



Sharing residential spaces: a comparative study of willingness to share in the Netherlands, Slovenia, and Sweden

Robert Boyer¹ · Aemiro Melkamu Daniel¹ · Andrea Armstrong² · Agnieszka Hunka¹ · Sabina Jordan³ · Anuša Babuder³ · Joana Wensing² · Nancy Bocken²

Received: 6 October 2025 / Accepted: 30 June 2026
© The Author(s) 2026

Abstract

One strategy for reducing the environmental impact of urban residential systems is the development of shared-access spaces that allow multiple households to use facilities that are typically privately owned. To date, however, cross-contextual evidence on interest in such arrangements remains limited, particularly for specific types of shared spaces. This study draws on a survey of 3077 individuals in the Netherlands, Slovenia, and Sweden to examine self-reported willingness to share three types of residential spaces: kitchen-and-dining areas, work-from-home spaces, and workshops. Using ordered logit models, we analyze how stated willingness varies with socio-demographic characteristics, prior experience, attitudes, and national context. The results indicate that responses differ across both space types and countries, with consistent positive associations observed for prior experience, environmental efficacy, and self-reported extraversion. At the same time, substantial variation across demographic groups and national contexts suggests that interest in shared-access spaces is not uniform. While a considerable share of respondents express openness to at least some forms of sharing, the findings should be interpreted as indicative of stated preferences under hypothetical conditions rather than realized demand. These results contribute to a more differentiated understanding of how interest in shared residential functions varies across populations and contexts, and provide a basis for further research on the design and feasibility of shared-access housing models.

Keywords Sharing economy · Shared housing · Urban housing · Circular housing

1 Introduction

In countries around the world, residential floor space per person has steadily grown for decades, offsetting gains in energy and resource intensity (Ellsworth-Krebs, 2020; Huang et al., 2024; Kallaios & Bohne, 2013; Lorek & Spangenberg, 2019; Ness, 2023; Underwood & Zahran, 2015). This has challenged efforts to improve building resource efficiency, which

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

has been labelled a “persistent problem” by the United Nations Environment Programme (2025, p. 30). One pathway to addressing this dilemma is increasing the use-intensity of existing and future residential buildings. This could be achieved by neighbors sharing access to spaces that are conventionally accessed privately and exclusively (Boyer et al., 2026; Denstadli & Sønstebo, 2025; Francart et al., 2020; Ruokamo et al., 2024). The integration of shared-access spaces into existing and future residential landscapes could allow for smaller and more efficient homes without diminishing, and perhaps *enhancing*, households’ access to functional spaces for cooking, dining, deskwork, repair and hobby work, socializing, etc. To date, research on residents’ interest in different types of shared-access living spaces is limited to a small number of studies, conducted in isolated contexts. Designers, policy makers, and developers would benefit from a broader understanding of the individuals that express interest in shared-access residential spaces. It is unclear, however, whether and to whom such spaces are appealing and thus unclear whether and which spaces could work as a design solution that is profitable to designers and housing builders and palatable to elected officials responsible for regulating housing production and design.

This article offers a multinational comparison of individuals’ self-reported interest in shared kitchen-and-dining spaces, work-from-home office spaces, and workshops. Drawing from a survey administered to 3077 adults in the Netherlands, Slovenia, and Sweden, the paper asks *to whom shared access spaces are appealing* by testing how ‘willingness to share’ varies on demographic-, social-, spatial-, and attitudinal variables associated with different rationales for sharing in a housing context. This study addresses two important research gaps: Firstly, while there is assorted research exploring interest in holistic shared housing models like co-housing and co-living, relatively little research has probed interest in specific shared spaces, which has fewer implied social obligations and may thus be a more pragmatic, “less intrusive” (Denstadli & Sønstebo, 2025, p. 2789) strategy for achieving resource efficiency in housing. Secondly, virtually no research has compared interest in shared-access residential spaces across multiple national contexts, which limits the generalizability of prior findings.

This paper thus aims to answer two overarching research questions:

1. Which individual characteristics are associated with individuals’ willingness to share different space types (kitchen/dining, office/study, workshop)?
2. To what extent do these associations differ across national contexts (the Netherlands, Slovenia, and Sweden)?

In Sect. 2, we review existing research suggesting that shared-access residential spaces are currently undersupplied and under-researched. We also detail prior research on motivations for sharing residential spaces and propose four cost-benefit dimensions of individuals’ perceptions of shared spaces. In Sect. 3, we present research methods. Section 4 reports the results of an ordered logit model. Section 5 discusses results. We offer concluding remarks and implications for practice in Sect. 6.

2 Prior research and conceptual framework: why willingness to share varies by space type and context

Research in multiple contexts suggests that shared residential options are undersupplied by the market. Several studies on co-housing conclude that individuals expressing interest do not match the socio-demographic profile of existing residents, suggesting demand that exceeds current supply or market targeting (Boyer & Leland, 2018; Sanguinetti & Hibbert, 2018). Similarly, research on co-living—a commercialized version of co-housing—in Seoul finds high stated interest among young single households despite limited supply, implying potential unmet demand for housing that includes shared facilities (Kim et al., 2020).

Other studies cast doubt on the general popularity of shared housing (Vadovics et al., 2024) and several studies suggest that interest in sharing certain spaces with neighbors is higher than interest in holistic shared housing models like co-housing or co-living. For example, Finnish survey evidence shows very low (7%) agreement that “shared housing” suits respondents’ living style but substantially higher willingness to share certain functions (e.g., repair-oriented spaces) (Ruokamo et al., 2024), and Slovenian survey evidence likewise shows very low willingness to share kitchens and dining rooms but higher willingness to share gyms, workshops, and outdoor green spaces (Hawlina et al., 2021). A recent survey of residents of Trondheim, Norway finds relatively high interest in shared storage facilities and gyms and comparatively low interest in spaces for laundry, office facilities, and gaming spaces for children (Denstadli & Sønstebo, 2025). Notably, this study did not test kitchens or dining spaces. Together, this literature suggests that willingness to share residential spaces is not encompassed in a single preference and may be better understood when broken down into specific space types.

The present study builds on this insight by examining willingness to share three specific shared-access spaces that are conventionally private in contemporary housing: (i) kitchen-and-dining spaces, (ii) home-office and study spaces, and (iii) workshops.

2.1 Perceived cost-benefit dimensions for shared-access spaces

In this section we propose a four-dimensional framework for assessing interest in shared-access spaces, which leads to hypotheses about how individuals perceive the relative costs and benefits of specific shared residential spaces.

Shared-access residential spaces remain uncommon in many housing markets. Drawing on diffusion of innovations theory (Rogers, 2010) residents can thus be assumed to be at an early stage of the adoption-decision process in which they still need to form an attitude about innovative spatial forms. This means that before they finally decide to adopt or reject shared-access spaces, individuals evaluate them based on (i) the perceived benefits of access to a shared facility and (ii) the perceived costs and risks associated with shared use. In this attitude-forming stage, beliefs, dispositions, and prior exposure to an innovation can be especially influential weighing potential benefits and risks, while later adoption depends more heavily on concrete design attributes and management arrangements (Rogers, 2010). Thus, we also theoretically connect potential benefits and costs of shared-access spaces to residents’ demographic, contextual and attitudinal characteristics, assuming that those factors activate or emphasize the perception of certain benefits and costs. Appendix A offers a

summary of prior studies linking demographic, contextual, and attitudinal characteristics to interest in shared housing and shared-access spaces.

Drawing on this literature, we identify four dimensions of potential benefits and costs that residents could perceive as they are exposed to the idea of shared-access spaces:

Dimension 1. Spatial efficiency and functional benefits

Where a function is already widely available in private dwellings (e.g., everyday cooking), a shared version may be perceived as redundant. By contrast, functions that are costly, rare, or space-intensive to provide privately have higher marginal value when offered as a shared amenity. This dimension is consistent with Denstadli & Sønstebo (2025), who find that individuals express willingness to live in smaller private dwellings when offered access to certain shared-access spaces. It is also consistent with aforementioned studies illustrating that everyday spaces like kitchens and dining spaces are among the least popular spaces to share. Individuals living in larger private dwelling units may be less sensitive to the perceived benefits or more sensitive to the perceived costs of shared spaces, however prior attempts to capture this empirically have not been conclusive (Ruokamo et al., 2024).

Dimension 2. Social exposure and sociability benefits

Shared spaces are inherently social and social benefits of shared housing have been well documented (Berggren, 2020; Markle et al., 2015; Vestbro & Horelli, 2012). Several studies illustrate how interest in shared housing and specific shared spaces increases with perceptions of social interaction (Kvietkute & Lappegard Hauge, 2022; Woo et al., 2019) and are more popular to extraverts (Boyer & Leland, 2018). At the same time, Kim et al. (2020) find that respondents have concerns about privacy in shared housing. Social exposure and perceived social costs and benefits may vary in different types of spaces. Kitchens/ dining facilities can intensify social exposure, while workshops and offices may permit use with minimal social interaction. Consequently, the perceived benefits of sociability—and the perceived costs of unwanted interaction—are expected to differ by space type, making sociability-related predictors potentially stronger for some spaces than others.

Dimension 3. Governance and maintenance risks

Shared spaces require rules and coordination about common resources—booking, conflict resolution skills, and norms of appropriate use—that take time to develop and implement (Boyer, 2016; Jarvis, 2011). Shared access implies collective responsibility for maintenance, cleanliness, and stewardship of equipment. Perceived risks such as lack of availability, theft, damage, noise, or poor upkeep are expected to vary by space type and to matter more where governance arrangements are uncertain or where residents anticipate sharing with neighbors whose norms and practices are not fully known. *Prior experience* sharing specific shared spaces may reduce perceived risks related to governance and maintenance, potentially increasing willingness to share (e.g. Boyer & Leland, 2018; Denstadli & Sønstebo, 2025; Kim et al., 2020; Woo et al., 2019), however it is conceivable that negative prior experiences could reduce it. At the same, the time costs associated with governance of common facilities may also be perceived as higher by individuals with dependent children, who express interest in sharing in some studies (Boyer & Leland, 2018) but not others (Denstadli & Sønstebo, 2025; Kvietkute & Lappegard Hauge, 2022).

Dimension 4. Expression of sharing ideologies

Interest in shared-access spaces may be an expression of political ideologies and beliefs about sharing's contribution to environmental causes. Multiple studies have found that shared housing and shared access spaces are more interesting to individuals with strong environmental beliefs (Boyer & Leland, 2018; Kvietkute & Lappegard Hauge, 2022; Ruokamo et al., 2024), and there is some evidence that shared residential spaces can yield resource efficiencies that lead to lower carbon emissions (Daly, 2017; Hendrickson & Wittman, 2010; Malmqvist & Brismark, 2023; Moos et al., 2006).

Table 1 Summarizes dimensions and associated theoretical expectations.

2.2 National context as a moderator: housing regimes and the expression of willingness to share

A primary motivation for this study is that willingness to share may depend not only on individual preferences but also on institutional context—particularly housing production regimes that shape individual expectations about privacy, collective rules, and shared responsibility (Flynn & Montalbano, 2024). To the authors' knowledge, few studies compare willingness to share specific residential spaces across multiple countries using a consistent empirical design.

This study compares interest in shared spaces in the Netherlands, Slovenia, and Sweden. Despite distinct political histories, each has moved through a broadly comparable arc in housing production regimes including post-World War II public-sector support for large-scale urban housing production and standardization, followed by market liberalization that reduced policy incentives for incorporating shared-access spaces in new construction (Boelhouwer & Priemus, 2014; Hall & Vidén, 2005; Kosec, 2022; Nađ & Podlogar, 2020). Within housing regime terms, Sweden and the Netherlands are often associated with historically unitary/integrated rental systems in which regulated, non-profit or cost-rental provision helped normalize collective arrangements and tenant-based governance, even as both have increasingly faced dualization and financialization pressures that can reorient housing toward privacy, exclusivity, and asset logics (Flynn & Montalbano, 2024).

Table 1 Summary of proposed cost-benefit dimensions

Cost-benefit dimensions	Expectations, aligned with prior literature
1. Spatial efficiency and functional benefits	Lower interest in shared kitchens, than offices or workshops Lower interest among individuals with more private dwelling space per person
2. Social exposure and sociability benefits	Higher interest among extraverted individuals Lower interest in kitchens, which require more social interaction
3. Governance and maintenance risks	Higher interest among individuals with prior sharing experience Lower interest among individuals with dependent children in the household Lower interest in kitchens, which are functionally and hygienically more complex
4. Expression of sharing ideologies	Higher interest among individuals who believe that shared spaces are good for the environment

Slovenia, by contrast, fits the “transition” profile common to Central–Eastern Europe: after a period of worker-oriented rental housing with utilitarian common areas (bathrooms, laundry and drying rooms) and later prefabricated high-rise estates, the post-1991 shift to a market economy and mass privatization converted much of the multifamily stock into individually managed, commodified apartments—conditions likely to strengthen consumer expectations of private control while raising the perceived coordination risks of shared-access amenities (Flynn & Montalbano, 2024; Kosec, 2022; Nađ & Podlogar, 2020).

These regime histories suggest a potential attitudinal pattern an empirical test can probe: integrated-rental legacies (Sweden/Netherlands) may cultivate greater expressed interest in shared facilities and collective rules, while post-socialist super-homeownership and commodification (Slovenia) may yield preferences for privatized responsibility, however all three contexts have experienced liberalization that can dampen institutional support for shared-access spaces, making contemporary willingness to share contingent on whether credible governance, maintenance, and risk-sharing arrangements are visible and trusted.

2.3 Hypotheses

The four-dimensional framework motivates four hypotheses designed to support interpretation across multiple space types and national contexts:

H1(Spatial efficiency) *The magnitude of predictors differs by space type because kitchens, offices, and workshops differ in substitutability, privacy norms, coordination costs, and perceived risks. In particular, willingness to share kitchen-and-dining spaces is expected to be lower on average than willingness to share workshops or offices, consistent with prior evidence showing low willingness for shared kitchens relative to repair-oriented spaces. Additionally, individuals with access to more private dwelling space per person will be less interested in sharing spaces, generally.*

H2 (Attitudinal variables) *Higher environmental efficacy and higher extraversion are associated with higher willingness to share residential spaces.*

H3 (Experience and uncertainty reduction) *Prior experience with analogous shared spaces is associated with higher willingness to share, consistent with reduced uncertainty about coordination and governance, while the presence of children in the household is associated with lower interest in sharing due to time constraints.*

H4 (Context moderation) *The associations between predictors and willingness to share differ across national contexts, consistent with housing regime and institutional differences shaping expectations surrounding shared amenities.*

Control variables (gender, age, income, housing tenure, dwelling type, and dwelling space per person) are included to account for alternative explanations and to isolate associations of primary theoretical interest.

3 Methods

3.1 Survey design and development

The hypotheses were tested in a multi-national digital survey. The survey was developed over the course of 15 months, beginning in October 2023. In the subsequent subsections, we describe the survey development.

3.1.1 Selection of shared-access spaces

First, a series of brainstorming sessions were conducted among the authors and a consortium of housing professionals with the aim of identifying shared-access spaces that were (i) simple to describe and understand in all three countries; (ii) not conventionally included in urban residences; and (iii) could conceivably contribute to resource savings by supplementing smaller residential spaces in urban dwellings. The full consortium identified shared kitchen-and-dining spaces (henceforth shared kitchens), shared home office spaces (shared offices), and shared workshops. Next, interest in these spaces was probed in a series of online focus groups in all three countries to ensure that at least *some* respondents were interested and *some* were not. Participants in these test focus groups were selected with the help of local housing industry professionals and included individuals of variable age and household composition. Focus groups validated that there was some variation in interest in all three shared-access spaces.

3.1.2 Survey design

The survey was designed as part of a larger study including a discrete choice experiment to estimate willingness-to-pay for shared-access spaces. The initial survey was developed in English and translated to national languages (Dutch, Slovenian, and Swedish) by two native speakers of each language and reconciled with the help of third native speaker. Each national language survey was then reverse translated to English by a bilingual researcher to ensure consistency in interpretation across surveys in all languages. All respondents had the option to complete the survey in either English or the national language of their country of residence. An English version of the full questionnaire can be viewed in Appendix B.

As part of this survey, all respondents were asked to read a description of each shared access space presented in Table 2.

The description for each space was followed by the question: “*Would you be interested in such a service?*” Respondents had the option to select “yes”, “maybe”, or “no” to this question. The order in which the descriptions were presented as well as the response options to this question (yes/maybe/no) were randomized to minimize primacy effect.

3.2 Data collection

The survey was conducted online in January 2025 with respondent panels administered by Kantar (www.kantar.com)—an independent data collection firm. Respondents were age- and gender representative sample of adults (n=3077) in the Netherlands (n=1011), Slovenia (n=1050), and Sweden (n=1016). Respondents were drawn from a sample that was

Table 2 Shared-access space descriptions

Shared kitchen-and-dining space	Imagine a scenario that you live in a unit with shared access to a common space with a larger kitchen and dining space. The shared-access kitchen is a space where you can prepare meals and host events that are too large for the kitchen in your own home. It can also be a space where you meet your neighbors for meals. The kitchen is equipped with utensils and cooking appliances. The space also has a dining table and seating for 15 people that can be rearranged for meetings or parties
Shared office space	Imagine a scenario that you live in a unit with a shared home office and study space. The home office and study space accommodate remote working, online meetings, or quiet studying. There are desks, office chairs, lockable cabinets and a well-lit reading area with comfortable seating, and a meeting room where you can have a private conversation. Residents can connect to free Wi-Fi, but must bring their own laptop or tablet
Shared workshop	Imagine that you live in a unit with a shared workshop. The shared workshop provides a space where you can work on different Do-It-Yourself projects. It has several work tables and access to simple tools for creative projects and for repairing things like bicycles, furniture, or clothes. You can safely store your own tools here as well

agnostic to population density or spatial criteria (e.g. urban vs. rural spaces), opting to draw from any location in each country. This approach was chosen for several reasons. Firstly, while residential space sharing is intuitively more common and more efficient in cities and the use of sharing economy applications appears more likely in higher-density neighborhoods (Leland et al., 2023), *willingness to share*—we assume—can exist anywhere; Secondly, developing methodologically consistent criteria for “urban” respondents in different countries is problematic, as different countries apply different definitions of “urban”. Sweden, for example, considers “urban” any settlement with at least 200 inhabitants, whereas Slovenia’s threshold for an urban settlement is 3000, and the Netherlands uses a grid cell density threshold of 1500 addresses per square kilometer. Consequently, selecting from official urban places in either the Netherlands or Sweden would effectively include 90% or more of each country’s population, while Slovenia’s definition of “urban” includes less than 60% of the population. Education is a variable included in some studies on the sharing economy, however it is rarely significant and is highly correlated with income, as is the case in this study (see Appendix C).

All respondents were remunerated for completing the survey. A summary of the sample characteristics is presented in Table 3.

3.3 Data analysis

The outcome variable of interest, willingness to share, is categorical with ordered responses—“No”, “Maybe” and “Yes”. These categories have a natural ranking, but the distances between them aren’t precisely measurable. A suitable approach to explain such ordered responses is the ordered logit (aka proportional odds) model (McCullagh, 1980).

Table 3 Sample characteristics of respondents

Variable	Category/statistics	Netherlands (n=1011)	Slovenia (n=1050)	Sweden (n=1016)
Gender	Female	52.7%	46.9%	49.9%
	Male	46.3%	51.8%	47.3%
	Non-binary	0.5%	0.5%	1.5%
	Other	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%
	Prefer not to answer	0%	0.8%	1.2%
Age	Mean (Median)	47.7 (49)	45.4 (46)	45.2 (45)
	18–24 years	12.1%	9.7%	10.3%
	25–34 years	15.3%	16.8%	20.2%
	35–44 years	16.5%	20.7%	18.2%
	45–54 years	13.5%	23.6%	18.1%
	55–64 years	20.8%	19%	20.3%
Monthly disposable income before tax: Netherlands/Slovenia/Sweden	65 years & above	21.9%	10.3%	12.9%
	Category-1: <€2000/€827/SEK23,700	19.7%	17%	29.6%
	Category-2: €2,000–3,000/€828–1,241/SEK23,700–35,600	29.1%	30.2%	32.9%
	Category-3: €3,001–4,500/€1242–1861/SEK35,601–53,400	27.3%	29.7%	24.6
	Category-4: >€4,500/>€1861/>SEK53400	10.2%	14.4%	5.4%
Presence of children in household	Prefer not to answer	13.7%	8.7%	7.5%
	Presence of children in the household	25.9%	36%	32.8%
Number of adults in the household	Mean	1.88	2.36	1.70
House floor area (per m ²)	Median (Mean)	113 (100)	117 (90)	101(81)
Housing type	Apartment	30.6%	42.4%	47.2%
	Stand-alone house	10.6%	51%	26.9%
	Row house/attached/terrace	57.6%	5.9%	17%
	Other	1.3%	0.7%	8.9%
Home ownership	Owner-occupied	61.1%	81.6%	47.5%
Environmental efficacy of sharing “Sharing spaces and services with neighbors as described in this study is good for the environment.”	Strongly agree or agree (on a five-point scale)	53%	58%	59%
Extraversion “I enjoy opportunities to socialize and meet other people.”	Strongly agree or agree (on a five-point scale)	62%	64%	58%

The ordered logit model is based on the idea that behind each respondent’s response lies an unobserved (latent) propensity (or willingness) to share space. This underlying willingness to share is influenced by various factors—such as age, gender, income, household size, environmental attitude or previous experience with shared arrangements. The model estimates how each of these predictors is associated with a higher or lower likelihood of being more open to sharing.

We observe how respondents replied to the willingness to share question, but we cannot observe the underlying willingness to share directly. The model estimates threshold (or cut-off) points along the unobserved scale of willingness to share which separate different response categories, in our case “No” from “Maybe” as well as “Maybe” from “Yes”. Respondents with a higher predicted value on this underlying scale (based on their characteristics) are more likely to fall into the higher response categories (e.g., “Yes” rather than “Maybe” or “No”). The model relies on the proportional odds assumption meaning that the effect of each predictor is consistent across all levels of the response—that is, it has the same direction and strength whether distinguishing between No and Maybe, or between Maybe and Yes.

3.4 Cross-national comparison

Cross-national comparison was assessed in two stages. In the first stage, a restricted pooled ordered logit model was estimated across all three countries, constraining predictor effects to be equal while allowing country-specific intercepts through country dummy variables. This allows differences in baseline willingness to share but not differences in the effect of predictors across countries. An unrestricted pooled model was then estimated, augmenting the restricted specification with full country-by-predictor interaction terms, making it mathematically equivalent to estimating country-specific models within a single unified framework. A likelihood ratio (LR) test comparing the two models was used to formally assess whether predictor effects jointly differed significantly across countries. In the second stage, where the likelihood ratio test indicated significant cross-national heterogeneity, country-specific ordered logit models were reported to facilitate interpretation of the direction and magnitude of effects within each national context. Significant interaction terms from the unrestricted pooled model were used to identify which specific predictor effects differed significantly across countries.

A mathematical description of the statistical model is available in Appendix D.

4 Results

Table 4 details the distribution of *yes*, *maybe*, and *no* responses by shared-access space and country. In almost all spaces and all countries, most respondents express either definite (“yes”) or possible (“maybe”) interest in shared-access spaces, with one exception being kitchens in the Netherlands, where nearly 55% of individuals responded negatively (“no”).

Interest in shared kitchens appears lower than offices or workshops in all countries, with “no” responses representing a higher proportion of responses for kitchens than all other spaces. Shared workshops attracted the highest proportion of “yes” responses relative to kitchens and offices, in all countries. When tested formally, the frequency of combined definite and possible interest in shared office spaces and workshops is significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher than interest in shared kitchens in the Netherlands and Slovenia; In Sweden, this is true for workshops, while the difference in frequency of negative responses for offices and kitchens is not statistically significant. This partially supports H1 that shared kitchens are less interesting than offices or workshops, which also suggests grounding in Dimension 1

Table 4 Distribution of responses of willingness to share, by shared space and country

Shared space	Response	Netherlands (%) (n=1011)	Slovenia (%) (n=1050)	Sweden (%) (n=1016)
Kitchen and dining	Yes	19.2	30.4	28.0
	Maybe	26.0	33.5	33.2
	No	54.8	36.1	38.8
Office and study	Yes	23.5	31.3	26.4
	Maybe	30.5	39.6	36.0
	No	46.0	29.1	37.6
Workshop	Yes	27.1	41.5	36.2
	Maybe	35.4	39.6	38.1
	No	37.5	18.9	25.7

(spatial efficiency and functional benefits). The result summarizing this test is presented in Appendix E.

Interest in all shared access spaces appears generally lower in the Netherlands, where “no” responses for all spaces were higher than in Sweden or Slovenia. Inversely, the proportion of “yes” responses for all shared access spaces is highest in Slovenia, and in the case of workshops “yes” responses exceed “maybe” responses 41.5–39.6%.

Below we present the ordered logit model estimation results for each shared space and country. We report country-specific coefficients corresponding to the sociodemographic, housing and attitudinal predictors included to explain willingness to share a space. Country-specific results are presented since the Loglikelihood ratio (LR) test supports that the predictors jointly affect willingness to share spaces differently across countries (See LR test results in Appendix F, Table F1). For purposes of clarity, we display the results from the unrestricted pooled models that directly allow assessing whether individual predictors operated differently across countries in Appendix F, Table F2. The coefficients indicate the log-odds of being in a higher category of willingness to share a considered space. i.e., more likely to say or “Yes” instead of “No” as well as more likely to say “Yes” instead of “Maybe”. Coefficient signs reflect the direction of the effect of the predictors on the latent outcome and thus the likelihood of a lower or higher observed outcome. We note that the estimation results in the subsequent sections are based on a slightly lower number of respondents since we removed observations with invalid responses/values on one or more variables.

4.1 Willingness to share kitchen-and-dining spaces

In all three countries, willingness to share a kitchen was positively associated with environmental efficacy, self-reported extraversion, and experience sharing kitchens in the past, supporting both H2 and H3 and Dimensions 2 and 3. Specifically, it seems that prior kitchen sharing experiences could lower the perceived risk of sharing and the perceived time costs or uncertainties related to governance issues. In addition, we find that respondents in the Netherlands and Sweden (but not Slovenia) with one or more children in the household were significantly more likely to express higher willingness to share kitchens relative to those without children in the household. In all three countries, willingness to share a kitchen is negatively associated with age, especially over age 35. In Slovenia, but not the Netherlands and Sweden, the second-youngest age category (25–34) is also less interested than the youngest age cohort (18–24 years). Beyond 35, all age cohorts in all countries express

lower odds of willingness to share a kitchen. Our results related to income were peculiar: respondents in monthly income “category-2” in all countries and “category-3” in the Netherlands and Slovenia, are significantly more likely to express higher willingness to share, relative to respondents in the lowest (reference) income category (category-1). However, we did not find significant differences between respondents in the reference category and those in the highest income category (category-4), suggesting that shared kitchens could be more appealing to “middle income” earners. International studies suggest that income and socio-economic status are positively correlated with environmental concern (Pampel, 2014), which indirectly supports Dimension 4.

We find that *neither* respondents’ self-reported housing floor area per person *nor* home ownership status are significant. But respondents from Slovenia living in apartments were significantly less willing to share kitchen space. Similarly, home ownership was marginally significant (again at 10% level) only in Sweden where the odds of sharing kitchens were lower for homeowners than those who rent (supporting Dimension 1).

We found that respondents in the Netherlands were generally less inclined to sharing kitchen space than those in Slovenia and Sweden (offering some support to H4). Comparing the effect of predictors across countries, our results show that extraversion has significantly more positive association with willingness to share kitchen space in the Netherlands than in Slovenia. The influence of living in apartments is also significantly different between these two countries. In addition, although the variable was not significant for either country, home ownership is significantly differently associated with willingness to share kitchen space in Slovenia and Sweden. Similarly, housing floor area per person was significantly differently associated with willingness to share kitchen space in Sweden and the Netherlands. These results are elaborated in Appendix F (Table 5).

4.2 Willingness to share home-office and study space

Turning to shared office spaces, we find again that environmental efficacy, extraversion, and experience are significantly and positively associated with willingness to share, in all countries (supporting H2 and H3, Dimensions 2, 3, and 4). Similar to shared kitchens, respondents with children in their household in the Netherlands and Sweden (but not Slovenia) are more likely to express higher willingness to share office spaces than households without children.

All housing-related variables including housing area per occupant, home ownership, and living in an apartment were found to have no significant influence on willingness to share an office. This result applies to all three countries. We find that female respondents in Sweden were substantially (32%) less likely to report higher willingness to share than other respondents. We find no significant differences between gender categories, however, among respondents in the Netherlands and Slovenia. In all three countries, older respondents, especially those who are 35+, were significantly less likely to report a higher willingness to share offices relative to younger respondents aged 18–24 years. Our results show no significant difference in the willingness to share between respondents in the lowest income category and those in higher income categories in the Netherlands. By contrast, in Slovenia and Sweden, respondents in income categories 2 and 4, respectively, were more likely to express interest in sharing an office compared to those in income category 1.

Table 5 Predictors for willingness to share kitchen and dining space (standard errors in parenthesis, * = $p < 0.10$; ** = $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$)

Variable	Variable category	Netherlands (n=844)	Slovenia (n=943)	Sweden (n=928)
Gender	Female	- 0.258 (0.147)*	- 0.194 (0.134)	- 0.208 (0.133)
Age in years (Reference: 18–24 years)	25–34 years	- 0.123 (0.266)	- 0.643 (0.265)**	- 0.453 (0.261)*
	35–44 years	- 0.690 (0.274)**	- 0.555 (0.263)**	- 0.745 (0.261)***
	45–54 years	- 0.657 (0.284)**	- 0.535 (0.254)**	- 1.004 (0.260)***
	55–64 years	- 1.016 (0.266)***	- 0.866 (0.261)***	- 0.962 (0.265)***
	65 years and above	- 1.431 (0.280)***	- 0.841 (0.298)***	- 0.925 (0.287)***
Monthly income (Reference: Category-1 ^a)	Category-2 ^a	0.474 (0.206)**	0.415 (0.185)**	0.301 (0.160)*
	Category-3 ^a	0.559 (0.217)**	0.324 (0.189)*	0.240 (0.180)
	Category-4 ^a	0.340 (0.272)	0.030 (0.222)	0.179 (0.307)
Children in the household (under 18 years old)		0.466 (0.193)**	0.151 (0.152)	0.432 (0.173)**
Experience sharing a kitchen-and-dining space		0.939 (0.183)***	0.721 (0.132)***	1.045 (0.165)***
Living in apartment		0.126 (0.164)	- 0.303 (0.147)**	- 0.247 (0.141)*
House area/person (in logs)		0.204 (0.119)*	0.024 (0.111)	- 0.167 (0.126)
Home ownership		- 0.023 (0.163)	0.191 (0.180)	- 0.285 (0.151)*
Environmental efficacy		0.816 (0.152)***	0.945 (0.133)***	0.767 (0.141)***
Extraversion		0.853 (0.160)***	0.327 (0.134)**	0.579 (0.138)***
Cut-point: No-Maybe		1.711 (0.512)***	0.066 (0.516)	- 0.920 (0.535)*
Cut-point: Maybe-Yes		3.265 (0.521)***	1.609 (0.520)***	0.719 (0.535)
McFadden's R-squared		0.12	0.07	0.10

^aMonthly income for the Netherlands/Slovenia/Sweden are category-1: less than €2000/€827/SEK23,700, category-2: €2,000–3,000/€828–1,241/SEK23,700–35,600, category-3: €3,001–4,500/€1,242–1,861/SEK35,601–53,400 and category-4: more than €4,500/€1,861/SEK53,400

We did not observe significant differences across countries in terms of general inclination to share study space (challenging H4). However, significant cross-national differences in the effect of predictors on willingness to share study space were observed related to gender, income and experience. In Slovenia, income category 2 and category 4 were significantly more positively associated with willingness to share study space than in Sweden and the Netherlands, respectively. While being female was significantly more negatively associated with willingness to share study space, income (category 4) was significantly more positively associated in Sweden than in the Netherlands. Similarly, previous experience with shared study space was significantly more positively associated with willingness to share study space in Sweden than in Slovenia (Table 6).

4.3 Willingness to share workshop space

In the context of the workshop space, we observed patterns similar to office spaces. Respondents in all countries with prior sharing experience, that believe in the environmental benefits of sharing spaces, or are self-reported extraverts were strongly and significantly more likely to express higher level of willingness to share a workshop space (supporting

Table 6 Predictors for willingness to share office and study space (standard errors in parenthesis, * = $p < 0.10$; ** = $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$)

Variable	Variable category	Netherlands (n=844)	Slovenia (n=943)	Sweden (n=928)
Gender	Female	0.053 (0.143)	- 0.103 (0.135)	- 0.388 (0.135)***
Age in years (Reference: 18–24 years)	25–34 years	0.021 (0.265)	- 0.692 (0.276)**	- 0.306 (0.254)
	35–44 years	- 0.595 (0.270)**	- 1.005 (0.275)***	- 1.076 (0.255)***
	45–54 years	- 0.797 (0.280)***	- 1.139 (0.265)***	- 1.060 (0.253)***
	55–64 years	- 1.324 (0.263)***	- 1.716 (0.275)***	- 1.415 (0.261)***
	65 years and above	- 2.070 (0.282)***	- 1.828 (0.315)***	- 2.243 (0.296)***
Monthly income (Reference: Category-1 ^a)	Category-2 ^a	0.155 (0.193)	0.388 (0.187)**	- 0.122 (0.161)
	Category-3 ^a	0.096 (0.207)	0.124 (0.191)	0.256 (0.180)
	Category-4 ^a	- 0.378 (0.271)	0.364 (0.223)	0.566 (0.316)*
Children in the household (under 18 years old)		0.424 (0.188)**	0.092 (0.155)	0.403 (0.172)**
Experience sharing an office or study space		0.633 (0.217)***	0.626 (0.145)***	1.467 (0.245)***
Living in apartment		- 0.076 (0.161)	- 0.021 (0.148)	- 0.107 (0.144)
House area/person (in logs)		0.050 (0.114)	0.146 (0.113)	0.065 (0.122)
Home ownership		- 0.177 (0.158)	0.246 (0.181)	- 0.167 (0.153)
Environmental efficacy		0.783 (0.148)***	0.780 (0.132)***	0.608 (0.141)***
Extraversion		0.558 (0.150)***	0.589 (0.136)***	0.673 (0.141)***
Cut-point: No-Maybe		- 0.132 (0.492)	- 0.268 (0.522)	- 0.671 (0.521)
Cut-point: Maybe-Yes		1.538 (0.494)***	1.666 (0.525)***	1.200 (0.522)**
McFadden's R-Squared		0.13	0.08	0.13

^aMonthly income for the Netherlands/Slovenia/Sweden are category-1: less than €2000/€827/SEK23,700, category-2: €2,000–3,000/€828–1,241/SEK23,700–35,600, category-3: €3,001–4,500/€1,242–1,861/SEK35,601–53,400 and category-4: more than €4,500/€1,861/SEK53,400

H2 and H3). The results related to age are consistent with results for other spaces for the Netherlands and Sweden. However, age was not significant in the Slovenian context except respondents aged 25–34 were significantly more likely to express higher willingness to share relative to those who are 18–24 years old. Respondents in higher income categories (compared to those in the lowest income category) as well as homeowners in Slovenia, unlike in the Netherlands and Sweden, were also significantly more likely to be interested in sharing workshop space. We find no association between housing type (i.e., living in an apartment) and level of willingness to share workshop space in all countries, but we found, intuitively, that respondents in Sweden that have a larger housing floor area per person were significantly less likely to be interested.

Swedes were significantly more positively inclined toward sharing workshop space than Dutch and Slovenian respondents (supporting H4, Dimension 1). Moreover, we found significant cross-national differences related to age, income, home ownership and home size per person. Higher age categories (relative to the youngest age category (18–24 years)) were significantly more negatively associated with willingness to share workshop space in

Table 7 Predictors for willingness to share workshop space (standard errors in parenthesis, * = $p < 0.10$; ** = $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$)

Variable	Variable category	Netherlands (n=844)	Slovenia (n=943)	Sweden (n=928)
Gender	Female	- 0.228 (0.140)	- 0.354 (0.140)**	- 0.084 (0.133)
Age in years (Reference: 18–24 years)	25–34 years	- 0.165 (0.273)	0.779 (0.273)***	- 0.187 (0.260)
	35–44 years	- 0.855 (0.278)***	0.228 (0.269)	- 0.657 (0.257)**
	45–54 years	- 0.974 (0.286)***	0.419 (0.260)	- 0.600 (0.254)**
	55–64 years	- 1.080 (0.261)***	- 0.180 (0.266)	- 0.832 (0.260)***
	65 years and above	- 1.287 (0.270)***	- 0.107 (0.307)	- 1.389 (0.282)***
Monthly income (Reference: Category-1 ^a)	Category-2 ^a	- 0.071 (0.189)	0.321 (0.187)*	0.044 (0.159)
	Category-3 ^a	0.086 (0.202)	0.412 (0.195)**	0.288 (0.178)
	Category-4 ^a	- 0.165 (0.258)	0.722 (0.230)***	- 0.123 (0.298)
Children in the household (under 18 years old)		0.461 (0.192)**	0.057 (0.159)	- 0.016 (0.173)
Experience sharing a workshop		0.986 (0.193)***	0.583 (0.182)***	1.021 (0.180)***
Living in apartment		- 0.032 (0.155)	- 0.092 (0.151)	- 0.086 (0.140)
House area/person (in logs)		0.070 (0.116)	0.017 (0.117)	- 0.273 (0.122)**
Home ownership		0.198 (0.156)	0.525 (0.182)***	- 0.073 (0.148)
Environmental efficacy		0.849 (0.145)***	1.080 (0.136)***	0.686 (0.138)***
Extraversion		0.695 (0.147)***	0.492 (0.138)***	0.504 (0.138)***
Cut-point: No-Maybe		- 0.108 (0.489)	0.182 (0.541)	- 2.013 (0.533)***
Cut-point: Maybe-Yes		1.737 (0.493)***	2.290 (0.546)***	- 0.148 (0.528)
McFadden's R-Squared		0.12	0.09	0.09

^aMonthly income for the Netherlands/Slovenia/Sweden are category-1: less than €2000/€827/SEK23,700, category-2: €2,000–3,000/€828–1,241/SEK23,700–35,600, category-3: €3,001–4,500/€1,242–1,861/SEK35,601–53,400 and category-4: more than €4,500/€1,861/SEK53,400

the Netherlands and Sweden than in Slovenia. In contrast, income category 4 was significantly more positively associated in Slovenia than in the Netherlands and Sweden. Also, the effect of home ownership was significantly different between Slovenia and Sweden while the effect of housing floor area per person was significantly different between the Netherlands and Sweden.

4.4 Test of robustness

We note that to test the robustness of our findings, we estimated alternative specifications of the dependent variable. More specifically we recoded willingness to share into binary outcomes: (1) recoding only “Yes” responses as indicating willingness to share (vs. “Maybe” and “No”) and (2) considering “Yes” and “Maybe” responses as indicating willingness to share (vs. “No”). We then estimated binary logit models with these specifications. Our core results remained the same- in terms of sign and significance of the predictors- in both specifications as the ordered logit model results presented in the paper (Table 7).

5 Discussion

This study hypothesized that shared kitchens would be measurably less interesting to respondents (H1), which is consistent with prior findings (Hawlina et al., 2021; Ruokamo et al., 2024). Effectively all contemporary European households have a private kitchen, so the functional benefit of an additional shared kitchen may seem superfluous. The observed patterns are consistent with several plausible factors, including the frequent and often personal nature of kitchen use, potential coordination requirements when shared, and perceived risks such as theft or trust-related concerns—all pointing towards high governance and maintenance concerns (Dimension 3). Offices and workshops may also require social coordination, but may be interpreted by respondents as additional functional space and comparatively lower-risk to share with neighbors. In line with these considerations, kitchens are significantly less popular than both workshops (in all countries) and offices (in Slovenia and the Netherlands, but not Sweden). At the same time, we found little evidence that individuals' access to total private dwelling space per person is associated, either positively or negatively, with interest in shared-access spaces *except* for a negative association with shared workshops in Sweden. This finding offers further support that the perceived balance of costs and benefits of sharing are associated with specific spaces and functions rather than total functional space (Dimension 1). We therefore find partial support for H1. We elaborate on two exceptions in the Swedish context below.

Self-reported environmental efficacy and extraversion are associated with higher interest in all space types across all countries, offering confirmation of H2 linking residents' perceived environmental efficacy and extraversion to sociability and sharing ideology benefits (Dimensions 2 and 4). This is consistent with prior findings focused on sharing in a housing context (Boyer & Leland, 2018; Ruokamo et al., 2024; Woo et al., 2019). Individuals who believe that sharing is beneficial to the environment and who enjoy social interaction may therefore be more inclined to express interest in shared spaces than those who perceive fewer environmental benefits or prefer less social engagement. Notably, this pattern holds across all space types, despite potential differences in levels of social exposure and sustainability signaling. This consistency also aligns with Denstadli and Sønstebo (2025), who identify attitudes as important determinants of willingness to share space and downsize.

Prior experience with specific spaces is associated with higher willingness to share across all countries, supporting H3. Because shared spaces remain relatively uncommon in contemporary housing, prior experience may reduce uncertainty, including perceived risks and coordination concerns (aligning with Dimension 3). It is also plausible that negative prior experiences could discourage future sharing—as suggested in several of our validation focus groups—however, the results here indicate that respondents are, on average, not deterred by prior sharing experiences. We also hypothesized that the presence of children in the household would be inversely associated with interest in shared spaces due to higher perceived time costs of governance but found the opposite for shared kitchens and offices (in the Netherlands and Sweden) and workshops (in the Netherlands). Through the lens of perceived governance and maintenance risks (Dimension 3), we interpret this as suggesting that parents in Sweden and the Netherlands perceive shared spaces as *reducing* rather than adding to the burden of domestic coordination, somewhat challenging H3 and contradicting findings from two Norwegian studies (Denstadli & Sønstebo, 2025; Kvietkute & Lappegard Hauge, 2022).

We find evidence that conditionally supports H4, indicating that some predictors of interest in shared spaces vary in magnitude across national contexts. While these findings do not map directly onto established housing regime frameworks, several patterns suggest the value of a context-sensitive approach to planning shared access spaces. For example, shared kitchens are significantly less popular in the Netherlands than in Sweden or Slovenia, independent of other predictors. Although extraversion is positively associated with interest in shared kitchens in all countries, the association is stronger among respondents in the Netherlands. This pattern may indicate that social dimensions of shared kitchens are particularly salient in the Dutch context and could be an important consideration in the design and positioning of such spaces. In Slovenia, living in an apartment is associated with lower interest in shared kitchens, which may point to additional challenges in developing such spaces within multifamily housing.

In Slovenia, the presence of children in the household is not a significant predictor of higher interest in shared spaces, whereas it is positive and significant for several space types in the other countries. Slovenian households with at least one child appear less enthusiastic about sharing compared to their Swedish or Dutch counterparts. Respondents in these households report lower interest in shared kitchens and offices than similar households in the Netherlands and Sweden. Prior research offers mixed findings, with some studies suggesting that families with children may be hesitant to share space (Denstadli & Sønstebo, 2025; Kvietkute & Lappegaard Hauge, 2022), while others find interest in shared housing among such households (Boyer & Leland, 2018). Together, these findings suggest that, for families with children, willingness to share space may be context dependent.

Across countries, the association between age and willingness to share workshops is not uniform: in the Netherlands and Sweden, older age categories show significantly lower willingness relative to 18–24-year-olds, while in Slovenia age is mostly not associated with willingness and 25–34-year-olds are significantly more willing than 18–24-year-olds. Thus, what appears as an ‘age effect’ in workshop sharing is concentrated in the Dutch and Swedish samples.

In Sweden, interest in offices wasn’t necessarily low, but it was the only country in which disinterest was statistically equivalent to disinterest in shared kitchens. This pattern is broadly consistent with Denstadli and Sønstebo (2025), who find that shared office spaces in Trondheim, Norway, were among the least popular shared spaces. Among Swedish respondents, *prior experience* with shared offices was a significantly more positive predictor of interest than in Slovenia. This may suggest that governance challenges of sharing (Dimension 3), which we hypothesize are mitigated by prior experience, are a particular challenge for shared offices in Sweden. An additional explanation for Swedes’ relative reluctance for shared offices is that residents of Sweden may already be well equipped with home office equipment: Swedes work from home at a higher rate (14.3%) than the Netherlands (12.7%), Slovenia (6.4%), and EU generally (8.9%), and nearly 30% of Swedish residents worked from home in 2021, during the COVID-19 pandemic (Eurostat, 2025). During this time, Swedish employers often subsidized the purchase of home office equipment ranging from desks to electronics. Thus Swedish respondents may see shared offices as redundant spaces.

6 Conclusion

This study examined self-reported willingness to share access to selected residential spaces across three European countries amidst broader trends toward smaller households and increasing resource pressures. The findings suggest that openness to shared-access spaces is present across diverse populations, but varies systematically by space type, individual characteristics, and national context. In particular, prior experience with sharing, environmental efficacy (belief that sharing is good for the environment), and self-reported extraversion are consistently associated with higher stated willingness to share, while other factors—such as income, household composition, and housing characteristics—show more context-dependent or inconsistent relationships.

At the same time, the results should be interpreted with caution. The measure of willingness used in this study reflects stated interest in hypothetical scenarios rather than observed behavior or willingness to pay. As such, the findings are better understood as indicating degrees of openness or receptiveness to shared-access arrangements, rather than evidence of realized or latent market demand. Additionally, the survey design does not capture important contextual factors—such as cost, governance structures, or the social composition of sharing arrangements—that are likely to influence actual adoption.

Despite these limitations, the study provides comparative evidence that interest in sharing specific residential functions may be more nuanced than is suggested by research focusing on holistic shared housing models. The variation observed across space types highlights the importance of considering shared-access arrangements at a functional level rather than as a single housing typology. Future research could build on these findings by incorporating behavioral measures, willingness-to-pay estimates, and qualitative insights into how individuals evaluate shared-access arrangements in practice.

Future studies can more deeply probe some of the specific dimensions described in this paper. For example, this study could not internalize the specific social dynamics of potential sharing situations. *With whom* individuals share space could be critical and mitigate social and governance barriers to sharing. What counts as “experience” with sharing can also be further probed. Is a simple site visit or a short overnight stay sufficient exposure to the governance structures to reduce perceived risks? Or does “experience” occur over a longer period of time? Similarly, how different attributes about sharing services e.g. physical access, bookability, and management structure impact interest in sharing were not considered and may impact individuals’ willingness to share. We expect that these and additional dimensions will impact future research.

For policymakers and practitioners, the results suggest that there may be segments of the population that are receptive to shared-access residential features, but that such receptiveness is conditional and unevenly distributed. Efforts to develop or promote shared-access spaces would therefore benefit from careful attention to user characteristics and contextual factors that shape how such arrangements are perceived.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-026-10331-4>.

Acknowledgements The authors wish to acknowledge Sam Short for his early research support, Derek Die-ner, Jakob Dahlqvist, Anders Kyrkander, Nika Stopar and Marcel Rous for their support with language translation, and Vesna Petrič for support with data analysis.

Author contributions R.B. led funding acquisition, survey design, and manuscript composition; A.M.D. and A.H. developed the methodology, constructed the digital survey, and conducted statistical analyses; A.A. and J.W. contributed to survey design and theoretical framing; S.J., A.B., and N.B. contributed to survey design, specifically to designing, testing, and translating survey questions; All authors contributed to manuscript composition and editing.

Funding Open access funding provided by RISE Research Institutes of Sweden. Funding was provided by the European Union's Driving Urban Transitions partnership grant number F-DUT-2022-0238 via national funding agencies Svenska Forskningsrådet Formas (Grant No. 2023-02230), Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (Grant No. EP1510.22.018) and The Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency (Grant No. H7-8294).

Data availability Data will be made available upon request to the corresponding author.

Declarations

Competing interests The authors declare no competing interests.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- Berggren, H. M. (2020). Is cohousing good for democracy? Comparing political participation among residents of cohousing communities and traditional condominium developments. *Housing and Society*, 47(3), 189–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08882746.2020.1778991>
- Boelhouwer, P., & Priemus, H. (2014). Demise of the Dutch social housing tradition: Impact of budget cuts and political changes. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 29(2), 221–235. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-013-9387-9>
- Boyer, R. H. W. (2016). Achieving one-planet living through transitions in social practice: A case study of Dancing Rabbit Ecovillage. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 12(1), 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2016.11908153>
- Boyer, R. H. W., & Leland, S. (2018). Cohousing for whom? Survey evidence to support the diffusion of socially and spatially integrated housing in the United States. *Housing Policy Debate*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2018.1424724>
- Boyer, R. H. W., Armstrong, A., Jordan, S., Hunka, A. D., Wensing, J., & Bocken, N. (2026). Planning for sufficiency shared housing: Toward an agenda for future research and practice. *Urban Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980261419662>
- Daly, M. (2017). Quantifying the environmental impact of ecovillages and co-housing communities: A systematic literature review. *Local Environment*, 22(11), 1358–1377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2017.1348342>
- Denstadli, J. M., & Sønstebo, O. J. (2025). Come together! Or not? Homebuyers' interest in sharing facilities with fellow residents. *Urban Studies*, 62(14), 2787–2806. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980251321351>
- Ellsworth-Krebs, K. (2020). Implications of declining household sizes and expectations of home comfort for domestic energy demand. *Nature Energy*, 5(1), 20–25. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-019-0512-1>
- Eurostat. (2025). Personnes en emploi travaillant à domicile par statut professionnel—% de l'emploi total. *Eurostat*. https://doi.org/10.2908/LFSA_EHOMP
- Flynn, L. B., & Montalbano, G. (2024). Housing regime typologies and their discontents: A systematic literature review. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 41(2), 127–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2023.2265370>

- Francart, N., Höjer, M., Mjörnell, K., Orahim, A. S., Von Platten, J., & Malmqvist, T. (2020). Sharing indoor space: Stakeholders' perspectives and energy metrics. *Buildings and Cities*, 1(1), 70–85. <https://doi.org/10.5334/bc.34>
- Hall, T., & Vidén, S. (2005). The million homes programme: A review of the great Swedish planning project. *Planning Perspectives*, 20(3), 301–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02665430500130233>
- Hawlina, P. M., Lazar, A., Hawlina, M., Ramšak, R., & Nina, P. (2021). *Vprašanja za Stanovanja, Tegobe in želje iskalcev stanovanj ter priložnosti za stanovanjsko združništvo*. Inštitut za študije stanovanj in prostora and Inštitut za politike prostora. <https://zadragator.org/wp-content/uploads/Vprasanja-za-stanovanja.pdf>
- Hendrickson, D. J., & Wittman, H. K. (2010). Post-occupancy assessment: Building design, governance and household consumption. *Building Research & Information*, 38(5), 481–490. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2010.494377>
- Huang, L., Long, Y., Chen, Z., Li, Y., Ou, J., Shigetomi, Y., & Yoshida, Y. (2024). Increasing single households challenges household decarbonization in Japan. *Global Environmental Change*, 86, Article 102848. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2024.102848>
- Jarvis, H. (2011). Saving space, sharing time: Integrated infrastructures of daily life in cohousing. *Environment and Planning A*, 43(3), 560–577. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a43296>
- Kallaos, J., & Bohne, R. A. (2013). Green residential building tools and efficiency metrics. *Journal of Green Building*, 8(3), 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.3992/jgb.8.3.125>
- Kim, J., Woo, A., & Cho, G.-H. (2020). Is shared housing a viable economic and social housing option for young adults?: Willingness to pay for shared housing in Seoul. *Cities*, 102, Article 102732. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2020.102732>
- Kosec, M. (2022). Iščem stanovanje... 1991–2021. In B. Ajda (Ed.), *Iščem stanovanje...: Sto let organizirane stanovanjske gradnje: [19. 10. 2021–31. 1. 2022, Muzej za arhitekturo in oblikovanje (MAO) ter različne lokacije v javnem prostoru Ljubljane]*.
- Kvietkute, D., & Lappegard Hauge, Å. (2022). Living with strangers: Exploring motivations and stated preferences for considering co-housing and shared living in Bergen, Norway. *Housing and Society*, 49(2), 128–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08882746.2021.1972264>
- Leland, S. M., Pinka, R., & Boyer, R. H. W. (2023). Who shares? Participation in the sharing economy in the U.S. *Journal of Urban Affairs*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2023.2221438>
- Lorek, S., & Spangenberg, J. H. (2019). Energy sufficiency through social innovation in housing. *Energy Policy*, 126, 287–294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.11.026>
- Malmqvist, T., & Brismark, J. (2023). Embodied carbon savings of co-living and implications for metrics. *Buildings and Cities*, 4(1), 386–404. <https://doi.org/10.5334/bc.347>
- Markle, E. A., Rodgers, R., Sanchez, W., & Ballou, M. (2015). Social support in the cohousing model of community: A mixed-methods analysis. *Community Development*, 46(5), 616–631. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2015.1086400>
- McCullagh, P. (1980). Regression models for ordinal data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Methodological)*, 42(2), 109–142.
- Moos, M., Whitfield, J., Johnson, L. C., & Andrey, J. (2006). Does design matter? The ecological footprint as a planning tool at the local level. *Journal of Urban Design*, 11(2), 195–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13574800600644381>
- Nad, S., & Podlogar, U. (2020). *Jazbinskov zakon #2 spomladi 2020*. Outsider. <https://outsider.si/srdan-nad-jazbinskov-zakon-2-spomladi-2020/>
- Ness, D. (2023). Growth in floor area: The blind spot in cutting carbon. *Emerald Open Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EOR-05-2023-0002>
- Pampel, F. C. (2014). The varied influence of SES on environmental concern. *Social Science Quarterly*, 95(1), 57–75.
- Rogers, E. M. (2010). *Diffusion of innovations* (4th ed.). Simon and Schuster.
- Ruokamo, E., Kylvilahti, E., Lettenmeier, M., & Toppinen, A. (2024). Are people willing to share living space? Household preferences in Finland. *Buildings & Cities*. <https://doi.org/10.5334/bc.453>
- Sanguinetti, A., & Hibbert, K. (2018). More room for cohousing in the United States: Understanding diffusion potential by exploring who knows about, who likes, and who would consider living in cohousing. *Housing and Society*, 45(3), 139–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08882746.2018.1529507>
- Underwood, A., & Zahran, S. (2015). The carbon implications of declining household scale economies. *Ecological Economics*, 116, 182–190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.04.028>
- United Nations Environment Programme. (2025). Not just another brick in the wall: The solutions exist—Scaling them will build on progress and cut emissions fast. *Global status report for buildings and construction 2024/2025*. United Nations Environment Programme. <https://doi.org/10.59117/20.500.11822/47214>

- Vadovics, E., Richter, J. L., Tornow, M., Ozcelik, N., Coscieme, L., Lettenmeier, M., Csiki, E., Domröse, L., Cap, S., Puente, L. L., Belousa, I., & Scherer, L. (2024). Preferences, enablers, and barriers for 1.5°C lifestyle options: Findings from citizen thinking labs in five European Union countries. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 20(1), Article 2375806. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2024.2375806>
- Vestbro, D. U., & Horelli, L. (2012). Design for gender equality: The history of co-housing ideas and realities. *Built Environment*, 38(3), 315–335. <https://doi.org/10.2148/benv.38.3.315>
- Woo, A., Cho, G.-H., & Kim, J. (2019). Would you share your home? The multifaceted determinants of preference for shared housing among young adults. *Applied Geography*, 103, 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2018.12.012>

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Authors and Affiliations

Robert Boyer¹ · Aemiro Melkamu Daniel¹ · Andrea Armstrong² · Agnieszka Hunka¹ · Sabina Jordan³ · Anuša Babuder³ · Joana Wensing² · Nancy Bocken²

✉ Robert Boyer
robert.boyer@ri.se

Aemiro Melkamu Daniel
aemiro.melkamu.daniel@ri.se

Andrea Armstrong
andrea.armstrong-pulinx@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Agnieszka Hunka
agnieszka.hunka@ri.se

Sabina Jordan
sabina.jordan@zag.si

Anuša Babuder
anusa.babuder@zag.si

Joana Wensing
joana.wensing@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Nancy Bocken
nancy.bocken@maastrichtuniversity.nl

¹ Department of the Built Environment, RISE Research Institutes of Sweden, Gothenburg, Sweden

² Maastricht Sustainability Institute, Maastricht University, Maastricht, Netherlands

³ Slovenian National Building and Civil Engineering Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia