

Peer review process documentation

of the article

**Creating Meaningful Experiences of Sufficiency: A longitudinal field study to
examine student housing settings to enhance the meaning of shared living and
sufficiency**

by

Tilmann Hüppauff and Marcel Hunecke

published in

Environmental Psychology Open

Handling editor: Florian Lange

Review Round 1

Comments by the editor

1. The reviews below provide additional elaboration on this, but I just wanted to highlight again that it is often not clear what you consider your key constructs to be. Are those person characteristics (traits, attitudes, or rather states?), evaluations or experiences, or (potentially imperfect) recollections of things that actually happened? In the latter cases, would that actually be constructs? For example, do you assume that people are characterized by a latent construct that causes them to engage in the twelve activities listed on the Experiences of Shared Living scale? Only then does it make sense to analyze Cronbach's alpha etc., I would think, or to ask whether this construct is different from other constructs (see the comment by Reviewer C). Perhaps this paper provides some helpful thoughts in that direction (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2024.102381>), but please do not feel obliged to cite it.
2. I am not sure the current study qualifies as a quasi-experiment. Having two student homes and then treating one of them with an intervention would be quasi-experiment (where student home residency, not random assignment would determine in which condition a participant ends up). But the current comparison reminds me more of studies comparing, for example, patients with and without depression and testing if one group is more likely to have or develop cognitive impairment (and I would not consider this a quasi or natural experiment). Perhaps I have missed the experimental feature of the study, but I feel that terms like "(longitudinal) observational study" might be more adequate here.
3. I saw a potential inconsistency in the statistics, with the correlations being tested using non-parametric tests (and I think the use of Spearman correlations specifically was not preregistered) and all other tests being parametric. Could you please check this again and harmonize or motivate the approach if necessary?
4. As I said above, I highly appreciate the proficient sharing of data and materials. Could you also share the data in a format that is accessible to non-R-users, ideally accompanied by a sort of codebook that explains any variable names or value labels?
5. Thank you for making such diligent use of our manuscript template. I attach a version of your manuscript with minor formatting comments from my side.

Comments by Reviewer B

This paper reports on a study examining how living in a shared student house that is oriented towards sufficiency impacts meaning and attitudes towards sufficiency in comparison to living in a standard student home. I found the manuscript enjoyable and interesting to read. It brings a nice addition to the psychological work on sufficiency, that has largely been focused on specific behaviours and wellbeing up to now. The study of settings and their impacts complements this existing work.

The methods are quasi-experimental, and the inclusion of the longitudinal element is to be applauded. The methodology is not without its flaws (e.g., not a strict pre-post design so hard to talk about changes being rooted in the housing itself, and not random allocation to groups therefore many the sufficiency condition already likely to hold environmental values). However, the discussion does a good job of appreciating the

limitations of the study and considering alternative reasons for their findings, along with their plausibility given the findings available.

This study offers a starting point from which future studies can build, through employing larger samples or supplementary the quantitative findings with qualitative insights. I think it will be suitable for publication after some revisions. I have noted my main suggestions down below, but these mainly revolve around being more precise in definitions and explanations of meaning making processes, and clearly outlining the similarities and differences between the two conditions.

My suggestions for improvement are below:

1. I felt the definition of sufficiency in Section 1.1 was too brief. Given that there are similar terms such as voluntary simplicity which the audience may be familiar with, it is important to be precise about exactly what you do/do not consider to be sufficiency. I have seen sufficiency spoken about in terms of having enough (not too much but also not too little), for example. But this is not reflected in your definition currently.
2. On page 4 when you say “we suggest that settings are a suitable leverage point for fostering the meaningfulness of sufficiency.” I found the use of the term ‘settings’ too vague and had to pause to make sure I was following the argument. Is it just settings overall or a change in settings that provides opportunities for meaning making?
3. I found the final few paragraphs of Section 1.2 introduced quite a few new terms/processes that had not previously been mentioned when outlining the process of meaning making. I was not clear how the individual factors could practically be encouraged in the co-housing process.
4. A couple of the hypotheses could do with a little more rationale. E.g., why should having experiences of shared living automatically lead to higher meaningfulness of shared living. Millions of people go to their work everyday but don’t find it meaningful. I guess that this is rooted in the content you cover around settings in Section 1.4, but a little more explanation as to how this process happens might improve the manuscript.
5. In Section 1.5, H1 (“Meaningfulness of shared living is positively connected to experiences of shared living (H1a)”) and H4 (“We anticipated that experiences of shared living in a sufficiency-oriented student home would enhance the meaning of shared living.”) could be seen as replicating one another. This might be a misunderstanding on my part and solved by being clearer on what the main differences are between your sufficiency and control setting.
6. Could you say a bit more about what opportunities each of the groups has for co-living. Many student homes have shared kitchens and bathrooms, for example, although sometimes students will have a studio set-up. How did your two conditions compare on these kinds of arrangements?
7. With the panel model, you say the model comparison found a significant difference in cross-lagged paths (I’m assuming comparing between residential setting). But then the mode in Figure 2 is for the overall sample? Could you not display the differences in the path coefficients across groups in Figure 2, as this would seem to be a more important finding than just looking at overall levels? (especially given the limitation that many of the residents of the CA were motivated by environmentally friendly living and hence this could be argued to be accounting for differences between your groups).
8. Do you have any way of assessing how far students were into their degree/how recently they moved away from home? You note a few times in the manuscript that “Major life incidents are more likely to prompt a conscious review of personal meaning systems” so it might be interesting to examine how the process of meaning making within the CA is easier for people who have experienced a more recent change in their educational/living setting.

Comments by Reviewer C

Overall, the paper addresses a very important and relevant topic in the field of sufficiency-oriented living. It asks to what extent an infrastructure geared towards sufficiency (building, division of spaces, associated other specific spaces, etc.) actually leads to people experiencing the sharing of things as meaningful and relevant and can lead to an increase in sufficiency attitudes. The study is well-conceived and thoughtfully conducted, with a strong practice-oriented approach. I really liked to read the study and appreciate the quasi-experimental design. The field study adds valuable insights and practical implications, making this a meaningful contribution to both research and application.

My main critique relates to the clarity of the argumentation that leads to your main research question and the hypotheses you address. In some sections, the reasoning could benefit from greater precision to avoid statements that might come across as tautological or overly normative (e.g. “These results imply that sufficiency settings can strengthen sufficiency-oriented living”. When they are constructed – by force – in a way that people share more space, than it – of course – strengthens sufficiency-oriented living. I suggest that you go through the paper and clarify as also define more precisely which facets you address and what measures do you apply). Enhancing the structure and coherence of the arguments will further strengthen the impact of the work.

Additionally, the abundance of paragraphs disrupts the flow, and at times the paper seems to become entangled in multiple concepts without clear focus. Providing clearer definitions and distinctions between key ideas (e.g. sufficiency vs. pro-environmental behavior, and high-impact behavior) would help to sharpen the argumentation and understandability of the paper. In particular, the exploration of sufficiency in the context of housing feels a bit underdeveloped and could benefit from a deeper and more nuanced analysis.

Overall, I also suggest to reduce the number of paragraphs and build more coherent ones. The many paragraphs make it seem a bit too complex and unconnected at least in the introductory part.

Furthermore, the term “meaning” as also “meaning construction” in regard to your study and the sharing concept remains unspecific. Please sharpen this further and explain more clearly what you mean by meaning (e.g. l. 27 “meaning related to shared living”).

Furthermore, I see a lack in clarifying what facets of sufficiency are particularly addressed in the CA environment but not in the standard living home, where are the concrete differences, and why is the sufficiency aspect there addressed more overtly to or by whom?

Please also check the equivalence of the German and English texts. I see small but relevant differences here (e.g. “we investigated how different living environments can influence” Vs. “den Vergleich von zwei verschiedenen Wohnheimen”).

I am also somewhat concerned about the degree of normativity in certain statements. For instance, in the sentence: ‘In this study, we elaborate on this approach by investigating the potential of student housing as a setting to foster the meaningfulness of shared living’ (l. 103). As an advocate of sufficiency, I can understand the intention behind this, but it comes across as quite normative, especially since it remains unclear why shared living should be meaningful to whom, and in what context.

Additionally, there seems to be some inconsistency in how shared living is framed. At times, it is discussed as part of sufficiency-oriented living, while at other times, it appears to be positioned as something separate or additional. This raises questions about whether 'experiences of shared living' are being considered as a driver of sufficiency, a component of it, or a result. Clarifying these distinctions would greatly enhance the coherence of the argument.

I also get the impression that your study takes a very positivist approach and does not sufficiently address the potential downsides of shared living and "forced sufficiency". I would strongly recommend integrating this perspective, at the latest in the discussion section. For instance, considering the role of money and life stages/age, but also pro-environmental identity and self-ascribed values which are highly significant factors in people's housing choices (in particular for the CA and which is evident by the varying socio-economic characteristics of the samples). These aspects are crucial for understanding the broader context and variability in shared living experiences and the potential for increasing sufficiency-oriented lifestyles.

Here is some more detailed feedback to the single sections:

Keyword: meaning – seems non-specific to me. Please reconsider it.

Abstract: I would enumerate the participant numbers per group. Integrate which facet of sufficiency is addressed in your paper by the CA as example in particular (more people per square meter? More people that are able to share X?)

Line 14: "Personal meaning of sufficiency" in regard to ones one life? As attitude? That stays unclear.

Introduction: For me, the argumentation between sufficiency, environmentally oriented behaviour and meaning construction is not clear. Paragraph 1.2. argues for a very long time without coming to sufficiency and I don't really understand the bridge that is then built l 160ff. I would suggest streamlining the paragraph and even put it after arguing on sufficiency and sharing.

I would also recommend not constantly mixing up the concepts (sustainability, sufficiency, pro-environmental behaviour).

Line 167: You should be more precise about what exactly you are investigating here. Is it a personality facet, a situational condition that facilitates reflection, or something else? Additionally, you might consider organizing the discussion about the role of self-reflection into a separate section with its own subheading. This would help avoid mixing multiple concepts and theories under a single heading and make your argumentation more structured and focused.

Line 181: I suggest moving this sub chapter to the beginning of your paper, as it is highly relevant for understanding the role of the living situation in relation to sufficiency which is the core point of your paper. Establishing this context early on would provide a stronger foundation for readers to grasp what happens in detail when people live in situations that encourage them to share more items.

Line 205: I don't think (shared) mobility should be categorized as miscellaneous consumption. Additionally, you introduce a new term here, 'high-impact pro...', which adds to the complexity and may confuse the reader. It would be helpful to clarify your terminology and ensure consistency to maintain the reader's understanding. Maybe another paper, that could perhaps be helpful as well: Bagheri et al. (2024). Investigating the influence of current trends and behaviours on household structures and housing

consumption patterns. *Consumption and Society*, 1-23.
<https://doi.org/10.1332/27528499Y2024D000000025>

The (overarching) goals you aim to address with this study seem to vary slightly throughout the text, which might confuse the reader. I suggest being more precise and consistent in articulating these goals. Repeating them clearly rather than varying their phrasing—such as in lines 268f., 280, and 631—would help maintain coherence and focus.

Line 272: This statement sounds tautological to me: 'experiences of shared living would relate to a higher meaningfulness of shared living.' It would be helpful to clarify the relationship between these two concepts to avoid redundancy and make the argument more precise.

Hypotheses: Some of them are unclear or not precise enough. For instance, what do you mean by 'richer' experiences? Doesn't this carry a normative implication?

H2: What exactly do you mean by 'experiences of shared living'—are you referring to the amount, intensity, or duration?

H3: Similarly, when you state 'sharing will be higher,' do you mean the amount, duration, or the quantity of objects or spaces shared?

H4: This hypothesis also seems somewhat tautological to me, and I think this stems from the way it's framed. If people are forced into a sufficiency-oriented setting, it seems illogical to argue that the meaning of sharing would be rated as higher due to this compulsion.

As already mentioned, it might be helpful to disentangle the constructs and definitions and clarify how you operationalize them, especially in the introduction. This would allow readers to better follow the logic behind your hypotheses."

H5: do you mean higher or stronger intentions? The same with attitudes in H6.

Line 308: 'Insight' or the 'ability to self-reflect' is not typically considered a core personality trait, though it could be part of one. Please clarify what exactly you intend to measure here. Based on this hypothesis, one might assume that you're measuring a specific personality trait, which does not appear to be the case.

Methods: Overall, the section is transparent and well-organized. However, some of the measures will become clearer when the introduction is streamlined (e.g. meaningfulness of shared living and meaning construction; the capability to self-reflect as part of a personality trait measure).

I don't understand why the standard student house offers only limited opportunities to share items and foster self-organization. I would imagine there are also shared kitchen areas, perhaps a room for sports, and other communal spaces. The distinction between the two settings could be made clearer to better highlight the differences in opportunities for shared living and self-organization.

Line 393: check subscripts

Why did you choose a 4-month interval between T1 and T2? Was there a specific reason for this time frame? Why not 2 weeks, 4 months, or even 6 months? Shortly clarifying the rationale behind this choice would be helpful.

Paragraph 2.3.4. I am a bit confused about the concepts and measures here. Are you measuring personal reflection, self-reflection, emotional insight, or just general insight? Clarifying these distinctions would improve the clarity of your argument.

Line 632 f “This approach...” the sentence remains unclear to me, please rework.

Lines 649 ff.: I suggest providing more specific examples of the causal effects that should be investigated in the future and how they could be addressed. The discussion of limitations here feels a bit superficial. Alternatively, you could shorten this section, as the limitations mentioned later are argued with more precision.

Results, Line 468: Considering my concerns about tautological arguments in some of your hypotheses, did you explore or control for whether ‘meaningfulness of shared living’ and ‘experiences of shared living’ are distinct latent constructs? Given the high correlations between them, I recommend running an exploratory factor analysis to support your hypothesis that these are separate concepts.

Line 513: I find this result quite interesting and, in my opinion, one of the most relevant findings. Specifically, people who did not intend to live in a particular ‘sufficiency setting’ seem to perceive their surroundings in a way that increased their sufficiency attitudes and behaviors by default. Given the self-selection biases in your CA sample, I believe you should build on this intriguing result much more in the later sections of your study.

Discussion

Line 543: The first sentence introduces something new—‘narratives’—which seems a bit abrupt. I would recommend first summarizing what you did in this section and then moving into the interpretation part.

Line 545: The phrase ‘tested the influence’ seems a bit overenthusiastic given your experimental setting. It might be more accurate to say something like ‘explored the potential influence’ or ‘examined potential effects’ to better reflect the nature of your study.

Line 572: Given the self-selection bias in the sample, I would suggest that a ceiling effect might be at play here. This could limit the generalizability of your findings and should be considered in the interpretation.

Line 590: This sentence seems redundant. I would suggest rephrasing it for clarity and to avoid repetition.

All in all, I miss some references to literature that investigated the effects of such forms of housing. More reference could be made here in the discussion. Regarding the points I address in the introduction, I would also like to argue a little less positivistically and normatively and deepen your argumentation: Why is sufficiency so unpopular? And why do people choose to live in the CA? What are the social hurdles for other people? Please also address the questions that come along with socio-demographic background here. How does voluntary sufficiency relate to prosperity and identity? Perhaps this could be added in a few places.

But to sum up: I really appreciate your work and look forward to the reworked paper!

Author response to the reviewers Round 1

Dear Editor,

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for your detailed and constructive feedback which certainly helped to improve the manuscript. You can find a point-by-point response to all the comments made for each section in the following table (General-Abstract-Introduction-Present Study-Method-Results-Discussion).

Kind regards

GENERAL

EDITOR	
I am not sure the current study qualifies as a quasi-experiment. Having two student homes and then treating one of them with an intervention would be quasi-experiment (where student home residency, not random assignment would determine in which condition a participant ends up). But the current comparison reminds me more of studies comparing, for example, patients with and without depression and testing if one group is more likely to have or develop cognitive impairment (and I would not consider this a quasi or natural experiment). Perhaps I have missed the experimental feature of the study, but I feel that terms like “(longitudinal) observational study” might be more adequate here.	Originally, we would define the features of the CA as a kind of intervention through being exposed to features of a sufficiency setting that create more experiences of shared living. However, as it was not possible to implement a pre-post design that rigorously captures this ‘intervention effect’, we adapted your suggestion and chose the label to ‘Longitudinal field study’ to describe our study design.
As I said above, I highly appreciate the proficient sharing of data and materials. Could you also share the data in a format that is accessible to non-R-users, ideally accompanied by a sort of codebook that explains any variable names or value labels?	We uploaded a CSV and a codebook file on the designated OSF project.
Thank you for making such diligent use of our manuscript template. I attach a version of your manuscript with minor formatting comments from my side.	We worked in the comments and adjusted the format accordingly.
The reviews below provide additional elaboration on this, but I just wanted to highlight again that it is often not clear what you consider your key constructs to be. Are those person characteristics (traits, attitudes, or rather states?), evaluations or	Thank you for this helpful impulse. I read your provided paper with great interest, and it really prompted some helpful reflections. We adjusted our variable descriptions accordingly. We would regard experiences as physical events that are

<p>experiences, or (potentially imperfect) recollections of things that actually happened? In the latter cases, would that actually be constructs? For example, do you assume that people are characterized by a latent construct that causes them to engage in the twelve activities listed on the Experiences of Shared Living scale? Only then does it make sense to analyze Cronbach's alpha etc., I would think, or to ask whether this construct is different from other constructs (see the comment by Reviewer C). Perhaps this paper provides some helpful thoughts in that direction (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2024.102381), but please do not feel obliged to cite it.</p>	<p>measured by recollected memories of the individual. These experiences are activities that are largely influenced by the settings in which the residents live in. We therefore measured frequency as properties of the physical event. As psychometry doesn't apply to behaviour properties we removed the cronbachs alpha from the variables "sharing of everyday items" as well as "experiences of shared living" and adjusted section 2.3.5</p>
Reviewer C	
<p>My main critique relates to the clarity of the argumentation that leads to your main research question and the hypotheses you address. In some sections, the reasoning could benefit from greater precision to avoid statements that might come across as tautological or overly normative (e.g. "These results imply that sufficiency settings can strengthen sufficiency-oriented living". When they are constructed – by force – in a way that people share more space, than it – of course – strengthens sufficiency-oriented living. I suggest that you go through the paper and clarify as also define more precisely which facets you address and what measures do you apply). Enhancing the structure and coherence of the arguments will further strengthen the impact of the work</p>	<p>We did a thorough rework of our introduction section and worked on a more precise definition of the concepts including shared living, sufficiency, meaningfulness of shared living and experiences of shared living. This includes a clearer description of the difference between sufficiency and e.g. low material consumption due to being poor (see lines 147 ff; 710ff). We hope this leads to an increased coherence and clarity of the manuscript.</p>
<p>Overall, I also suggest to reduce the number of paragraphs and build more coherent ones. The many paragraphs make it seem a bit too complex and unconnected at least in the introductory part.</p>	<p>We reduced the number of paragraphs building longer sections.</p>
<p>I am also somewhat concerned about the degree of normativity in certain statements. For instance, in the sentence: 'In this study, we elaborate on this approach by investigating the potential of student</p>	<p>Connected to the debate about normativity in sustainable science we think it is legitimate to talk about sustainability development as a normative goal to a certain degree. As it is a central</p>

housing as a setting to foster the meaningfulness of shared living' (l. 103). As an advocate of sufficiency, I can understand the intention behind this, but it comes across as quite normative, especially since it remains unclear why shared living should be meaningful to whom, and in what context.	component of sustainable development, we think this is also applicable to sufficiency. Nevertheless, we rephrased the introduction of concepts at the beginning of the manuscript in order to provide a clearer understanding of our perspective.
Keyword: meaning – seems non-specific to me. Please reconsider it.	We changed the keyword to “meaning construction”

ABSTRACT

Reviewer C	
<p>Please also check the equivalence of the German and English texts. I see small but relevant differences here (e.g. “we investigated how different living environments can influence” Vs. “den Vergleich von zwei verschiedenen Wohnheimen”).</p>	<p>We reworked the abstract and impact statement paying attention to equivalence of the text.</p> <p>The mentioned sections in the impact statement however are only different in the sentence structure, which we think is legitimate if the sentence contains the same information:</p> <p>“In dieser Studie haben wir durch den Vergleich von zwei verschiedenen Wohnheimen untersucht, wie unterschiedliche Wohnumfelder Einstellungen, Verhalten und das Sinnerleben gemeinschaftlichen Wohnens und der Suffizienz beeinflussen können.”</p> <p>„In this study we investigated how different living environments can influence attitudes, behaviour and meaning related to shared living and sufficiency by comparing two different student homes.“</p>
<p>Abstract: I would enumerate the participant numbers per group. Integrate which facet of sufficiency is addressed in your paper by the CA as example in particular (more people per square meter? More people that are able to share X?)</p>	<p>We included the participants per group. We also included a brief characterisation of the CA as a student home similar to Co-housing projects that facilitates sufficiency-oriented living. We included a more detailed description of the differences between the student homes in table 1.</p>
<p>Line 14: “Personal meaning of sufficiency” in regard to ones one life? As attitude? That stays unclear.</p>	<p>We formulated this section as a more general research question: “We examined whether such sufficiency settings can lead to a changed perspective on shared living and sufficiency compared to ordinary shared living environments.” and kept this overarching goal of the study more consistent throughout the manuscript (see also response in later comment referring to overarching goals of the study)</p>

INTRODUCTION

REVIEWER B	
I felt the definition of sufficiency in Section 1.1 was too brief. Given that there are similar terms such as voluntary simplicity which the audience may be familiar with, it is important to be precise about exactly what you do/do not consider to be sufficiency. I have seen sufficiency spoken about in terms of having enough (not too much but also not too little), for example. But this is not reflected in your definition currently.	We rephrased section 1.1 as “Necessity, potentials and barriers of <i>sufficiency</i> ” and did a more extensive literature review on current concept of sufficiency.
On page 4 when you say “we suggest that settings are a suitable leverage point for fostering the meaningfulness of sufficiency.” I found the use of the term ‘settings’ too vague and had to pause to make sure I was following the argument. Is it just settings overall or a change in settings that provides opportunities for meaning making?	We restructured the introduction section to first elaborate on Settings as an important level of analysis where some settings serve better for sufficiency than others (co-housing vs. traditional student housing for shared living, see section 1.3).
I found the final few paragraphs of Section 1.2 introduced quite a few new terms/processes that had not previously been mentioned when outlining the process of meaning making. I was not clear how the individual factors could practically be encouraged in the co-housing process.	To improve clarity, we put the paragraph in a new section (1.5), where we introduce personal reflection and insight abilities as individual factors that may help to integrate experiences that are made in a specific setting. Thus, there are potential moderators that influence the experience - meaning relationship (see H7).
Reviewer C	
Additionally, the abundance of paragraphs disrupts the flow, and at times the paper seems to become entangled in multiple concepts without clear focus. Providing clearer definitions and distinctions between key ideas (e.g. sufficiency vs. pro-environmental behavior, and high-impact behavior) would help to sharpen the argumentation and understandability of the paper. In particular, the exploration of sufficiency in the context of housing feels a bit underdeveloped and could benefit from a deeper and more nuanced analysis.	We worked on reducing the introduced concepts and combined the paragraphs when appropriate. We reworked section 1.2 and 1.3 and put an emphasis on behaviours related to sufficiency and at the same time removed sections regarding high-impact PEB and PEB more generally.

<p>Furthermore, the term “meaning” as also “meaning construction” in regard to your study and the sharing concept remains unspecific. Please sharpen this further and explain more clearly what you mean by meaning (e.g. l. 27 “meaning related to shared living”).</p>	<p>We reworked section 1.4 for greater clarity of the concepts meaning, meaning of shared living and the process of meaning construction.</p>
<p>Additionally, there seems to be some inconsistency in how shared living is framed. At times, it is discussed as part of sufficiency-oriented living, while at other times, it appears to be positioned as something separate or additional. This raises questions about whether ‘experiences of shared living’ are being considered as a driver of sufficiency, a component of it, or a result. Clarifying these distinctions would greatly enhance the coherence of the argument.</p>	<p>Again we worked on clarifying these concepts, especially in section 1.2 and 1.3.</p> <p>Shared living is a sufficiency practice, so it is a part of sufficiency. At the same time, shared living also boosts other sufficiency-oriented behaviours such as sharing of everyday items.</p> <p>We argue that it depends on personal experiences in shared living context that determine whether someone find of living appealing (e.g meaningful). The experiences we assess in this paper are related to co-housing elements that can be found in the CA, but less in the standard student home (self-organisation, communal areas, community live; see section 2.3.5).</p>
<p>I also get the impression that your study takes a very positivist approach and does not sufficiently address the potential downsides of shared living and “forced sufficiency”. I would strongly recommend integrating this perspective, at the latest in the discussion section. For instance, considering the role of money and life stages/age, but also pro-environmental identity and self-ascribed values which are highly significant factors in people’s housing choices (in particular for the CA and which is evident by the varying socio-economic characteristics of the samples). These aspects are crucial for understanding the broader context and variability in shared living experiences and the potential for increasing sufficiency-oriented lifestyles.</p>	<p>We discussed this perspective in several sections of the manuscript including 1.1, 1.2 (line 147ff) and 4.3 (710 ff).</p>
<p>Introduction: For me, the argumentation between sufficiency, environmentally oriented behaviour and meaning construction is not clear. Paragraph</p>	<p>We followed your recommendation and restructured the introduction section.</p>

1.2. argues for a very long time without coming to sufficiency and I don't really understand the bridge that is then built l 160ff. I would suggest streamlining the paragraph and even put it after arguing on sufficiency and sharing.	In a second step we worked on a stronger application of the meaning literature in the context of sufficiency. We introduced a new paragraph (section 1.5) where we described personal abilities that might moderate a meaning construction process.
I would also recommend not constantly mixing up the concepts (sustainability, sufficiency, pro-environmental behaviour).	We streamlined the mentioned concepts and removed them where possible.
Line 167: You should be more precise about what exactly you are investigating here. Is it a personality facet, a situational condition that facilitates reflection, or something else? Additionally, you might consider organizing the discussion about the role of self-reflection into a separate section with its own subheading. This would help avoid mixing multiple concepts and theories under a single heading and make your argumentation more structured and focused.	We followed your recommendation and put the self-reflection argumentation in a separate section. We refer to them as (meta-cognitive) abilities throughout the manuscript.
Line 181: I suggest moving this sub chapter to the beginning of your paper, as it is highly relevant for understanding the role of the living situation in relation to sufficiency which is the core point of your paper. Establishing this context early on would provide a stronger foundation for readers to grasp what happens in detail when people live in situations that encourage them to share more items.	We followed your recommendation and moved this section to 1.2
Line 205: I don't think (shared) mobility should be categorized as miscellaneous consumption. Additionally, you introduce a new term here, 'high-impact pro...', which adds to the complexity and may confuse the reader. It would be helpful to clarify your terminology and ensure consistency to maintain the reader's understanding. Maybe another paper, that could perhaps be helpful as well: Bagheri et al. (2024). Investigating the influence of current trends and behaviours on household structures and housing consumption patterns. <i>Consumption and Society</i> , 1-	<p>We rephrased the sentence containing shared mobility to avoid the misunderstanding that it is part of the miscellaneous consumption category (l 142ff).</p> <p>We also removed the high impact argument.</p> <p>Thank you for providing the helpful literature. We worked in the paper in several sections of the manuscript.</p>

23. https://doi.org/10.1332/27528499Y2024D00000025	
The (overarching) goals you aim to address with this study seem to vary slightly throughout the text, which might confuse the reader. I suggest being more precise and consistent in articulating these goals. Repeating them clearly rather than varying their phrasing—such as in lines 268f., 280, and 631—would help maintain coherence and focus.	We reformulated the research question which we kept more consistent throughout the manuscript: “The central research question was if student homes that incorporate elements of co-housing can change individual perspectives of sufficiency in general and shared living specifically through providing different experiences of shared living. In our deducted hypotheses we refer to this kind of student housing as a sufficiency setting of shared living” (l 275 ff)
As already mentioned, it might be helpful to disentangle the constructs and definitions and clarify how you operationalize them, especially in the introduction. This would allow readers to better follow the logic behind your hypotheses.”	We tried to address this critique throughout the manuscript by giving more context to the introduced constructs and putting more effort in relating them with each other.

HYPOTHESES/PRESENT STUDY

EDITOR	
At this point, it is not entirely clear what that phrasing means. That the difference between groups increases over time? Or that it will be there at all time points? Or only that Y increases over time in one of the groups (without reference to the other group)?	The hypothesis intends to predict that Y (sufficiency attitude) increases over time in only the sufficiency setting group (CA student home). We rephrased hypotheses H4b and H6b to depict the hypothesized effect more clearly.
Reviewer B	
A couple of the hypotheses could do with a little more rationale. E.g., why should having experiences of shared living automatically lead to higher meaningfulness of shared living. Millions of people go to their work everyday but don’t find it meaningful. I guess that this is rooted in the content you cover around settings in Section 1.4, but a little more explanation as to how this process happens might improve the manuscript.	We worked on section 1.6 to provide more context to the given hypotheses. In the case of experiences, we focus on certain experiences of shared living that are tied to the co-housing elements being more prominent in the CA. We think that those specific experiences of living in student home similar to co-housing can support meaningfulness of shared living.

<p>In Section 1.5, H1 (“Meaningfulness of shared living is positively connected to experiences of shared living (H1a)”) and H4 (“We anticipated that experiences of shared living in a sufficiency-oriented student home would enhance the meaning of shared living.”) could be seen as replicating one another. This might be a misunderstanding on my part and solved by being clearer on what the main differences are between your sufficiency and control setting.</p>	<p>H1 investigates whether the constructs meaningfulness of shared living and experiences of shared living are related in principle (regardless of setting membership). H4 builds on findings of H1. H4 investigates whether H1 can causally explain the differences between the settings investigated by combining within-subjects and between-subjects predictions. We modified table 1 to illustrate the differences between the two settings in a greater detail.</p>
<p>REVIEWER C</p>	
<p>Line 272: This statement sounds tautological to me: 'experiences of shared living would relate to a higher meaningfulness of shared living.' It would be helpful to clarify the relationship between these two concepts to avoid redundancy and make the argument more precise.</p>	<p>We hope that through the introduction it becomes now clearer that these two variables are different by definition as well as they way they are measured. Experiences relate to past activities/events whereas meaning is the evaluation experiences related to shared living.</p>
<p>Hypotheses: Some of them are unclear or not precise enough. For instance, what do you mean by 'richer' experiences? Doesn't this carry a normative implication?</p>	<p>We now only refer to more or less frequent experiences and at the same time explain what kind of experiences we assess and why (related to co-housing elements)</p>
<p>H2: What exactly do you mean by 'experiences of shared living'—are you referring to the amount, intensity, or duration?</p>	<p>Referring to the dimensions described above we use the term more frequent as it can be used to test our theoretical argument and is in line with our operationalisation.</p>
<p>H3: Similarly, when you state 'sharing will be higher,' do you mean the amount, duration, or the quantity of objects or spaces shared?</p>	<p>We adapted H3 to express that we expect the amount of sharing to be higher in the sufficiency setting.</p>
<p>H4: This hypothesis also seems somewhat tautological to me, and I think this stems from the way it's framed. If people are forced into a sufficiency-oriented setting, it seems illogical to argue that the meaning of sharing would be rated as higher due to this compulsion.</p>	<p>H4 aims to further investigate the proposed relationship between settings, experiences and meaning. In H1 we investigate whether experiences of shared living related to meaning of shared living across conditions. In H2 we test whether people from the CA report significantly more experiences of shared living. H4 then test if setting-related experiences of shared living than account for differences in meaning of shared living by combining within-subjects</p>

	(longitudinal) and between-subjects (setting-membership) predictions. We rephrased H4b to give a more precise description of the hypothesized effect.
H5: do you mean higher or stronger intentions? The same with attitudes in H6.	We rephrased the hypotheses relating to “More positive Attitudes” and “Stronger Intentions”
Line 308: 'Insight' or the 'ability to self-reflect' is not typically considered a core personality trait, though it could be part of one. Please clarify what exactly you intend to measure here. Based on this hypothesis, one might assume that you're measuring a specific personality trait, which does not appear to be the case.	Indeed, the constructs are somewhat blurry in their definition. Although referred to as traits by some authors https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.035 , we aimed for more consistency by avoiding the term trait and refer to them as (meta-cognitive) abilities throughout the manuscript.

METHOD

EDITOR	
I saw a potential inconsistency in the statistics, with the correlations being tested using non-parametric tests (and I think the use of Spearman correlations specifically was not preregistered) and all other tests being parametric. Could you please check this again and harmonize or motivate the approach if necessary?	Thank for the remark. We adapted the statistics to Pearson. Table 2 already included Pearson correlations.
Reviewer B	
Could you say a bit more about what opportunities each of the groups has for co-living. Many student homes have shared kitchens and bathrooms, for example, although sometimes students will have a studio set-up. How did your two conditions compare on these kinds of arrangements?	<p>In table 1 we included additional information that describe differences between the student homes in relation to shared living and sufficiency. We compare both settings in 4 categories: Shared spaces withing the flat, community spaces outside the flat, organisational structure, other facilities to support sufficiency.</p> <p>We hope this adds to a clearer understanding of shared living opportunities.</p>
Reviewer C	
Furthermore, I see a lack in clarifying what facets of sufficiency are particularly addressed in the CA environment but not in the standard living home, where are the concrete differences, and why is the sufficiency aspect there addressed more overtly to or by whom?	<p>We dublicate the response made to a very similar remark made by reviewer B:</p> <p>In table 1 we included additional information that describe differences between the student homes in relation to shared living and sufficiency. We compare both settings in 4 categories: Shared spaces withing the flat, community spaces outside the flat, organisational structure, other facilities to support sufficiency.</p> <p>We hope this adds to a clearer understanding of shared living opportunities.</p>
I don't understand why the standard student house offers only limited opportunities to share items and foster self-organization. I would imagine there are also shared kitchen areas, perhaps a room for sports, and other communal spaces. The	We included additional information in Table 1 to clarify the differences between the student homes. Self-organisation varies significantly between both student homes since the CA is completely self-

distinction between the two settings could be made clearer to better highlight the differences in opportunities for shared living and self-organization.	organised by the students, whereas the standard student home is not. Shared spaces exist in the standard student home only outside. As described in line 355ff and depicted in Table 1, the CA offers additional infrastructure for a sufficiency-oriented lifestyle which is quite unique for a student home.
Overall, the section is transparent and well-organized. However, some of the measures will become clearer when the introduction is streamlined (e.g. meaningfulness of shared living and meaning construction; the capability to self-reflect as part of a personality trait measure).	We hope that we could streamline the previous sections accordingly to facilitate understanding. Responses related to the mentioned constructs have been made in previous reviewer comments.
Line 393: check subscripts	Thank you for the remark, we adapted the subscripts.
Why did you choose a 4-month interval between T1 and T2? Was there a specific reason for this time frame? Why not 2 weeks, 4 months, or even 6 months? Shortly clarifying the rationale behind this choice would be helpful.	We added a short paragraph that explains our rationale for choosing a 4-month interval (l 396): “We chose this time interval for several reasons. Firstly, it was important that the participants had the opportunity to make all investigated experiences of shared living on a regular basis. It was also important to end the measurement interval before the end of the summer term to avoid dropout due to exams and the general fluctuation in student home residents during summer break.”
Paragraph 2.3.4. I am a bit confused about the concepts and measures here. Are you measuring personal reflection, self-reflection, emotional insight, or just general insight? Clarifying these distinctions would improve the clarity of your argument.	In line with our adaptations in the previous parts we now refer to the constructs as self-reflection and insight as meta-cognitive abilities.

RESULTS

REVIEWER B	
With the panel model, you say the model comparison found a significant difference in cross-lagged paths (I'm assuming comparing between residential setting). But then the mode in Figure 2 is for the overall sample? Could you not display the	The cross-lagged panel model does not compare the two settings but correlates experiences and meaningfulness of shared living across the two groups. The significant model test refers to the difference in cross-lagged path coefficients (Exp_1

<p>differences in the path coefficients across groups in Figure 2, as this would seem to be a more important finding than just looking at overall levels? (especially given the limitation that many of the residents of the CA were motivated by environmentally friendly living and hence this could be argued to be accounting for differences between your groups).</p>	<p>→ Mng_t2 vs. Mng_t1 → Exp_t2). This means there is a significantly stronger effect of experience on meaning than the other way round. This effect follows our theoretical assumptions since we expect meaning be an outcome of the investigated experiences of shared living. As the frequency of experiences are more frequent in the CA (see figure 1) we cautiously argue for a setting-related effect on meaningfulness of shared living (see l 609ff). We also adapted section 3.4 with a clearer description of the analysis.</p>
<p>Do you have any way of assessing how far students were into their degree/how recently they moved away from home? You note a few times in the manuscript that “Major life incidents are more likely to prompt a conscious review of personal meaning systems” so it might be interesting to examine how the process of meaning making within the CA is easier for people who have experienced a more recent change in their educational/living setting.</p>	<p>Thank you for this interesting idea. However, as the CA only opened 6 months before we conducted the study there is hardly any variance in the time they lived in the student home. Thus, it is probably not useful to do conduct a more thorough analysis in this direction.</p>
<p>Reviewer C</p>	
<p>Results, Line 468: Considering my concerns about tautological arguments in some of your hypotheses, did you explore or control for whether 'meaningfulness of shared living' and 'experiences of shared living' are distinct latent constructs? Given the high correlations between them, I recommend running an exploratory factor analysis to support your hypothesis that these are separate concepts.</p>	<p>We measured experiences of shared living not as a latent construct (we further elaborated on this argument with helpful remarks of the editor in section 2.3.6). As mentioned in a previous response, experiences relate to past activities/events whereas meaning is the evaluation experiences related to shared living. There we would argue for a difference in constructs based on face validity. From our point of view, it supports our theoretical argument (included in our hypotheses) that these variables are highly correlated.</p>
<p>Line 513: I find this result quite interesting and, in my opinion, one of the most relevant findings. Specifically, people who did not intend to live in a particular 'sufficiency setting' seem to perceive their surroundings in a way that increased their</p>	<p>We are cautious to interpret this effect too extensively from a theoretical perspective. The effect size was close to zero (l 530) and was only present in the sufficiency attitudes, not in the</p>

sufficiency attitudes and behaviors by default. Given the self-selection biases in your CA sample, I believe you should build on this intriguing result much more in the later sections of your study.	meaningfulness of shared living. However, we discuss some theoretical arguments in l 622.
---	---

DISCUSSION

Reviewer C	
Line 632 f “This approach...” the sentence remains unclear to me, please rework.	We rephrased the sentence (see l 659 ff).
Lines 649 ff.: I suggest providing more specific examples of the causal effects that should be investigated in the future and how they could be addressed. The discussion of limitations here feels a bit superficial. Alternatively, you could shorten this section, as the limitations mentioned later are argued with more precision.	We rephrased the section providing with more specific suggestions for future studies to investigate casual effects (l 674 ff).
Line 543: The first sentence introduces something new—‘narratives’—which seems a bit abrupt. I would recommend first summarizing what you did in this section and then moving into the interpretation part.	We rephrased the section accordingly and tried to make a closer connections to the problems and resulting research questions raised in section 1.1 (see l 560 ff).
Line 545: The phrase ‘tested the influence’ seems a bit overenthusiastic given your experimental setting. It might be more accurate to say something like ‘explored the potential influence’ or ‘examined potential effects’ to better reflect the nature of your study.	We rephrased the section (see l 563 ff).
Line 572: Given the self-selection bias in the sample, I would suggest that a ceiling effect might be at play here. This could limit the generalizability of your findings and should be considered in the interpretation.	Thank you for your remark. We added this argument to the discussion of our findings (see l 604 ff).
Line 590: This sentence seems redundant. I would suggest rephrasing it for clarity and to avoid repetition.	We rephrased the sentence (see l 615 ff).
All in all, I miss some references to literature that investigated the effects of such forms of housing. More reference could be made here in the discussion. Regarding the points I address in the introduction, I would also like to argue a little less positivistically and normatively and deepen your argumentation: Why is sufficiency so unpopular? And why do people choose to live in the CA? What are the social hurdles for other people? Please also address the questions that come along with socio-	We tried to address your remarks more thoroughly by rewriting our conclusion in section 4.3 which sums up our approach based on your arguments mentioned here. We hope this adds more substance to the provided argumentation.

demographic background here. How does voluntary sufficiency relate to prosperity and identity? Perhaps this could be added in a few places.	
---	--

Reviews Round 2

Comments by the Editor

In line with Reviewer B's suggestions, you may consider moving/repeating some (but probably not all) of the information on the student accommodations from the methods section to/in the introduction (e.g., to the "The present study" subsection). I would say the introduction information about those accommodations should be on a more abstract/conceptual level, and the concrete details can then remain in the methods section.

I attach a pdf of your article in which I highlighted some minor typos and potential phrasing issues. Please consider them when revising your manuscript, but you do not need to respond to them in your response letter.

Comments by Reviewer A (corresponds to Reviewer B in Round 1)

This manuscript is massively improved from the first version - congratulations to the authors for their work in revising.

My comments now are only minor, and once addressed I am happy to recommend publication.

My remaining queries:

1. Double check that your language is not implying causality when describing the effects of the two settings. In section 1.1, for example, there is a sentence where you say "We tested whether living in one of the student homes would lead to different experiences of shared living..." 'Lead' is perhaps too strong of a word - 'associated maybe? You do a good job in your discussion of highlighting that causality cannot be implied, especially given the group self-selection and difference in meaning scores observed at T1, so just make sure there is no problematic language still remaining.
2. A couple of sentences in the introduction are still a little vague. E.g., in section 1.2 you say "These uses may be promoted through making experiences of shared living in specific settings." I was wondering what uses and experiences might look like.
3. There are a lot of hypotheses and this section of the introduction can be a little hard to follow. Is there perhaps a way to graphically display the proposed relationships to aid quicker interpretation here?
4. The finding that sufficiency attitudes increase in the control group (but not CA) group seems to go against the main finding. You suggest a possible intervention effect as a reason behind this (and why it is unlikely to be the case). Are there any other societal trends that might explain an increase in sufficiency attitudes amongst those not in the CA group?

Comments by Reviewer B (corresponds to Reviewer C in Round 1)

The paper gained a lot from the revision. Thanks for addressing all my points in detail and the great rework you did.

However, some parts are still unclear. I would also recommend checking grammar again, as sometimes words seem to be missing, likely due to the fundamental rework you conducted.

The lines refer to the document with edit mode.

- L.97: "Barriers of sufficiency"? Or did you mean "barriers to sufficiency"?
 - L.123: The source (Lamb ...) appears incomplete.
 - L.127ff: You should build a clearer bridge to explain what you mean by "building up new narratives for sufficiency."
 - L.149ff – CA: I miss a link to a website or similar resource to show readers what it actually is. Furthermore, it would be helpful to clarify earlier whether the CA was built with an explicit sufficiency approach. Please explain why it was created and the intentions behind it. Maybe move parts from the method part to this part, as it gets much more clearer with the description you give later on in the method section.
 - L.255–257: Either provide a source here or rephrase so that it is clear that this point is not yet proven.
 - L.296: As you cite Rogers: I am a bit skeptical whether this source fits well here. Perhaps you should explain what you mean in relation to "leverage points" at this point in the paper? Consider either not citing the concept here or explaining it in more depth, including relevant literature.
 - L.316: What exactly do you mean by "positive social effects"?
 - L.338: This sounds very global. Whose goals, beliefs, and expectations are you referring to?
 - L.369: Could you clarify what you mean by "supportive infrastructure and organized community"?
 - L.377: I suggest renaming the heading to explicitly reflect the personality facets you are investigating.
 - L.401: The meaning of "this kind of student housing" remains unclear. Please be more specific.
 - L.404: "Proposed theory" — since you cite a lot, this phrase is a bit unclear to me. Could you specify?
 - L.481ff: I suggest moving the description of the CA to the introduction. Providing this information earlier would make it easier to understand the differences between the housing forms and the focus of your investigation.
 - L.553: Does this number capture only completers then?
 - L.718: Please name the settings here (as you do below).
 - L.798: Please check the sentence — I think a word is missing.
 - L.865: The conclusion feels very general and not closely tied to the findings of your paper. I recommend shortening it. Additionally, you could move the implications (and recommendations for policymakers) to one paragraph in the Discussion section. Staying closer to your results would strengthen your argument.
 - L.879: Did you discuss this finding earlier? It feels a bit sudden. Also, what exactly does "strong" mean in relation to your findings?
-

Author response to the reviewers Round 2

Reviewer A	
Double check that your language is not implying causality when describing the effects of the two settings. In section 1.1, for example, there is a sentence where you say "We tested whether living in one of the student homes would lead to different experiences of shared living..." 'Lead' is perhaps too strong of a word - 'associated maybe? You do a good job in your discussion of highlighting that causality cannot be implied, especially given the group self-selection and difference in meaning scores observed at T1, so just make sure there is no problematic language still remaining.	We checked the wording and adapted it in line ll 112, ll 279 and ll 694.
A couple of sentences in the introduction are still a little vague. E.g., in section 1.2 you say "These uses may be promoted through making experiences of shared living in specific settings." I was wondering what uses and experiences might look like.	We added a sentence in ll 156 providing an example for uses and experiences.
There are a lot of hypotheses and this section of the introduction can be a little hard to follow. Is there perhaps a way to graphically display the proposed relationships to aid quicker interpretation here?	We included a figure depicting all hypotheses in subdivided in three clusters (Figure 1).
The finding that sufficiency attitudes increase in the control group (but not CA) group seems to go against the main finding. You suggest a possible intervention effect as a reason behind this (and why it is unlikely to be the case). Are there any other societal trends that might explain an increase in sufficiency attitudes amongst those not in the CA group?	We are not aware of any other social trends that could account for this effect. Given that the student homes are situated in the same neighbourhood, any larger social trends would probably have affected both student homes. We were present in the area multiple times during the data acquisition. At this time we did not observe any specific trends in the standard student home that could potentially have explained this effect.

Reviewer B	
L97: "Barriers of sufficiency"? Or did you mean "barriers to sufficiency"?	We reformulated the caption 1.1 into "Sufficiency: Necessities, potentials and barriers" to avoid misleading prepositions
L123: The source (Lamb ...) appears incomplete.	We doublechecked: The citation is complete (l 99)

L127ff: You should build a clearer bridge to explain what you mean by "building up new narratives for sufficiency."	We added an additional sentence to specify that these narratives should include a stronger recognition of the advantages that sufficiency provides (ll 101).
L149ff – CA: I miss a link to a website or similar resource to show readers what it actually is. Furthermore, it would be helpful to clarify earlier whether the CA was built with an explicit sufficiency approach. Please explain why it was created and the intentions behind it. Maybe move parts from the method part to this part, as it gets much more clearer with the description you give later on in the method section.	L 110: We moved the link referring to the CA website from the method section to this section. Furthermore, following the editor's recommendation we moved information from the method to the present study section (see 1.6) as for us it seems more fitting to introduce some basic theoretical concepts (co-housing, setting, shared living) first. We retained the specific features of both student homes in the method section.
L255–257: Either provide a source here or rephrase so that it is clear that this point is not yet proven.	We rephrased the sentence to make it more hypothetical (ll 145).
L296: As you cite Rogers: I am a bit skeptical whether this source fits well here. Perhaps you should explain what you mean in relation to "leverage points" at this point in the paper? Consider either not citing the concept here or explaining it in more depth, including relevant literature.	We adapted the sentence and removed rogers as a reference (ll 180). There is now a focus on social diffusion process by Hunecke, that is described in the context of psychological resources and settings that could potentially bring forward sufficiency.
L316: What exactly do you mean by "positive social effects"?	We specified the empirical findings regarding positive social effects (ll 197)
L338: This sounds very global. Whose goals, beliefs, and expectations are you referring to?	To some extent this is intended because it is meant as a general definition of meaning construction that is not content specific. We however added that we mean goals, beliefs and expectation of an <i>individual person</i> (l 219)
L369: Could you clarify what you mean by "supportive infrastructure and organized community"?	We formulated the sentence with greater detail and provided examples (ll 249)
L377: I suggest renaming the heading to explicitly reflect the personality facets you are investigating.	We renamed the heading 1.5: "Self-reflection and insight as personal capacities that potentially support the integration of experiences"
L401: The meaning of "this kind of student housing" remains unclear. Please be more specific.	We reformulated the sentence with greater detail (ll 292)

L404: "Proposed theory" — since you cite a lot, this phrase is a bit unclear to me. Could you specify?	The proposed theory is mainly around the mechanisms of meaning construction. We specified it in the text accordingly (ll 302)
L481ff: I suggest moving the description of the CA to the introduction. Providing this information earlier would make it easier to understand the differences between the housing forms and the focus of your investigation.	We moved the description of the student homes to the "present study" section. We kept concrete specifications of the student homes in the method section (ll 376).
L553: Does this number capture only completers then?	Yes this captures only participants who fully completed both surveys
L718: Please name the settings here (as you do below).	We reformulated the sentences naming both settings (ll 589).
L798: Please check the sentence — I think a word is missing.	We rephrased the sentence (ll 668).
L865: The conclusion feels very general and not closely tied to the findings of your paper. I recommend shortening it. Additionally, you could move the implications (and recommendations for policymakers) to one paragraph in the Discussion section. Staying closer to your results would strengthen your argument.	We shortened the conclusion part with a stronger emphasis on the findings. We moved policy recommendation to ll 660.
L879: Did you discuss this finding earlier? It feels a bit sudden. Also, what exactly does "strong" mean in relation to your findings?	This finding relates to H5 of our hypotheses that tested whether there is a difference in the intention to continue shared living after their time in the student home. We show results in 3.2 and discuss them in ll 637. We rephrased the sentence, to provide more context to the finding (ll 734)