to go online, and their experiences with the website.

Amongst the Lambeth focus group participants, there was a general perception that the scheme has potential, but that more time is needed to establish a better reward system, which offers a wider choice of rewards and fewer vouchers that are conditional on minimum spends (see Section 7.6). In addition, many of the new recyclers felt the system of relying on people to say they have recycled is flawed; not only might people cheat the system, but a number of participants said they often forget to go online to register their recycling.

Access to technology appeared to be a real constraint for some participants; one new recycler said she tends to sort her recycling out on Saturdays but does not have access to the internet again until Monday, by which time she’s forgotten about the recycling. An existing recycler highlighted the problem of not having a printer; those who cannot print out the reward vouchers at home have to wait for Recyclebank to post the vouchers, which can take up to ten days (by which time participants report having already having bought what they had needed to buy anyway). As with the new recyclers in Maidenhead, concerns were raised by participants in both Lambeth groups that the need to log in online would exclude groups who are less computer literate, such as more elderly individuals. Linked to that, a couple of new recyclers appreciated the visit by a Recyclebank
representative after receiving the initial leaflet, who actually helped them sign up and talked them through the process. It seems these house visits are more likely to encourage people to register with the scheme than relying solely on leaflets: ‘the fliers are usually mixed with the pizza fliers because they all go in the recycling bin, but there was some person door-to-door and they were quite nice and interesting so I register actually with them’ [existing recycler, Lambeth].

3.5.8 INFLUENCE OF SCHEMES ON PERSONAL RECYCLING BEHAVIOUR

Given the relatively recent roll-out of the Lambeth Recyclebank scheme, limited impacts on participants’ recycling behaviour were reported by focus group participants. Nonetheless, the new recyclers felt the scheme had got them thinking more about recycling and that it has the potential to encourage more significant changes in the future, once two key drawbacks of the scheme have been addressed. Firstly, the new recyclers were sceptical of the self-report system. They felt there is currently no motivation to try to recycle significantly more, in part because the points they receive are more or less the same regardless of how much or how little they recycle (provided they just report having recycled) and partly because they felt people would cheat the system i.e. even the additional points distributed to participants on the basis of the total weight of the Borough’s recycling at the end of the month would not be fairly distributed if false claims are made by people who are just looking to get points without actually recycling.

Secondly, both groups felt the rewards were not yet sufficiently appealing (discussed in section 5.4). Two of the existing recyclers commented that the initial buzz and interest around the scheme dropped off once they realised the narrow range of rewards available; ‘there was a bit of a buzz at the beginning and then, you know, now we’re kind of like “oh, it’s not really that worth it”’. The motivation to sign up to the scheme tended to be triggered by curiosity, but this has not yet translated into interest for many; ‘me personally, it wasn’t for the points, it was, you know, I was informed about something, you kind of look at it and you kind of press it the first time and, you know, well I haven’t really looked into how you retrieve it’.

Nonetheless, the new recyclers felt the scheme does have marginal benefit and does no harm, and existing recyclers appreciated the potential value of the scheme: ‘once they start to sort out what they’re doing with the points and how people are actually going to benefit I think it will make a lot of people actually start recycling, those that don’t already, but for us who are probably quite good at recycling anyway, it hasn’t made much of a difference’. As is apparent from the other focus group discussions, there was certainly no sign of crowding out amongst the existing recyclers, though one new recycler felt very strongly that paying people to recycle is wrong and that it is something that people should be doing anyway. Another participant argued that, whether or not people should be paid for recycling, the promise of a reward may work to tip people into the habit of recycling. Certainly, one participant who had turned up early for the focus group was very enthusiastic about the points when he first arrived but then went quiet following the suggestion that paying people to recycle is wrong.

There was little indication in either group that the scheme had directly encouraged the adoption of any wider pro-environmental behaviours. When the new recyclers were asked about the potential to expand the scheme to cover other behavioural areas, there was a general perception that other behaviours were too different and would require different interventions. Again, like the Maidenhead new recycler group, they noted that the incentive to reduce energy use is already present in the cost of energy bills.
3.5.9 SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS

The sources used included:
Written submissions to the London Assembly’s ‘Carrots and Sticks’ inquiry (2011b: 94) and (2011b: 79).
Discussions with Recyclebank and their November 2011 Press Release Websites: 
http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web/wm_Recyclebank.htm and 

Primary data drawn from four focus groups with Recyclebank participants (specific comments relevant to this study are reported above in sections 3.5.4).

Other than the information included from the focus groups conducted by the project team, this case study has relied on secondary sources, none of which are peer-reviewed. Furthermore, no contextual information is available about the rigour of the data collection methods used to inform these sources and no control groups appear to have been used when examining changes in recycling performance across the participating boroughs. This raises concerns about the robustness of the conclusions that can be drawn from this existing data and suggests the need for a more robust evaluation, including both quantitative and long-term qualitative measures, to better understand the extent (and duration) of the scheme’s impacts.
One specific aim of the Phase 1 Review and Case Study Analysis was to propose a typology for the different types of reward and recognition schemes that are in operation, or have operated, within the context of waste and recycling. This section reports on the work that was done to develop a typology of reward and recognition schemes.

An obvious starting point for a typology was the distinction that emerged from the literature between schemes which monitor and reward individual behaviour and those which are collective in focus. The Oxfam/Marks and Spencer Clothing Exchange provides a useful example of an individual scheme: participants are personally rewarded with vouchers as a reward for their individual reuse behaviour. In contrast, Ealing’s Community Reward scheme monitored community behaviour (ward recycling participation rates), rewarding the collective rather than any particular individuals.

However, this distinction is muddied by the fact that reward and recognition schemes have two components – the monitoring of behaviour and the subsequent reward or recognition of that behaviour – and that each of these components may be individual or community-based. So, some schemes may monitor the behaviour of a community but reward or feedback to individuals, while others may monitor the behaviour of individuals but provide community-based rewards. This leaves four possible ways in which a scheme might operate:

- **One-to-one**: a scheme that monitors individual behaviour and rewards individuals
- **One-to-many**: a scheme that monitors individual behaviour but rewards a community
- **Many-to-one**: a scheme that monitors community behaviour but rewards individuals
- **Many-to-many**: a scheme that monitors community behaviour and rewards communities.

Table 1 below, shows how four of our five case studies fit into these categories. Note that the term ‘community’ does not necessarily imply a geographical community or neighbourhood; in the case of Manchester’s Golden Ticket scheme (Case Study 4), the community rewards are offered to a local primary school.

**Table 1: Case study examples of different individual and community based schemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual reward or recognition</th>
<th>Individual participation</th>
<th>Community participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-to-one</td>
<td>e.g. Case Study 3: Oxfam/M&amp;S Clothing Exchange</td>
<td>Many-to-one e.g. Case Study 2: Oldham food waste feedback trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community reward or recognition</td>
<td>One-to-many e.g. Case Study 4: Manchester Golden Ticket</td>
<td>Many-to-many e.g. Case Study 1: Ealing Community Rewards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While this distinction is useful, it is not always possible to classify a scheme discretely because some schemes are flexible or implemented differently in different areas. For example, the kerbside Recyclebank schemes included in Case Study 5 have different models that monitor both individual

---

18 Note that ‘rewards’ here is used to mean rewards and recognition, which may include just feedback.
and collective behaviour. Similarly, while participants in the Recyclebank scheme can choose to spend their vouchers in shops or other local leisure facilities, they can also donate their points to local schools at certain times during the year. An overriding message from our focus group participants (discussed in section 5) is the need for schemes which present options for both individual and community rewards.

As well as distinguishing between schemes according to the way in which participation is monitored and rewarded, a second useful distinction is between monetary and non-monetary schemes. As above, schemes do not necessarily fall into one of these two categories neatly. While cash rewards or cash back schemes lie squarely at the monetary end of this spectrum, a number of other schemes offer vouchers or non-monetary gifts as a reward. For example, reverse vending machines like those found in the car parks of supermarket Tesco, reward people for recycling with Tesco Clubcard points. At the other end of this spectrum, are schemes which offer gifts (such as the temporary Teignbridge organic box scheme trialled in the Defra Household Waste Incentive Pilot Scheme) or provide purely verbal or written feedback on performance.

Figure 3, below, illustrates how different schemes map according to both the way in which monitoring and rewards are offered, and the types of reward. More information about the different schemes featured can be found in Annex 3 of the Technical Annex.
Figure 4 below maps our five case studies according to these two distinctions. Note that Recyclebank (Case Study 5) crosses the boundary between both ‘one-to-one’ and ‘one-to-many’ because of the different ways in which the scheme can be structured, and the different types of incentives which it offers to participants.

![Diagram of case studies mapping]

**Figure 4: Mapping the case studies according to scheme and incentive type**

In our initial proposal, we suggested devising a detailed typology based on incentive types, collection design, scheme providers, and community context. However, we have not been able to gather enough information about existing reward and recognition schemes to do this. In part, this is because it is difficult to obtain reliable and detailed information about past schemes and trials that are no longer in operation. Contacting local authorities to try and obtain information has proven a time-consuming and largely fruitless task. In addition, there are still relatively few waste-related reward and recognition schemes currently in operation. While we would not claim that the list in Annex 3 is comprehensive, there do not appear to be enough schemes currently in operation for the development of a more detailed typology.
5 FOCUS GROUPS FINDINGS

This section presents the findings of the Phase 3 primary research undertaken to build on the case studies and Phase 1 scoping review. We provide a brief recap of the focus group schemes before detailing the focus group findings which begin by discussing participants’ general awareness and engagement in waste prevention behaviour, before focusing specifically on their perceptions of the schemes, and the influence of the schemes on their personal recycling behaviour (including the existence of any spillover to wider waste prevention or non waste-related pro-environmental behaviours). The final sections focuses more specifically on the nature of the rewards included in the scheme, attitudes towards different reward types and participants’ perceptions of interventions (be they reward-based or not) that they think could encourage themselves and others to recycle more. Finally, we present a series of conclusions to be considered when designing future reward and recognition schemes intended to enhance diverse public engagement in recycling. The rationale for selection of the schemes explored in the focus group, a description of methods used and their limitations is provided in sections 2.3 and 2.4.

5.1 THE SCHEMES

The full descriptions of each of the schemes are provided in section 3, but to recap, the three schemes included:

- Manchester City Council’s ‘Golden Tickets’ community-based reward scheme, run in the Sharston Ward, Wythenshaw, from January to May 2011, in order to encourage greater household participation in dry recycling. Each time householders put their recycling bin out for collection with the correct materials inside, a ‘Golden Ticket’ was attached to the bin’s handle. These tickets were collected by two participating local schools which could exchange the tickets for money to buy teaching equipment (such as books, new technology or sporting equipment) or to be spent directly within the school.

- Windsor and Maidenhead’s Recyclebank scheme, introduced in June 2010. Reward points are awarded to participants on the basis of the weight of dry recyclables placed in new individual (or for flats, communal) blue wheelie bins, which are embedded with a Radio Frequency Identification Device (RFID). This chip enables individual bins to be linked to households (or groups of households for communal schemes) using encrypted coding. Waste collection vehicles are fitted with scanners and scales, allowing them to capture the weight of the materials collected. This data is then sent to a central database. Participants claim rewards at local participating retail, restaurant and entertainment outlets, based on the number of points they collect.

- Lambeth’s ‘I Recycled’ Recyclebank scheme, introduced specifically to estate residents in May 2011. This scheme relies on self-reporting by participants, be it online (logging in to click ‘I recycled’), by phone or using a smart phone app. For every week that participants report having recycled, they receive 10 points, and additional rewards are shared equally at the end of each month based on the total weight of all recycling collected across the Borough.

5.2 WASTE PREVENTION AND AWARENESS

The initial discussions held during the focus groups were intended to explore participants’ general awareness and engagement in recycling and waste prevention, and their perceptions of existing services and facilities available to assist them in their efforts to reduce waste. The focus was primarily
on recycling but questions were also included to understand the degree to which participants consider wider waste prevention behaviours, such as repair, reuse and reduce.

5.2.1 WASTE PREVENTION: A BRAINSTORM

The initial activity in each focus group discussion was an ice-breaker activity in which participants worked in pairs to discuss their top-of-mind thoughts when they hear the terms ‘waste’, ‘recycling’ and ‘waste prevention’. The majority of thoughts that were discussed related to: environmental factors; recycling bins, bags and banks; different recyclable materials; curiosity about where their recycling goes; and comments on existing waste disposal and recycling service provision. In Sharston and Maidenhead, only the existing recyclers considered activities linked to reuse and reduce (such as using bags for life, buying loose fruit and vegetables, re-using old biscuit tins, ice-cream tubs and bottles, keeping jars for jam etc.) and none of the groups mentioned repair, with the exception of one existing recycler in Sharston whose profession involves repair work. In Lambeth, both the new and existing recycler groups discussed reuse and reduce activities, particularly hand-me-down clothes and the concept of ‘buy less, use longer’. A relevant point raised by the new recyclers in Lambeth was the impact of the recession on waste; they reported reductions in their household waste simply because they were buying less as a result of the current economic situation.

When directly asked about repair, it was apparent that all groups saw it as something quite separate to recycling and other waste prevention efforts. The existing recyclers in Sharston appeared to be particularly proactive in trying to repair items wherever they could, but the general feeling across the groups is reflected in their remarks that: ‘society is not geared up for repair’, ‘we live in a waste era don’t we’, and ‘we are a more and more throwaway society’. Amongst all groups, decisions concerning repair generally appear to be based on cost, with a number of participants highlighting the ‘built in obsolescence’ of goods today and all participants agreeing that it is often cheaper and easier just to buy new products than to try to locate and buy replacement parts for old ones. This is consistent with the limited literature identified in the Phase 1 scoping review, noting that repair decisions tend to be driven by financial reasoning (Granville and Mulholland, 2006). Consistent with these views of repair as something quite distinct from recycling, none of the groups considered it when asked what councils and/or central government could be doing to make it easier for individuals to reduce waste, even when specifically prompted.

5.2.2 WHAT MOTIVATES PARTICIPATION IN RECYCLING?

When asked about key motivations for recycling and reducing waste, environmental factors were mentioned within all groups, new and existing recyclers alike. These factors included landfill, pollution, impacts on wildlife and animals, carbon footprints and the ozone layer. Many (particularly the new recyclers) reported seeing images of wildlife trapped in plastic or documentaries of toxic waste and recycling being exported to developing countries to be sorted. Only the existing recyclers linked these images to feelings of guilt if they don’t recycle, and noted being driven by their conscience, with one participant in the Lambeth group arguing that it is ‘a matter of responsibility’. Both Lambeth groups were particularly aware of the need to save resources, and the cost and environmental benefits of reusing and recycling existing resources rather than trying to produce new products.

Despite all groups noting these environmental motivations, only the existing recyclers felt that waste is a genuine concern. One existing recycler in Maidenhead commented, ‘I think we all must be [concerned] otherwise none of us would have the blue bin and the green bin and the other bin; we’d
just chuck everything into the black bin if we didn’t care’. In contrast, many (but not all) participants in the new recycler groups tended to see waste as a passing concern, perhaps in response to a particularly graphic documentary or media image. Others expressed curiosity about where all their recycling and waste goes; ‘we’re an island, where’s it all going to and if it’s going somewhere else, it’s still our concern really’.

A number of participants across all groups mentioned service-related drivers. Participants in both Sharston groups indicated they had been forced to increase their recycling rates by the new alternate weekly collection (‘just to keep things neat and tidy’), and two participants in each of the Recyclebank new recycler groups suggested the reward points provide extra motivation. Existing recyclers in Maidenhead and new recyclers in Lambeth reported increases in food waste recycling since receiving a free green bin, and the new recyclers in Maidenhead emphasised the value of the new blue Recyclebank wheelie bin; ‘it’s just because everything goes in the one bin, it’s just so much easier, rather than having to sort it’ and ‘it’s neater as well’. Existing recyclers in Sharston felt they had got into the habit of recycling ever since kerbside recycling collections had been introduced. One person even joked about being ‘obsessed with the sorting!’ She commented ‘I’ve actually sorted through bins, you know like if you have a party especially, I’m like, “put your paper plates in the blue one! Cans in the brown one!”’

A common theme across four of the focus groups (i.e. all except the existing recyclers in Maidenhead and Sharston) was the importance of child pester power, be it children or grandchildren. There was a sense that children are getting environmental issues ‘indoctrinated’ at school now; ‘she learned about it at school and then kind of reinforced it, she’s the one who reinforced it in the home’ [existing recycler, Lambeth].

5.2.3 WHAT ARE THE BARRIERS TO RECYCLING?

Across all groups, the barriers to recycling largely concerned limitations in recycling service provision, infrastructure and confusions regarding what can and cannot be recycled.

Residents in the Sharston area still have a system of multiple bins for recycling (green bins for garden waste, brown bins for glass and plastic, blue bins for paper, a small indoor grey bin for food waste to be used before emptying it into the outdoor green bin, and a black bin for residual waste) and this was by far the most frequently cited barrier to recycling; ‘looks like a sea of wheelie bins’, and ‘it’s just bloody awkward’. Not only were the bins seen as untidy and unsightly amongst participants with gardens, they posed a problem for those with limited space. Participants reported constant confusion about which bins to put out on different days of the week and felt unsure about exactly which materials could go in each bin; ‘I have an anxiety crisis every week, “where does this go? Can I recycle this?”’.

The existing recyclers in Sharston expressed frustration at not being able to recycle everything that is marked as recyclable; ‘well they’re pushing it and you’re doing what you can but they’re not actually allowing you to recycle everything that you can’. This frustration and confusion was also apparent in the other four groups in Maidenhead and Lambeth; ‘don’t you find yourself thinking, “I want to recycle this” but it won’t take it? Like the margarine tub. There’s so much you can’t recycle’ [new recycler, Maidenhead]. Whilst participants in all groups acknowledged receiving leaflets about recycling through the post, most felt these provided very limited detail about the specific materials that can be recycled.
Linked to this, all groups showed significant irritation concerning the ‘excessive’ levels of packaging used by supermarkets, with many participants querying why central government is not regulating manufacturers to use more biodegradable packaging or to phase out the use of packaging materials that cannot be recycled. There was a perception amongst the new recyclers in Lambeth that buying fruit and vegetables loose is more expensive than buying packaged versions, which seems a relatively straightforward but important misconception (except in the case of buy-one-get-one-free offers) to tackle in future communications.

Generally, the new recyclers in Sharston and Maidenhead felt the sorting system takes too much time, with their main priority being to do as much as they feel they can do; ‘I mean who’s got time, seriously, without being awful, to have to spend the day worrying about what you’re putting in your bin, really’. Even the existing recyclers in Sharston and Lambeth, and the new recyclers in Maidenhead, felt being asked to take labels off bottles and wash out the recycling was asking too much of them.

Participants also expressed a sense that their efforts were not being sufficiently recognised or acknowledged by the Council; ‘you make all these efforts but council tax doesn’t go down’ [existing recycler, Sharston]. Furthermore, the new recyclers in Sharston felt their efforts were being undermined on collection day; they held the perception that all their separated recyclables were being tipped back into the same compartment in the collection vehicle; ‘at present, if you think you’ve done it and then you know the skip wagon comes and puts it altogether and puts it in landfill, you think “why should I be arsed?”’. Similarly, one of the existing recyclers noted the ‘guy at the tip’ telling her: ‘oh just throw it anywhere because it all goes in the same place anyway’. Both Maidenhead groups noted having similar concerns prior to the introduction of the blue Recyclebank wheelie bin; ‘you religiously sort them out and then the bin men came along and just chucked them all in the back and you thought “why have I bothered?” and then they even refused to take them if they weren’t sorted properly!’.

5.2.4 WHAT IS BEING DONE TO MAKE WASTE PREVENTION EASIER?

Participants were asked to think of examples of measures and activities, implemented by the Local Council, businesses, charities, Central Government, Europe or other actors, that have made recycling and waste reduction easier at home. As can be seen in Table 2 below, the majority of specific initiatives were linked to business actions, but it was clear from discussion that most people see the Council as primarily responsible for enabling and encouraging recycling, whilst recognising that additional support and buy-in is needed from other actors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New recyclers, Sharston</th>
<th>Existing recyclers, Sharston</th>
<th>New recyclers, Maidenhead</th>
<th>Existing recyclers, Maidenhead</th>
<th>New recyclers, Lambeth</th>
<th>Existing recyclers, Lambeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess supermarket packaging</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excess supermarket packaging</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excess packaging in supermarkets</td>
<td>Excess packaging in supermarkets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash for old phones</td>
<td></td>
<td>JD sports – get £5 off new trainers when you bring in old ones</td>
<td>JD sports sending old sports equipment to Africa</td>
<td>Sainsbury’s recycling banks in the car parks</td>
<td>Sainsbury’s recycling banks in the car parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously used Tesco bottle banks etc. but since the introduction of kerbside collections they usually only use electrical/batteries recycling banks</td>
<td>Previously used Tesco bottle banks etc. but since the introduction of kerbside collections they usually only use electrical/batteries recycling banks</td>
<td>Charging for plastic bags</td>
<td>Bags for life – supermarkets</td>
<td>Bags for life – supermarkets</td>
<td>Bags for life – supermarkets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boots – recycle old mobile phones and ink cartridges for Advantage Card points</td>
<td>Boots – recycle old mobile phones and ink cartridges for Advantage Card points</td>
<td>Coffee company – issued refills instead of glass jars</td>
<td>Offered an example from Sweden where supermarkets give vouchers for recycling cans, bottles, batteries</td>
<td>A pilot plastics recycling bank in Sainsbury’s years ago that never got removed</td>
<td>A pilot plastics recycling bank in Sainsbury’s years ago that never got removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;S/Oxfam clothing exchange</td>
<td>M&amp;S/Oxfam clothing exchange</td>
<td>Old mobile phones recycled e.g. through Vodafone.</td>
<td>Mobile phone recycling</td>
<td>Plastic bag charges e.g. 5p charge on substantial bags levied by M&amp;S</td>
<td>Plastic bag charges e.g. 5p charge on substantial bags levied by M&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;S recycling phones and other electronics, batteries (also IKEA)</td>
<td>M&amp;S recycling phones and other electronics, batteries (also IKEA)</td>
<td>M&amp;S/Oxfam clothing exchange</td>
<td>Robert Dyas – recycle Britta filters</td>
<td>M&amp;S/Oxfam clothing exchange</td>
<td>M&amp;S/Oxfam clothing exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airports providing more recycling facilities now</td>
<td>Airports providing more recycling facilities now</td>
<td>Facilities at airports (suspected this is driven by financial not environmental concerns)</td>
<td>Nespresso – coffee capsules can be recycled</td>
<td>Supermarket recycling banks (bottles, textiles etc.) and loyalty points for using them e.g. Tesco</td>
<td>Supermarket recycling banks (bottles, textiles etc.) and loyalty points for using them e.g. Tesco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarks – buy a pair of shoes and they donate a pair</td>
<td>Clarks – buy a pair of shoes and they donate a pair</td>
<td>Talked about facilities and ‘green policies’ in workplaces e.g. shredder and paper recycling, though one teacher reported</td>
<td>Noted a business in Slough which collected and sent boys’ spent football kits to Africa</td>
<td>Keyring bags – fabric bags that fold up and attach to keyrings</td>
<td>Keyring bags – fabric bags that fold up and attach to keyrings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some companies assisting repair of domestic appliances</td>
<td>Some companies assisting repair of domestic appliances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charities</th>
<th>bringing recycling home due to poor facilities at school</th>
<th>glasses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charity leaflets and bags received for door-to-door clothing collections e.g. Help the Aged, Age Concern, British Heart Foundation (raised the issue of bogus collections)</td>
<td>Door-to-door textile collections (raised concern about bogus collections – suggested ‘90% of the bags that people leave it don’t go to charity’)</td>
<td>Charity shop donations e.g. books, DVDs (prefer to take it into the shop due to issue of bogus collections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donations to charity shops e.g. textiles</td>
<td>A charity link on e-bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charity shoe/textile recycling banks.</td>
<td>Donations to charity shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donations to charity shops e.g. shoes</td>
<td>Door-to-door textile collections (raised concern about bogus collections and generally felt they’d rather give things to friends or direct to charity shops).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charity leaflets and bags received for door-to-door clothing collections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Local Council | Provision of the green bin (for garden waste), brown bin (glass and plastic), blue one (paper), grey bin (food waste), black one (residual waste) | Provision of the colour coded bins, including the relatively new grey bin for food waste |
| | Discussed the issue of refusing to take side waste or overflow – felt it depends on the bin man | Providing local communal recycling bins – e.g. for textiles, shoes etc. |
| | Provision of leaflets and/or letters about what containers should be used for, or about forthcoming changes to collection schedules etc. | Fortnightly collection of black bin (a recent change) |
| | Fortnightly collection of black bin, weekly | Charge a yearly fee for the green bin and associated fortnightly food and garden waste collection service |
| | | Charge for the collection of bulky items, which has to be requested in writing (by post not email) |
| | | Provision of the blue wheelie bin – for dry recyclables i.e. glass, jars, tins, paper, certain plastics etc. |
| | | Points and rewards for recycling |
| | | Option of a food waste recycling service |
| | | Provision of the blue bin for recycling |
| | | Coordinating the Recyclebank points scheme |
| | | Organised food waste systems on some estates |
| | | Provision of leaflets about recycling |
| | | Distribution of orange recycling bags (but not enough) |
| | | Charge for the collection of bulky items if requested. |
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collections of the green bin (in the summer only) – though sense that everything privatised now i.e. the Council coordinates it but private companies actually collecting and sorting.

Had heard rumours that the Council was going to give bin men iPhones/iPads to check and report on bin content

Roll out of the Golden Ticket scheme

Controls access to the local tip – the ‘local Gestapo!’

Pay as you throw

<p>| <strong>Central Government</strong> | <strong>Product labelling about recycling status</strong> (although queried whether those come from government or manufacturers) Television advertisements and children’s programmes e.g. Bob the Builder’s ‘reduce, reuse, recycle’ slogan Raising awareness of | <strong>Fines for mobile phone companies which are seen as ‘constantly pushing new phones’ – fines can be reduced if companies seen to be helping customers to recycle phones Tax breaks for companies who do recycling Noted Irish plastic bag charges</strong> | <strong>Noted Irish plastic bag charges</strong> Otherwise just expressed frustration at what the government should be doing e.g. regulating manufacturers to reduce packaging, regulating car manufacturers to reuse parts, regulating product manufacturers in general to make it easier to repair products and facilitate | <strong>Mentioned the Irish bag tax but otherwise nothing really sprung to mind about the work of central governments</strong> | <strong>No specific examples mentioned but assumed central government must have something to do with the actions of local government.</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recycling amongst children through the school curriculum</th>
<th>The shift away from inbuilt obsolescence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Europe**

- EU fines for countries who do not meet their recycling targets
  - Nothing specific but felt there must be regulation coming from Europe
  - Mentioned EU fines for not meeting landfill reduction targets.

**Other**

- Tinkers - scrap metal being taken from front gardens if left out
  - Noted a boost in the 'scrap scene' in Wythenshaw
  - Freecycle
  - Discussed scrap metal demand – one had left their washing machine outside and it disappeared almost overnight
  - Freecycle
  - Reading Festival organisers sending abandoned tents to developing countries
- Discussed scrap metal demand – one had left their BBQ outside and found it without the grill the next day
  - Freecycle
- Junk modelling in schools, and schools collecting toys/old clothes/Christmas boxes etc. to send to developing countries.
  - Noted initiative in Germany where one day a year, anyone can put anything outside in the road/garden for others to pick up if they want it, and the Council then takes anything left over.
5.3 PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF THE SCHEMES

This section will briefly consider participants’ perceptions of each of the schemes, before considering their perceptions of the schemes’ actual behavioural impacts in the next section.

5.4 THE REWARDS

In this section, we discuss participants’ perceptions of the rewards, together with their suggestions for improvements that could be made to ensure more salient rewards are offered.

5.4.1 PERCEPTIONS OF EXISTING REWARDS

A fundamental drawback of these reward schemes, highlighted by participants in all six focus groups, was the lack of choice within the existing reward systems.

Whilst perceptions of the Golden Ticket scheme were generally positive (as discussed in section 3.4.3), there was a sense that school-based rewards only appeal to and/or motivate a subset of the population; namely those with children or friends and relatives at the school, or community-minded individuals living in close proximity to participating schools. Both Sharston groups highlighted the need to ‘cater for everyone’, and provide a means for people to ‘choose what your incentive could be, perhaps via a letter, so you could personalise what you want, so you could tick a box’.

The Recyclebank schemes come closer to enabling people to choose from a selection of different rewards, but the rewards available carried limited appeal to all four Recyclebank focus groups; ‘to be honest, I struggle to find anything on the voucher catalogue that I’m interested in’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead]; ‘I’ve never looked at what’s on there, my wife just spends them, I do remember her having a moan and saying “oh, there’s not much here”’ [new recycler, Maidenhead]. Whilst the existing recyclers in Maidenhead did not see rewards as a priority anyway, the new recyclers felt that ‘quite a lot aren’t relevant to me for various reasons’, notably the range of shops and restaurants involved and, more importantly, the tendency for most rewards to involve a minimum spend or a buy-one-get-one-free option (which has implications for the impact of rewards on consumption patterns, as discussed in section 5.4.2 below). Having said that, a number of the new recyclers in the Maidenhead focus group did not appear to be deciding how all the points are redeemed; ‘I’ll have to have a look, my husband’s keeping it a secret from me’, ‘my husband spends the food ones and I spend the clothes ones’.

Both Lambeth groups emphasised the need to offer rewards for things that you’re actually going to use (see section 5.4.5), rather than offering rewards that are conditional on a minimum spend or trying to steer people to places they might not otherwise go to; ‘I think the rewards could be better, there could be more beneficial stuff, stuff you actually use and need around the house’ [existing recycler, Lambeth]. Also criticised was the time between choosing rewards online and the vouchers being posted through; ‘there’s too much forward planning involved, like “I’ll go to M&S in 11 days!”’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead], and ‘you can’t just do it instantly, you’ve got to think about where you’re going to spend the vouchers and stuff before they send it’ [existing recycler, Lambeth].
5.4.2 IMPACTS OF EXISTING REWARDS ON CONSUMPTION

A common criticism levied at the Recyclebank scheme (as yet largely unsubstantiated by evidence) is the risk of the rewards triggering increased consumption amongst participants. However, there was little evidence of this amongst focus group participants.

As touched on above, many focus group participants (particularly the new recyclers) criticised the design of the vouchers such that you need to spend a certain amount before you can get the discount (‘makes you spend first though doesn’t it and then it’s money off’ – new recycler, Maidenhead) or to shop in places you wouldn’t otherwise go to. In practice, the minimum spend tended to discourage use rather than increase consumption; ‘when am I going to spend £25 in M&S to be able to use the voucher?!’ (new recycler, Lambeth). Instead, focus group participants reported using rewards linked to places they would go to anyway, for example to pay for the bottle of wine with dinner at their favourite restaurant, or an M&S meal deal on a Friday, or to fund their children’s weekly swim at the leisure centre, or one participant used the voucher to buy her children’s school uniforms in M&S i.e. they were using them as cash replacements rather than spending more. A number of participants across all groups said they had clocked up the points but had yet to find anything appealing to redeem them for. One of the existing recyclers highlighted a tendency to forget to bring the vouchers with them when they’re out; ‘It’s remembering to do it, I sometimes shop in M&S and I’m like “oh I didn’t use my voucher!”’.

When discussing how the schemes could be improved, there was a clear desire for a greater range of shops and supermarkets to be involved, to enable the inclusion of discounts off products that they actually need (such as money off the weekly food bills, or money off in health-related shops like Boots and Superdrug). Many participants suggested value in linking the rewards to reduced public transport or fitness-related leisure costs, or special days out for the family, or reductions in council tax i.e. the focus was on the use of rewards to fund necessary rather than luxury consumption or to enable more family experiences (see section 5.4.5).

5.4.3 INDIVIDUAL VERSUS COMMUNITY REWARDS

A key aim of the focus group topic guide was to determine participants’ interest in individual as compared to community-based rewards. In every group, there was a mix of participants who felt more motivated by community-based rewards and those calling for rewards for individuals, which suggests the need for reward schemes to offer a choice of both types.

The Golden Ticket scheme in Sharston was received positively, primarily for enhancing community spirit, engaging children in recycling, and bringing benefits to the schools. As discussed above, whilst this was seen as positive and/or motivating for most focus group participants, two participants without links to the schools openly admitted having little interest in the scheme (though this was not the case for all individuals without school links). They instead called for the option to give rewards to other community causes, charities or just to gain personal benefits, which they felt would be more motivating. Whilst new recyclers did report going ‘the extra mile’ because they knew the school was benefiting, others commented; ‘you want to see something for yourself, you want to be rewarded yourself because you’re the one that’s doing the work, not the local school, no offence’.

The existing recyclers recognised the need for a greater variety of options (including both community and individual rewards); ‘not necessarily for me, but some people, they might not have
even known children that went to that school or they couldn’t be bothered driving to go and put them in a collection point so I suppose it would have been stronger [if individual rewards were also included]’. As a group, however, the existing recyclers in Sharston generally expressed a greater preference for community rewards as they felt this type of system would be easier to monitor and administer. Nonetheless, the one individual-focused reward that was volunteered as particularly appealing amongst all focus groups (except the new recycler group in Lambeth, which did not mention the idea) was a reduction in council tax (discussed further in section 5.4.5).

Participants in the Recyclebank schemes, who have as yet primarily only had the option of individual rewards, felt strongly that these should be complemented by charity or community (e.g. school-related) options; ‘all I’ve done is racked up thousands of points that we don’t really use, I wish there was a charity button I could hit’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead]; ‘you’d know your points are going to a worthy cause, a whole school is going to use it, going to be exciting’ [existing recycler, Lambeth], ‘it starts to be social, people see who is doing it so it’s a motivation’ [existing recycler, Lambeth].

The new recyclers in Lambeth were particularly keen for the Recyclebank website to include a charity option, calling for a drop-down list of multiple charities and community causes, including for example schools, hospitals, homeless charities, children’s care units, and hospices. They felt this would make them more conscientious about banking points. Both this group and the new recyclers in Maidenhead flagged up the Waitrose green token system as a good example, especially because the charities are local and different in every store. The importance of local charities and local community causes was particularly apparent amongst all the new recycler groups:

‘I think only because it was a local school then, if you thought it was going to schools across… I probably wouldn’t have bothered but because you know it’s a local school that you personally know, it made a bit more of a benefit I think’ [new recycler, Sharston]

‘Anything for the community really… I suppose it’d be quite nice to do local, like you say the Waitrose because the Waitrose are always local ones aren’t they’ [new recycler, Maidenhead]

‘A lot of the community need a lot of things, that’s a good idea, charity starts at home’ [new recycler, Lambeth].

Nonetheless, participants also recognised the need to maintain the option of individual rewards; ‘it depends on the individual, there’s something, it’s meant to be for everyone so it’s got to be spread out’ [new recycler, Maidenhead].

5.4.4 GUARANTEED VERSUS PROBABILISTIC REWARDS

There was clear preference amongst most participants for guaranteed (e.g. voucher/points-based) rather than probabilistic (e.g. prize draw/lottery type) rewards. The new recyclers in Lambeth greeted the suggestion of a prize draw with a resounding ‘no’ from the whole group, with similar sentiment apparent in both the Sharston groups. Generally, these groups preferred the idea of working towards a definite, tangible reward:

‘That probably wouldn’t be ideal would it, you know, a prize draw’ [new recycler]

‘Like Readers Digest, where it’s like “fill this in and you might win” and then it’s like “Mrs Davies…” a picture of her and you just think, “I don’t think she really exists” whereas if you
actually got that free coffee, you know, in the long run and you’re out and you’re thinking “I’ve got that voucher, I can get a coffee” I think then it’s like “oh”, it’s not much but at least you do see something don’t you’ [new recycler]

‘I don’t know, a slow reward, ten pence per week, could be more, twenty pence per week, but if you knew you were going shopping at the weekend and you could get the train into town for free, it would be nice, wouldn’t it’ [new recycler]

‘Not the lottery, God, never win anything’ [existing recycler]

‘Let’s say if you’re getting something built up, you know you’re going to get something back don’t you?’ [existing recycler]

‘You’re working towards something so you know you’re going to get to a goal at the end of it’ [existing recycler].

New recyclers in Maidenhead and existing recyclers in Lambeth were slightly more open to the idea of a prize draw than the other groups, depending on the nature of the prize (for example, if there was a significant cash prize) and the odds of winning (e.g. if 100:1). However, they still felt this should just be one of many reward options.

5.4.5 WHICH INDIVIDUAL REWARDS APPEAL?

Throughout discussion and during the final focus group exercise, participants highlighted a number of rewards which they would consider more appealing than those currently available. Some of these discussions concerned the range of shops in which rewards could be redeemed (as discussed above), but others were not linked directly to shops or restaurants, as discussed below:

**Council tax rebates**

The first reward to note, mentioned without prompting by all groups, is reductions in council tax. There was a clear sense amongst participants (including both new and existing recyclers) that if they were doing more to help the Council (with a clear perception that recycling and waste are a council responsibility), this should be reflected in their council tax bills:

‘It’s not “oh if you recycle we will reduce your council tax now”, I would imagine that would get a lot of people going’ [new recycler, Sharston]

‘Like you said, your services are being reduced so why not get a reduction on your bill’ [new recycler, Sharston]

‘Obviously the government’s asking everyone to recycle and people are playing the game so why can’t that be reflected a bit in the council tax? We’re doing our bit so why can’t they chip a bit off ours?’ [existing recycler, Sharston]

‘Money off council tax because if you’re recycling, you’ll be wasting less, therefore you should pay less’ [new recycler, Maidenhead]

‘I don’t know how much of the council tax is set aside for collecting your wheelie bin every week but I would think that perhaps the more you recycle, perhaps a percentage off that year or a percentage off your next year’ [new recycler, Maidenhead]
‘I originally thought you might get some money off your council tax...that would be nice wouldn’t it’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead]

‘Things that people are going to use or things that you have to pay like council tax or like the Oyster card, maybe travel and things like that would definitely get people on board’ [existing recycler, Lambeth].

Despite much discussion surrounding council tax reductions, few participants actually rated it as a ‘gold star suggestion’ in the final brainstorming exercise. Listening to the smaller group discussions during the brainstorming sessions, this lower rating appeared to result from the recognition that not everyone pays council tax and therefore such reductions would not appeal across the board.

One participant had tried to calculate an appropriate reduction, based on the value of the existing rewards available: ‘I worked it out at about £10 a week or something like that, I don’t know where I got that from, I worked it out using the vouchers, thinking what’s the perceived value of M&S versus… that’s 1000 points in currency, what currency, work out the exchange rate and then I worked it out as being about £10 a week’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead]. This suggests the need to raise public awareness about how council tax is actually spent, and of the small proportion dedicated to recycling and waste disposal. Future work could usefully consider how the appeal of council tax reductions varies when the actual monetary value of this is highlighted to participants.

**Link to transport**

Amongst the new recyclers in Sharston and the existing recyclers in Maidenhead and Lambeth, a number of participants linked reward points to free or reduced-price public transport (such as free Oyster card credit) or free parking. The new recyclers in Sharston commented that: ‘each week you could get 10p off public transport or something like that because they’re trying to encourage more of that happening’ and because ‘everyone needs to travel don’t they’. They thought this type of reward could encourage people to try public transport and may then result in a shift away from their car use where public transport is available;

‘People that have never been into town on the train might go, “actually it only took 15 minutes and it’s really easy, don’t have to put the car in a car park, I’m going to do it next week because then I spent seven pounds on parking anyway’

‘Yes because sometimes when you give someone something free, they try it and then might actually keep doing it’.

Another participant suggested linking the reward points into cycle-to-work schemes, though did not elaborate how this might work. The new recyclers in Maidenhead did discuss transport when they split into sub groups but a pensioner in the group highlighted already having a free bus pass and so this suggestion was not highly rated in the exercise.

**Link to leisure**

Another popular suggestion mentioned by all groups (except the existing recyclers in Maidenhead) was the option to link the points to leisure time. The new recyclers in Sharston felt quite strongly

---

19 This concept links to the findings of Bamberg’s (2006) Randomised Control Trial in Stuttgart, which concluded that giving new residents the chance to try the public transport system through the provision of a free bus pass upon arrival significantly increased the likelihood of subsequent public transport use.
that this should only include fitness-related leisure time rather than cinema trips where people ‘stuff themselves with popcorn’. Rewards could include a free swim, free day-passes for the local gym or a special promotion night, such as ‘Fitness Wednesdays’ when people could use their points in a two-for-one deal on a visit to the gym or swimming baths (modelled on the concept of Orange Wednesdays). Again they felt this approach may encourage people to try the gym a few times, possibly leading to membership: ‘the local gym, right, could get in touch with the Council – that’s a good idea because that would encourage people to come, they might get a free week or whatever, it might encourage them to get into it and pay for membership’. The group felt this type of reward had the added benefit of fitting in with current goals to promote healthy living and reduce obesity.

The leisure suggestions put forward by the other groups primarily concerned points for free day trips and activities the whole family could do together, with suggestions ranging from trips to local farms, the zoo or Chessington, or just free tea and cake at the local tea rooms. New recyclers in Maidenhead suggested ‘something like Tesco points, where you can go to Legoland, or save up and get a Merlin card or something like that’.

**Link to better infrastructure provision**

A small number of participants suggested linking points directly to rewards that would make it easier for them to recycle and manage their waste. Both groups in Maidenhead saw appeal in being given a free green bin for food waste recycling as a reward for good performance with their dry recycling (rated silver by the new recyclers and gold by existing recyclers), and one of the new recyclers in Sharston commented; ‘why not reward us by emptying our black bin every week like we used to have?’

A number of the suggestions made during the final focus group activity concerned the need for improvements to infrastructure and/or service provision to make it easier to recycle, which are discussed in more detail in section 5.5.4 below.

### 5.4.6 HOW SHOULD REWARDS BE ALLOCATED AND DISTRIBUTED?

Though not specifically asked, a number of participants put forward ideas concerning the way in which points and rewards may be determined and distributed, discussing the merits of systems based on recycling the correct materials versus weight-based mechanisms, rewards-based on individual effort versus communal effort, and systems involving barcodes, scanners and reward cards.

**Fill the bin or recycle correctly?**

Both the Sharston groups and the new recyclers in Lambeth discussed whether points should be conditional on the weight of recycling set out or on recycling correctly, with a general consensus that the latter would be more appropriate. There was a sense that weight-based measures are flawed since there’s no way of checking that people are actually filling their bins with materials that can be recycled, rather than non-recyclable but heavy items (such scheme abuse appears to be a genuine risk, given the discussions held by three of the new recyclers in the Maidenhead focus group – see section 3.5.5). The new recyclers in Lambeth felt the rewards should be based on the range and nature of materials recycled rather than on weight for fairness reasons:
‘Because that might mean that you’re just wasting a lot of stuff anyway and even if you’re recycling, you shouldn’t have bought that much stuff in the first place; or a big family up against a single individual, obviously they’re going to have much less but the single person shouldn’t be discriminated against simply because they’re recycling less stuff, they might be buying less and using less which is good’ [new recycler, Lambeth].

**Individual or communal effort?**

Again, though not explicitly asked, mixed opinions were expressed regarding whether rewards should be calculated on the basis of individual recycling effort or communal efforts. Only one participant within the Maidenhead focus groups was part of the community Recyclebank scheme rather than an individual scheme and she felt that a scheme based only on individual effort would be fairer:

‘Except if you’re in a flat and you don’t get your share, if that makes sense? We recycle a lot but we only get, I only get a few points, whereas I should probably get more, it just goes into one green bin, the big one, and then that’s divided by eight people or however many are in the block’.

The new recyclers in Lambeth were not as concerned about whether it was based on individual or communal efforts, but just wanted a system where rewards were contingent on *actual performance* rather than relying on people to be honest about whether or not they genuinely recycled. One participant felt it would be sufficient to base the rewards on communal efforts, distributing points amongst the groups of people using each communal bin, which would at least provide ‘an average idea’ of recycling effort.

Most of the ideas for scheme improvements presented by the Sharston focus group participants were based on individual efforts, but the existing recyclers did highlight that a scheme where points and rewards are based on communal efforts may be easier to monitor and administer.

**The mechanics of allocating points**

When brainstorming ideas for how to improve existing recycling systems, many participants put forward the idea of using a barcode and scanner system; all recycling bins would have a specific barcode, which the bin men would scan on collection day (likened to the reader used by postmen for ‘Special Delivery’ postal items) provided a set standard of recycling performance had been met (i.e. recycling correctly/putting forward a full recycling bin and reduced refuse bin etc.). Upon scanning, points would automatically be uploaded to an online account for each household, which would also be linked to a reward card or a swipe card (similar to the Tesco Clubcard or Sainsbury’s Nectar cards), which people could use in a diverse range of participating businesses (including supermarkets, high street stores, leisure and fitness centres etc.). This would mean that residents without access to the internet could bypass the online element of the reward scheme and just use their reward cards directly to redeem points in stores of interest. Alternatively people could choose to donate their points to charity or a community cause or to build up points with a view to gaining a reduction in their annual council tax bill at the end of the year. For the Sharston groups, it was important that this system was all electronic rather than distributing paper-based rewards like the Golden Tickets which will then need to be recycled at some stage anyway.

A separate scanner and barcode system was also suggested by the new recyclers in Maidenhead as an information device for people trying to identify what can and cannot be recycled locally; the
barcode would be on products and each household would have a scanner at home (perhaps linked to some form of smart phone app) so they could scan the barcode and determine which bin to put it in. For products that are recyclable but are not collected locally, the reader could highlight the nearest recycling bank for that type of product. A similar idea highlighted by the same group was for manufacturers to mark all their products with a number, which would correspond to a series of numbers on household recycling bins. Households would then know which product numbers could be recycled locally and which needed to be taken to recycling centres elsewhere.

Also discussed briefly by the existing recyclers in Sharston and Lambeth was the value in setting up more reverse vending machines in supermarkets, where people could return their packaging and gain vouchers or cash from the machine directly.

Though not discussed in detail, participants in the new recycler group in Maidenhead suggested value in providing points not just for household recycling but also to reward efforts to take excess recycling to the tip (existing recyclers, Maidenhead), and in broadening the scheme to include the provision of points to businesses and schools which are particularly proactive in recycling and reducing their waste.

5.5 SUPPORTING MEASURES

Many of the suggestions rated as gold or silver in the final focus group exercise related to non-reward related interventions, intended to enhance understanding and awareness of recycling and to make it easier for people to do. This section will present these ideas in more detail.

5.5.1 EDUCATION

Amongst all six focus groups there was a sense that recycling is something that the younger generation are much more aware of as a result of sustainability education in schools (as reflected in comments about the motivational effect of child pester power on household recycling – see section 5.2.2). Nonetheless, all groups called for more of this, highlighting the need for improved education from school age onwards:

‘They’re the future mindset of recycling aren’t they, schools, if it’s instilled in children at a young age then going forward, the whole process in their minds is different, they won’t be throwing their can of Stella on the corner of the street!’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead]

‘I think it’s just about education really’ [new recycler, Sharston]

‘Education in schools and teaching them all about sustainability before, get everybody, and make that a compulsory part of the curriculum and then hopefully a little bit of that will stick with them as they go forward…the future manufacturers and council officials’ [new recycler, Maidenhead]

‘It’s all about the education of, you know, what they and the children do and what incentives they give them because that not only goes through school, it gets brought home to parents and their awareness is raised as well so, you know, it’s not just about the children’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead]

‘Kids can put peer pressure on each other, which will then put peer pressure on adults’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead].
The ideas discussed for raising the profile of recycling in education did not just relate to changes in the curriculum. Also discussed was: the need for teachers and school staff to be setting a better example to the children through visibly putting waste reduction into practice in school (noted by existing recyclers in Maidenhead and Lambeth); the potential value in organising educational visits to recycling plants, and providing children with tangible examples of how waste can actually be a resource e.g. engaging them in projects converting food waste into compost to be used in school food growing, and how paper recycling can become a new school exercise book (noted by existing recyclers in Sharston); and offering small prizes to children in school to reward positive recycling efforts e.g. giving out little badges, like those given to children who come to school via a local walking bus [existing recycler, Lambeth].

Mirroring the discussions held about the community-value of the Golden Ticket scheme (section 3.4.3), there was also the feeling that getting children involved and working through the education system would create a greater sense of community and team spirit around recycling efforts; ‘I think children get a great sense of community about doing something like this as well, certainly with my children, they like a feeling of community, of being part of that group, doing something together’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead].

5.5.2 IMPROVED COMMUNICATIONS

Focus group participants did recognise that education needs to go beyond the school level and suggested the need for better communications for households in order to make it clearer what can and cannot be recycled. Each of the groups in both Maidenhead and Lambeth highlighted the need for more informative and detailed leaflets about what can and cannot be recycled, combining text and graphics, but also offering multi-lingual versions to reach out to members of the community who do not speak English.

At the same time, all acknowledged the limitations of leaflets and the tendency just to add them to the recycling bin; ‘because people throw leaflets away all the time’ [existing recycler, Lambeth]. With this in mind, a range of additional suggestions were made; from setting up an advice line to answer any queries about what can and cannot be recycled (existing recyclers, Maidenhead), following up leaflets with more house visits or phone calls from Recyclebank representatives (existing recyclers, Lambeth), including adverts on estate notice boards, buses, or on television (existing recyclers, Maidenhead and Lambeth), and including recycling-related activities in the estate ‘fun days’ that are already organised on a regular basis in several Lambeth estates [new recyclers, Lambeth]. It was suggested that the fun days could include a recycling tent, providing information about local recycling, distributing the orange recycling bags, collecting batteries, textiles and printer cartridges etc and organising fun activities like making outfits from plastic bags. A linked suggestion in this group was to organise more roadshows with a town crier in different parts of the borough on some sort of rota system.

20 The motivational value of small prizes, such as stickers and badges, for children was highlighted in the Phase 2 scoping review, particularly in a study (reported by Lowe et al., 2004 and Horne et al., 2004) using rewards to encourage healthier eating in schools. All the rewards were small (e.g. stickers, pencils, pens) and branded with a ‘Food Dudes’ logo; cartoon characters who champion the role of fruit and vegetables in helping to defeat the ‘Junk Punks’.
The general feeling, particularly amongst existing recyclers, was the need to ‘just keep drumming it into people, it’s easy for people to throw a leaflet away but it’s not easy to not look at a bus’ [existing recycler, Lambeth].

5.5.3 BETTER FEEDBACK AND REASSURANCE

Moving beyond the provision of generic information, participants in four of the focus groups emphasised the need to offer better feedback about the outcomes of household recycling efforts. This need not be in relation to the amount of waste diverted from landfill or total tonnages or recycling collected\(^\text{21}\) but rather, about who benefited from their efforts, what was the end result? As discussed in section 3.4.4, in Sharston, focus group participants felt there should have been better feedback about how their efforts had actually benefited the schools; how many tickets had they received? What new equipment had been bought for the children as a result?

A slightly different type of feedback was called for by the existing recyclers in Maidenhead and Lambeth; participants wanted to see what their recycling could be used to make:

‘Or when you’ve recycled it, it can come back with a message saying, “thanks, do you realise that by doing this you’ve managed to produce X amount of batteries” or “you’ve managed to make some more tin cans”’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead]

‘That’s how charities do it; “you can feed a child for a couple of weeks for £5” and it does make you feel better’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead]

‘I feel a lot of people might feel cheated if they’re not seeing it actually go somewhere and seeing something happen out of’ [existing recycler, Lambeth]

‘If they were able to track some of the items being recycled and come back to the person to say to them that “this is for your recycling, it remade this bag”, I mean it would be exciting to get to know about it’ [existing recycler, Lambeth]

‘Track your recycling and be able to identify what they’ve been used to reproduce’ [existing recycler, Lambeth].

Linked to this were calls from many participants for greater transparency and reassurance about where their recycling goes. As discussed in section 5.2.3, people reported feeling disheartened by the perception that their carefully sorted recycling was being dumped back into one container in the collection vehicle, or after watching documentaries about waste and recycling from the UK being exported to developing countries to be sorted or dumped. This concern was raised by all groups, and likely underpins their apparent desire to see how their recycling has been used; to gain that reassurance that it has been used productively:

‘I think people just need convincing that they are actually doing something positive with it, if they give you updates or whatever, “this is what we’re doing, how we’re doing it”...something to make you see that “well, it’s worthwhile”’ [new recycler, Sharston]

‘you want reassurance that it’s not being shipped off somewhere else to actually make money, it’s helping the environment’ [existing recycler, Sharston].

\(^{21}\) This is the type of feedback primarily highlighted in the scoping reviews completed in earlier phases of this project.
5.5.4 SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE

Underpinning all these suggested improvements were calls for basic improvements to the supporting infrastructure and recycling service provision to make it easier for people to recycle. All groups (except the new recyclers in Sharston) mentioned the need to be able to recycle more materials. In part, this was linked to calls for government to regulate manufacturers such that they only use recyclable or biodegradable packaging materials, and in part it was directed at councils, arguing that councils should be able to collect anything that technically can be recycled. Participants wanted to see more consistency in recycling i.e. if the product label indicates that the packaging is recyclable, participants felt it should also be accepted by the kerbside recycling service (especially in relation to plastics). There was no discussion, however, of the likely financial implications of an enhanced kerbside collection; any increases in the range of materials collected and sorted will likely increase the cost of providing the kerbside collection service and therefore potentially lead to increases in council tax.

Existing recyclers in particular expressed frustration that the Council would not yet collect materials such as yogurt pots (and other plastics), batteries, ink cartridges etc., arguing that they are now at ‘saturation point’ given what can be recycled in the current system. The new recyclers felt a more comprehensive collection service would reduce their confusion about what can and cannot be put out for recycling, as they could just follow the instructions on product labels. There were also calls for more recycle banks in communal areas or in supermarkets, for example battery banks that are not overflowing. A common suggestion made by participants in the Lambeth focus groups was the need for more outlets for the orange bags (more local shops, community centres, or distribution at the estate fun days) or for the Council to drop them off more regularly.

Other infrastructure-related suggestions included: including free green bins and food waste collections as a reward option (mentioned by both Maidenhead groups); introducing better food waste collection schemes on estates, perhaps linked to estate food growing projects (Lambeth new recyclers); providing greater assistance to the elderly who may struggle with the weight of their different bins (raised as a potential issue by participants across all groups); maintaining weekly rather than fortnightly refuse collections (new recyclers, Sharston; existing recyclers, Maidenhead); designing more effective recycling systems for flats e.g. more compact but compartmentalised bins, and effective recycling chutes (existing recyclers, Sharston; new recyclers, Maidenhead; existing recyclers, Lambeth); introducing more street recycling bins and street cleaners designed to sweep up anything that could be recycled, similar to those apparently used in Sweden and France (existing recycler, Maidenhead); opening ‘swap shops’ to encourage re-use, which would work a little like Freecycle but with actual shops (rather than online trading) where people could donate their unwanted goods in payment for appealing goods donated in store by others (existing recyclers, Lambeth); and, drawing on a system used in Germany, was the idea of dedicating a certain number of days a year to community recycling swaps – on these days, people would be able to leave any goods they no longer need or use outside their house for anyone else to pick up and take home, and anything remaining at the end of the day would be collected and sorted by the Council (existing recycler, Maidenhead).

5.6 SUMMARY
Drawing on the findings from these six focus groups, a number of key conclusions can be identified to bear in mind when designing and implementing future reward and recognition schemes intended to influence waste prevention and recycling behaviour.

Firstly, generally the participants liked the concept of rewards; low to medium recyclers did report greater recycling effort as a result of the reward schemes (a finding supported by the release of Recyclebank’s RBWM annual recycling improvement rate data, reported on in section 3.5), though many participants were yet to redeem the points they had collected. For these types of individuals, including appealing rewards in a wider package of measures intended to influence behaviour could tip them into the habit of recycling.

For high recyclers, the self-reported behavioural impact of rewards was limited, but no adverse impacts were identified, nor any indication of motivational crowding out. High recyclers tended to see the rewards as ‘something for nothing’ and positive recognition of their efforts. In particular, in the Maidenhead focus groups, participants highlighted their appreciation of the Council’s decision to introduce a reward scheme for households at a time when other councils in the country were introducing fines; ‘that made me feel sort of warm towards the whole thing and that’s why I got actively involved in it’ [existing recycler, Maidenhead]. Whilst many of these participants were yet to redeem any rewards, it seems the reward scheme changed the nature of the relationship between the focus group participants and the Council, making them more predisposed to engage in the scheme.

Secondly, choice is essential. Each focus group, be it with new or existing recyclers, included a mix of participants who felt more motivated by community-based rewards and those calling for better and more appealing rewards for individuals. Many participants appreciated community or charity rewards for providing an additional societal benefit of their recycling efforts (with a particular preference for smaller charities and local causes), but most felt there should be options for both individual and community rewards. With respect to individual rewards, participants indicated a general lack of interest in rewards tied to minimum spends or those trying to encourage them to go to places they would not normally visit. Participants called for a wider variety of reward options to choose from, including: reductions in council tax bills (perhaps the most frequently volunteered suggestion across the groups); rewards linked to transport, such as reduced fares or free passes; rewards linked to leisure time, be it free gym passes and swimming sessions or days out for the family; or rewards linked to improvements in local recycling service provision, for example being given a free green bin and food waste collection.

Thirdly, prize draw models carry little appeal. Some participants suggested including the option within a wider selection of rewards, depending on the nature of the prize and the odds of winning. Most participants preferred the idea of a guaranteed reward, even if something small or something larger they had to work towards through building up points over time.

Fourth, feedback is vital. Unlike much of the discussion about feedback in the two scoping reviews completed earlier in the project, focus group participants did not call for feedback in terms of waste diverted from landfill or increased recycling tonnage; they wanted to know the positive community

---

22 Given the small sample size, we cannot comment on whether this is true for the wider population of non to low recyclers, particularly since we did not hold groups with those who are still not recycling despite registering for the Recyclebank scheme.
benefits of their actions\textsuperscript{23} (how many Golden Tickets had the schools collected? What equipment had they bought?) or to see where their recycling goes, what is it used to produce and what quantity of resources was saved by recycling rather than producing products from new? In part, the latter type of feedback stems from participants’ desire for reassurance that their recycling is not being sent to landfill or exported to be dealt with elsewhere; a concern emerging from perceptions that their carefully separated recycling is being dumped into the same van, or in response to documentaries or media images related to waste.

Fifth, \textit{schemes need to be designed in a way that is seen as fair}. In part this relates to how the rewards are determined; for example, concerns were raised that weight-based schemes would reward those who consume more and therefore can recycle more (or indeed those who abuse the system with Argos catalogues and water-logged cardboard!) rather than those who consciously try to reduce their waste and recycling. Similarly, concerns were raised by those involved in communal schemes that the rewards received are not proportional to their actual recycling effort since they just receive an average number of points based on the total weight of communal recycling. On a different note, participants felt the online system of claiming rewards may work against those who are less computer literate or without regular access to the internet, and suggested a system based on individual reward ‘swipe cards’ may be fairer from this perspective.

Sixth, \textit{rewards will have a greater behavioural effect when combined with complementary interventions}. As highlighted in both scoping reviews, rewards are more effective as one part of a wider package of measures intended to encourage recycling and waste prevention participation. Participants in all six focus groups emphasised the importance of improved education (from school onwards), communications and outreach, and supporting infrastructure to make it easier for them to recycle. In particular, a key constraint highlighted by both new and existing recyclers was the disparity between materials that can technically be recycled and those which the Local Council will actually collect. For existing recyclers, this leads to frustration as they feel they cannot recycle all that they would like to, whilst for new recyclers, it leads to confusion and anxiety about what can and cannot be recycled. The importance of supporting infrastructure was particularly apparent in discussions with the new and existing recyclers in Maidenhead; both groups highlighted the importance of the new blue Recyclebank wheelie bin in encouraging increased recycling, in part because it has made recycling much easier and less time-consuming (as all materials go in the one bin) and in part because they are no longer discouraged when they see all their recycling being emptied into the same van.

Seventh, \textit{people want to see their efforts matched by government and industry}. Though not a new finding, common frustrations mentioned by all groups concerned the barriers to recycling, reuse and repair resulting from wasteful industry practices. Amongst different groups, there were calls for government to regulate industry to:

\begin{itemize}
  \item reduce packaging on all products (a measure that many industries are doing voluntarily through the Courtauld Commitment\textsuperscript{24});
  \item use only recyclable or biodegradable packaging;
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{23} This mirrors a finding identified in the Phase 1 Review, in which Woollam et al. (2003) emphasise the importance of providing positive feedback of local achievements.

\textsuperscript{24} More information is available here: 
• encourage local councils to explore the cost and feasibility of increasing the range of materials collected in kerbside recycling schemes such that households could just follow the recycling guidance provided on product labels; and
• reverse the shift towards the production of products with in-built obsolescence, and make it easier to source new parts to repair items rather than having to buy new each time.

Finally, people are keen and willing to engage in discussions about recycling and waste prevention. Obviously it is hard to determine whether this is just an artefact of self-selection bias in the recruitment process, but all focus group participants were very open and keen to discuss their views and experiences of waste. Moreover, some participants commented that providing more opportunities like these focus groups would be useful, serving to increase awareness of waste reduction techniques and facilities, share experiences and frustrations, and encourage further action to reduce waste.
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