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Section 1: Introduction

1. LIFE+ Up and Forward Project Aim

The Up and Forward LIFE+ project was developed in recognition that many European Union (EU) countries face the same problem, which prevents them from being able to achieve higher waste prevention and recycling goals in low performing deprived areas. It aimed to develop an innovative communication process to increase recycling and waste prevention participation in low performing urban areas, and develop communication media which would support implementation across the EU.

The project has demonstrated how by underpinning communication campaigns with marketing science you can increase participation in waste prevention and recycling activity. As a result the project has delivered considerable EU added value as municipalities increasingly need to understand how to maximise their waste prevention and recycling services, which are directly dependent on public participation. As the EU develops its infrastructure (as Greater Manchester has done for the next 23 years) this will become the main limiting factor. This challenge is made even harder in light of the knowledge that participation is low in densely populated urban areas. Pertinently, it is an issue the EU must tackle to implement current policies and understand how much more can be achieved in the future. In order to attain higher goals more will need to be done to engage with those that live in urban areas - around half of the EU-27 citizens.

1.2 Recycling Rates in Deprived Greater Manchester Districts (as at January 2011)

It is more difficult to engage residents in urban areas as they often have issues of deprivation, transience, multiple cultures and restrictive storage space linked to housing type. Across Greater Manchester these areas have lower recycling rates than their more prosperous suburban counterparts, despite the majority receiving the same service and information. This shows there is a need for more targeted communications developed with and for communities.

Greater Manchester is typical of many densely populated EU regions, with a significant proportion of residents that do not participate. In some areas high recycling rates (near 70%) are being achieved, but in others they are low (near 15%). The data below highlights how issues relating to deprivation, transience/youth, faith/culture and high density housing impact on participation at the local level. An example of one of the Manchester Districts Salford is provided which shows that recycling participation varies from around 20% to around 70% between areas within the District. The area of Langworthy, for example, is lowest and is a deprived area, Broughton is second lowest and has a large ethnic community, and the third lowest Irwell Riverside is a transient student area.
1.3 Project Overview

Changing peoples’ behaviour to be good and accurate recyclers all the time is the key to achieving higher waste prevention and recycling goals. However, changing resident behaviour in low performing, deprived, urban communities is not easy, making the success of recycling schemes in these areas particularly challenging. While many municipalities are involved in waste communications the process of segmenting urban populations to deliver targeted waste related campaigns is often unfamiliar, poorly understood and simply not applied.

As part of the EU LIFE+ Up and Forward project, Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority (GMWDA) piloted 42 innovative communication campaigns across nine different Districts within Greater Manchester to encourage residents to separate and recycle their waste in low performing urban areas.

Image 1: LIFE+ Project area
Each campaign had a different focus, targeting sections of the community that have traditionally been hard to reach. The project targeted smaller groups, generally around 1500 households, with focused recycling messages, allowing for a variety of communication methods and messages to be piloted and the impact of each to be monitored.

The project started in June 2013 and ran until January 2015 with campaigns covering one of the four following themes:

a) **Deprivation** - focused on communities in disadvantaged areas.
b) **Transient and Youth** - focused on those areas with a high level of rental properties or student rental accommodation.
c) **Faith and Culture** - focused on those areas with a strong religious or cultural background.
d) **High Density Housing** (Apartments) - focused on those areas with a high level of low rise or high rise apartments.

### 1.4 The Six Step Approach

The Up and Forward project has demonstrated a six step process (that other municipalities could follow) to deliver effective communications to demographics that are hard to reach using traditional blanket communication methods. The six steps are listed below (with more detail in sections two to eight).

#### Step 1: Understanding the target demographics

*See section 2*

#### Step 2: Understanding the waste streams and effective targeting

*See section 3*

#### Step 3: Outlining campaigns to overcome participation barriers

*See section 4*

#### Step 4: Engaging with residents develop campaigns from within the community and incorporate their views into the campaign

*See section 5*

#### Step 5: Delivering campaigns on a large scale

*See section 6*

#### Step 6: Monitoring and evaluating campaign success

*See section 7*
Section 2: Step one - Understanding the target demographics
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2.1 Understanding the demographics

A review of recent research was undertaken to inform how communication may be targeted. In the UK work has been undertaken by DEFRA (2009) and WRAP (2008) on barriers to waste prevention and recycling, which show there is a complex mix of barriers relating to knowledge, attitudes, ingrained behaviours or situations.

Overall, the work carried out shows that a targeted approach to communicating waste issues is required, that incorporates messages that enable people to overcome these barriers. In order to do this it is first necessary to identify and understand the target audience. Further research, explained below, identifies the key factors determining low performance as:

a) high deprivation;
b) transient populations, youth and students;
c) high proportion of different cultures;
d) high density housing (apartments),

2.1.1 Deprivation

Analysis of factors affecting kerbside dry recycling performance in the UK (WRAP, 2009/10) including deprivation, kerbside frequency, number of materials collected, regional variation and containment capacity showed deprivation was the single most important factor and strongest predictor of low recycling performance. Research carried out by Brooklyndhurst (2008) for DEFRA related socio-economics to participation in food waste collections, specifically linking low participation to social renters, social classes DE and the unemployed which are all indicators of deprivation.

Relevance to European Union

Evidence shows that despite varying degrees of deprivation across the EU (particularly the East and West) the factors associated with deprivation - low incomes, lack of access to education and opportunity etc. - are the same. Therefore, people on low incomes across the EU are likely to have difficulties prioritising recycling.

2.1.2 Transience and youth

Research undertaken (Williams and Timlett, 2008) examined the issue of transience in the City of Portsmouth. A large survey of 62,299 households was undertaken in 2005 and repeated in 2007. Even though participation was the same overall, deeper analysis showed 10% were new recyclers and 10% had stopped recycling. A follow up survey of the households that stopped recycling showed that transience was the key issue with around half of the occupants being in the house for less than one year. The report also implicates transience as being key to forming recycling habits, as those residents that had

Relevance to European Union

In recent years the EU has become more transient and fluid characterised by migration within the EU and from outside it. Likewise, nationals increasingly move around within their own countries impacting on the delivery of EU objectives. The transient population (mainly young people) is the same across the EU and therefore directly applicable.
stayed in the same household had continued to recycle. Moreover, in streets characterised by highly transient populations very low levels of participation were observed (only 3 in 10 households put out their recycling). This compounds the problem reducing visibility and shared neighbourhood learning preventing the habit being formed.

2.1.3 Faith and Culture

Many studies have implicated ethnic minority groups as being less likely to recycle, and indeed, lower recycling rates have been observed across Greater Manchester in areas where ethnic minorities form a significant proportion of the community. However, it is important to note that this does not necessarily mean that ethnic minorities are bad recyclers. There are significant inter-correlated factors, for example MORI (2002) stated that this was partly a function of tenure, and WRAP research has shown deprivation to be an over-riding factor. Indeed, research undertaken (Williams, 2007) demonstrates that this view is too simplistic as a study in Burnley showed that those of Indian Asian Origin were in fact more likely to participate than their White British counterparts. Nevertheless, where there are low performing communities with a high proportion of ethnic minorities there is a need to tailor communications to aid understanding and ensure equality of service through active participation.

2.1.4 High Density Housing

High-medium density housing (apartments) has been linked to low recycling rates (WRAP, 2009), which is a significant issue for urban areas. The evidence clearly shows that convenience, ease of access and structural issues are significant barriers (Waste Watch, 2006) and these need to be addressed alongside any communications. While a study undertaken by the Scottish Executive showed that the provision of facilities led to increased recycling rates other studies (Sita, 2010) have also shown that the provision of facilities is not a straight forward matter and strategies such as clustering and limiting residual waste disposal access need to be developed with residents. Pertinently, the Sita study found that blanket communications did not work, suggesting that micro level engagement could work, though this was not demonstrated.

Relevance to European Union

Urban areas in many EU countries are increasingly characterised by diverse ethnic communities. The challenge of how to overcome language barriers, and cultural sensitivities to enable these communities to have access to services and deliver equality is the same across the EU.

Relevance to European Union

Many urban areas across the EU are characterised by apartments constrained by space. To maximise participation the Municipality must work with residents to maximise the use of the space available for waste separation.
Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority is a partnership made up of nine district councils (Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Stockport, Tameside and Trafford), working alongside a private sector contractor Viridor Laing (GM) Ltd. The nine Districts are responsible for the collection of waste in their own conurbations. A four stream collection system is used across Greater Manchester to approximately one million households that enables paper/card, food/garden waste, plastic bottles, tin cans, foil and glass bottles to be collected separately from residual waste. The partnership also provides an extended range of services for bulky waste with 20 household waste recycling centres that enable residents to separate waste into a minimum of 23 categories, as well as door to door pick up of specific waste streams.

3.1.1 Waste compositional analysis

A Waste Compositional Analysis and Survey was undertaken to ascertain a better understanding of the potential to recycle more waste and to inform communication campaigns (i.e. LIFE+ project). The study was carried out in two phases; the first in February/March 2011 and the second in September 2011 to take into account differences in seasonality. All four kerbside streams were analysed across Greater Manchester.

A waste compositional analysis involves sorting the waste into categories, and weighing each item separately, so that the quantity and percentage of waste in each category can be modelled. Prior to sorting the waste a household survey was undertaken to establish demographic and waste related behaviours, and to see if these could be linked to the data which would help to develop targeted communication campaigns.

A total of 1302 households took part in the door step survey, of which, 879 household (approximately 100 per District) had the contents of their bin analysed. In addition some work was done to compare the waste composition in high and low performing areas.

The composition of the kerbside recyclates across all the four kerbside waste streams operated in Greater Manchester is depicted in the Table below. It shows that the system is very well designed, with potentially 75.9% of the waste being recyclable. It should be noted that the composition of waste has changed considerably over recent years, and whilst a further study has not been undertaken extrapolation of the data using published growth rates indicates the proportion of recyclable waste is likely to have fallen in 2015 to around 73%.
Table 1: Composition of waste depicting recyclable waste streams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recyclable Waste</th>
<th>GMWDA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recyclable Paper/card</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carton/tetrapaks</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic bottles</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrous cans and aerosols</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ferrous cans and aerosols</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium foil</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass bottles and jars</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden waste</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic catering waste</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total recyclable Waste</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non-recyclable waste</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in the table below shows the capture rates for each of the materials collected in Greater Manchester. Showing that there is already good capture of materials like paper, glass and garden but significant improvement can be made in the capture of other materials. In terms of weight then focusing on organics and card would make the biggest difference to increasing recycling rates. It should be noted that at the time of the analysis the majority of Districts had not rolled out their organic catering waste collections.

Table 2: Capture Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Category (Recyclables)</th>
<th>Capture Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recyclable paper (%)</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card (%)</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetrapak (%)</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic bottles (%)</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrous cans and aerosols (%)</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ferrous cans and aerosols (%)</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium foil (%)</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass bottles and jars (%)</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden wastes (%)</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic catering waste (%)</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data was examined by household type, and showed that the capture of recycling materials (i.e. the percentage of the material in recycling bin) was significantly less in terraced areas and flats/apartments. With around 17% of Greater Manchester households in Greater Manchester living in flats/apartments this showed the importance of tackling this area for the LIFE+ project.

**Table 3: Capture rates for different household types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Category (Recyclables)</th>
<th>Detached</th>
<th>Semi-Detached</th>
<th>Terraced</th>
<th>Flats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recyclable paper (%)</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card (%)</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetrapak (%)</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic bottles (%)</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrous cans and aerosols (%)</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ferrous cans and aerosols (%)</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium foil (%)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass bottles and jars (%)</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden wastes (%)</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic catering waste (%)</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey results were used to undertake a statistical analysis of factors such as profession (as an indicator of deprivation) and first language (as an indicator of ethnicity), showed they were linked to performance, but the differences were often too small to explain the exact relationship. For example the data may be able to demonstrate that there is a significant difference in the performance between professions, but the relationship may not be strong enough to say exactly which profession was causing that difference. The data also showed a number of other factors were also linked to performance, namely, household size, age, presence of a garden, tenure and housing type that are often compounded in specific geographical areas.

The relationship between high and low performance was also analysed in a different way by undertaking a survey and compositional analysis in two high and two low performing areas. The low performing areas were characterised by a younger age group, a lower percentage with English as their first language, higher levels of renting, and a higher proportion of households on low incomes compared to the high performing areas. The data below shows the capture rates two areas of Rochdale where the pulpables and com mingled dry recycling streams were examined.
Table 4: Comparison of the capture rates in a high and low performing area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage capture rate (%)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performing</td>
<td>performing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Capture Rate)</td>
<td>(Capture Rate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recyclable Paper</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carton/Tetrapak</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic bottles</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrous cans &amp; aerosols</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ferrous cans &amp; aerosols</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium foil</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass bottles and jars</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above data clearly shows much higher capture rates in the area that would be expected to be high performing based upon its demographics and socio-economics characteristics compared to the low performing area across all waste streams. Interestingly, there are also differences within the areas, which show some materials are inherently harder to capture than others. The more detailed analysis in the report also showed that the waste in these low performing areas is composed of a greater proportion of materials like organics, plastics and metals which are inherently harder to capture. That means there is a triple effects occurring in these areas where the social-economic (e.g. deprivation) make it harder to focus attention on recycling, demographic problems (e.g. flats/terraced properties) make it more difficult to sort and separate waste, and the actual waste arising in these areas is more difficult to recycle.
3.2 **Effective targeting**

To enable the targeting of areas within the lower quartile of performance and to meet the specific campaign objectives, areas were selected based on a number of factors including:

a) Local authority local knowledge  
b) Assessment of the tonnage collected  
c) Demographics.

GMWDA maintains waste data (recycling rates, facility tonnages etc.) as part of its contract monitoring procedures and analyses waste to support its overall strategy.

In order to select an appropriate intervention area existing data was made available to the project and used to identify low performing rounds to target within each of the 12 campaigns delivered.

In addition national statistics were used. In England demographic data is available on a geographical basis including:

a) Deprivation indicators  
b) Students (%)  
c) Rental sector (%)  
d) Ethnicity (%)  
e) Faiths (%)  
f) Apartments (%)  

This data was matched to collection rounds representing an area of around 1,500 households from which waste is collected in one vehicle. The quantity of waste collected (by weight) was ranked to identify a low performing round. The same data was also used as a quick, easy and low cost indicator of the campaign success.

3.2.1 **Step 1 - Identify lower yielding rounds through round based tonnage data**

To establish performance by round for each waste stream, existing secondary data was used to identify locations (target zones’) in which low yields were most prevalent. Districts were asked to provide annual tonnage data to allow for seasonal variations for all three waste streams for each round. It should be noted that not all districts could provide this data or provided only partial data. Therefore in some cases, data assumptions had to be made. Where districts could not provide any round based tonnage data, step 1 was missed entirely, therefore selection resulted from defined characteristics (Step 2). Of those that could provide this information a tonnage yield report was produced showing average kilograms collected per household per collection by round for each waste stream. The rounds for each waste stream were ranked as high and low yielding.

**Tonnage data assessment**

The Tonnage Data assessment ranks the rounds depending on the yield (amount of recycling captured) per household. Yield was chosen rather the recycling rate because the three recycling rounds and residual waste round do not sufficiently overlap to calculate the recycling rate.
Table 5: Example of the lowest rank rounds for Bolton Pulpables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Pulpables</th>
<th>No of properties</th>
<th>Pulpables KG/HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REC-L-TUE-BLU</td>
<td>1678.71</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC-C-WED-BLU</td>
<td>1344.75</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC-J-MON-BLU</td>
<td>1632.79</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC-G-WED-BLU</td>
<td>1527.27</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC-D-TUE-BLU</td>
<td>1702.36</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was considered the best method with available data. It measures performance in terms of the amount collected. However, it should be noted that it does not take into account how much waste is the residual stream. For example, REC-L-THEU-BLU is the lowest performer in terms of the quantity that is recycling collected, but may not be the lowest performing if there is no more material that can be recycled in the residual waste.

3.2.2 Step 2 - Select a round or rounds with a suited demographic profile

For each selected campaign round, individual districts or GMWDA campaign officers provided GMWDA with a potential round to target, which, based on their knowledge was low yielding and would meet the objectives of the campaign. Districts were asked to provide full-street lists with postcodes and maps on selected rounds. It should be noted that some districts were unable to provide this data; where this occurred information was compiled using GIS software.

To provide further insight, rounds identified as low performing were profiled by ACORN classification and census data (2011) to assess their socio demographic makeup, thereby determining if the round would meet the objectives of the campaign. The potential round was mapped and profiled by output area. The information produced from the two steps above were collated together and compared to the Greater Manchester area as a whole.

Table 6: Example of using Acorn Data to choose the area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Financially Stretched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.K</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.K.34</td>
<td>Student flats and halls of residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.K.35</td>
<td>Term-time terraces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.K.36</td>
<td>Educated young people in flats and tenements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.L</td>
<td>Modest Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.L.37</td>
<td>Low cost flats in suburban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.L.38</td>
<td>Semi-skilled workers in traditional neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.L.39</td>
<td>Fading owner occupied terraces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.L.40</td>
<td>High occupancy terraces, many Asian families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.M</td>
<td>Striving Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.M.41</td>
<td>Labouring semi-rural estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.M.42</td>
<td>Struggling young families in post-war terraces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.M.43</td>
<td>Families in right-to-buy estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.M.44</td>
<td>Post-war estates, limited means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.N</td>
<td>Poorer Pensioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.N.45</td>
<td>Pensioners in social housing, semis and terraces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.N.46</td>
<td>Elderly people in social rented flats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversion to kg/hh standardises the data so that the rounds can be compared on a like for like basis.
4.N.47 Low income older people in smaller semis
4.N.48 Pensioners and singles in social rented flats

5 Urban Adversity
5.O Young Hardship
5.O.49 Young families in low cost private flats
5.O.50 Struggling younger people in mixed tenure
5.O.51 Young people in small, low cost terraces
5.P Struggling Estates
5.P.52 Poorer families, many children, terraced housing
5.P.53 Low income terraces
5.P.54 Multi-ethnic, purpose-built estates
5.P.55 Deprived and ethnically diverse in flats
5.P.56 Low income large families in social rented semis
5.Q Difficult Circumstances
5.Q.57 Social rented flats, families and single parents
5.Q.58 Singles and young families, some receiving benefits
5.Q.59 Deprived areas and high-rise flats

Table 7: Example of census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Data as % for Area</th>
<th>Data as % for Base</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned outright</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned with mortgage/loan</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared ownership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rented</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority rented</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Association rented</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other rented (mostly rent free)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data shows that 28% fewer properties are owned outright in the area compared to Greater Manchester.

This data shows there are 113% more socially rented properties in the area compared to Greater Manchester.

3.2.3 Step 3 - Select the intervention zone

The final step was carried out after the baseline results had been achieved (see section 7), this ultimately narrowed down the final intervention zone within the selected round (based on steps 1 and 2 above) to around 1500 properties. The intervention zone was selected from low performing streets or flats (campaign dependent); this being based on the baseline findings provided. In essence this tailored the intervention zones that were most in need of communications, the campaign then focused on these campaign zones. GMWDA were responsible for the selection of the campaign zone.
Limitations

The final selection of the round to be included was therefore carried out using all the data available and was not consistent across all districts. All three recyclable streams were required to be monitored to assess the two weekly set out rate. As not all waste streams on all rounds were coterminous, this was District dependent. The three waste streams (pulpables, comingled, organics) were selected based on their overlay, for example, a comingled round was identified as being low yielding and meeting the objectives of the campaign (socio-demographics) then pulpables and organics rounds that overlapped this area were selected.

It should also be noted that some authorities could not provide tonnages for certain waste streams. For example Oldham could not provide tonnages for their organic waste stream as the Council did not operate a structured organic collection. In most cases where this occurred ACORN/CENSUS data, combined with local knowledge was used. For a significant proportion of districts ranking data was not available.

Therefore using available census data and local knowledge was part of the overall methodology. Using this sampling methodology was justified because areas with the defined characteristics e.g. deprivation are likely to be low performing according to national data. Where there are instances of this type it is highlighted in the specific final campaign report.

As some of the authorities had round restructures pre and post tonnage data could not be directly compared.

Acorn is a classification system that segments the UK population by analysing demographic data, social factors, population and consumer behaviour. Acorn is broken down into three tiers; 6 categories, 18 groups and 62 types. Acorn provides valuable insight into, helping to target and understand the attributes of households and postcodes areas.

Output Areas are built from clusters of adjacent unit postcodes in the United Kingdom and are the base unit for Census data releases. Due to their smaller size, Output Areas allow for a finer resolution of data analysis.
Section 4: Step 3: Outline campaigns to overcome participation barriers

4.

4.1 The third step is to develop an outline for each campaign aimed at the specific target audience that is likely to overcome the barrier identified through research. Taking the four demographics identified then it is generally considered that those living on low incomes do not have the ability to prioritise recycling; therefore, the campaigns need to evolve around motivation.

Likewise, youth and students are in a life cycle stage where they cannot prioritise recycling, and again, motivation is key, but they may also be new to the area and need additional information. Residents from different cultures have difficulty relating to the information and understanding it, so there is a need for simple messages developed within the community. Whereas, those living in high density housing need to know what they can do to maximise the limited space that is available for them to recycle.

The following campaigns were developed as part of the Up and forward project.

Deprivation campaigns

a) B1 Recycling Rewards  
b) B2 Celebrating recycling achievements  
c) B3 Community and Business

Transience and youth campaigns

a) B4 Private Rental  
b) B5 Golden Bin  
c) B6 Recycling games

Faith and culture campaigns

a) B7 faith  
b) B8 Culture  
c) B9 Diverse communities

High density housing (apartments) campaigns

a) B10 bags and caddies  
b) B11 Ambassadors  
c) B12 Facilities

A full outline for each campaign is given in Appendix A.

Case studies are available for download on the Up and Forward project website: www.recycleforgreatermanchester.com/upandforward
4.2 Deprivation campaigns - Low performing areas with a high level of deprivation

a) B1: Recycling rewards

The aim of the campaign was to involve the community in promoting recycling behaviour through a community financial reward to schools. It looked to reward local schools with a prize dependant on how many ‘Golden Tickets’ were received and collected for recycling correctly.

b) B2: Celebrating recycling achievements

The aim of the campaign was to help local residents to more clearly understand why they are asked to recycle and how to recycle correctly through a fun family and community event.

c) B3: Community and business recycling campaign

The aim of this campaign was to involve local businesses in a low performing area to support and reinforce kerbside recycling of cans, plastic bottles and paper/card, and recycling of small item like WEEE, through promotion at the point of sale. Here local businesses become points of information holding the latest recycling information. This was seen to be an effective mechanism as many low income families (many without cars) are reliant on local businesses.

4.2 Transience and Youth campaigns - Low performing areas with a high level of transience, youth and students.

a) B4: Private rental market

The aim of the campaign was to increase waste prevention, reuse and recycling behaviours in privately rented properties; as well as reduce contamination in the recycling bins by informing residents of the correct materials to put in each bin. The campaign looked to work closely with tenants and landlords to improve recycling levels and methods of communication.
b) **B5: Golden bin**

The aim of the campaign was to promote the use of the recycling facilities available to Greater Manchester Universities’ students living in private rental accommodation. This would help to address the fact that low recycling levels and high contamination rates are problematic in student populations. The campaign was held in a student area, whereby they were encouraged to find the Golden ticket attached to a recycling bin to gain a prize.

c) **B6: Recycling games**

The aim of the campaign was to promote recycling amongst Greater Manchester students to increase recycling from students living in both university halls of residence and privately rented properties. The campaign worked with students to create a ‘real life’ recycling game and launch it at a student event.

4.3 **Faith and Culture campaigns** - Low performing areas with a high level of different cultures.

a) **B7: Faith campaign**

The aim of this campaign was to increase recycling in low performing areas that have a high proportion of a particular faith, and where the place of worship is the focal point for the community.

b) **B8: Culture campaign**

The aim of this campaign was to increase recycling in low performing areas that have a high proportion of a particular culture, and may therefore be responsive to a cultural message e.g. Bollywood campaign.

c) **B9: Diverse communities campaign**

The aim of this campaign was to work with the community to find a common theme which brings together a diverse area in regards to recycling.
4.4 High Density Housing campaigns - Low performing areas with high density housing (apartments).

a) B10: Bags and caddies campaign

The aim of this campaign was to encourage residents in apartments to recycle paper and card, commingled (cans, glass, jars and plastic bottles) and food waste by distributing the following items to residents in apartments with existing recycling facilities: a recycling bag with split sections for paper and card and commingled (cans, glass, jars, plastic bottles); a separate food caddy with a compostable liner.

b) B11: Ambassadors campaign

The aim of this campaign was to encourage residents to recycle paper and card, commingled (glass, cans, jars and plastic bottles) and food waste using local community volunteers. As it has been shown that blanket type communications do not necessarily work in apartment blocks, the campaign looked to demonstrate how micro-level communications can work.

c) B12: Facilities campaign

The aim of this campaign was to encourage residents in high rise apartments to recycle paper and card, co-mingled (glass, cans, jars and plastic bottles) and food waste. The provision of recycling facilities to apartment blocks is not a simple matter, and each block was assessed on a case by case basis. The campaign looked at the benefits of two way communication with residents to get community ‘buy in’ when providing new facilities.
Section 5: Step 4 Engage with residents to develop campaigns from within the community and incorporate their views.

5.1 The fourth step involves targeted interviews, surveys and focus groups to develop an in-depth understanding of the issues affecting the underperforming groups. This understanding informed each campaign by describing existing practices and identifying major obstacles or issues that specific groups had.

The outcomes were used to maximise the benefits of the campaign by incorporating the views of residents into the campaign messages. This engagement also provided an avenue for early engagement with residents and in some areas residents were involved in the physical delivery of campaign messages.

5.2 Focus Groups

To understand resident behaviour a range of 1-hour focus groups were conducted alongside attitudinal surveys (see 5.3). The aims of the focus groups were:

a) to understand key drivers and barriers to recycling behavior;
b) to gauge residents’ knowledge of what they can and can’t recycle;
c) to consider the effectiveness of key information channels;
d) to help identify what new strategies/messages could be put in place to encourage recycling and reduce contamination of recyclable waste.

Each focus group requires an individual topic guide to be produced relevant to the campaign (see Appendix F).

Findings from focus groups were considered in a wider context along with other consultation and engagement work.

5.3 Attitudinal surveys

Surveys are useful in establishing the level of understanding, attitudes and barriers towards recycling in campaign areas.

During the Up and Forward project, surveys were carried out in the campaign area prior to the behavioural change period, via face to face interaction either through individual door step engagement or during attendance at community groups and events.

Surveys should focus on a range of factors in order to gather a full understanding of the issues and barriers residents are facing in the target area, including:

a) attitudes towards recycling;
b) levels of understanding of recycling;
c) obstacles to recycling in the area;
d) opinions on types of campaign materials and campaign messages;
e) demographic information of the area i.e. cultural backgrounds/languages spoken.

Results from these surveys can then be used by Campaign Officers to inform the delivery of the campaign during the behavioural change period. By talking to residents, through door step engagement, attending events and visiting community groups, Project Officers on the Up and Forward project found that in the most cases
residents wanted to recycle but just didn’t know how to do it correctly or didn’t have the equipment - mainly missing bins. By addressing these issues and encouraging the community to become involved in campaigns, especially through the recruitment of volunteer ambassadors, participation in recycling was shown to increase in many of the campaigns.

5.4 Contamination monitoring

During phase 2 of the campaigns, Campaign Officers carried out contamination monitoring on two consecutive collections of each stream. The contamination level was established using a matrix to calculate the average percentage of contamination at street and campaign area level. The information was then used to highlight the highest levels of contamination at street level; allowing for effective targeting by campaign officers via planned face to face interaction.

5.5 Participation monitoring

During phase 2 of the campaigns additional participation monitoring was undertaken by Campaign Officers parallel to the above contamination monitoring. This enabled Campaign Officers to gather a good geographical knowledge of the area and to establish any issues that may be of relevance to the campaign including:

a) access to bins for monitoring purposes;
b) occurrences of fly tipping;
c) amenities/facilities that can be updated or used for the campaign;
a) creating a more targeted campaign for the area.

Monitoring throughout the campaign and by Campaign Officers allowed for the detection of residents who were consistently contaminating or not participating. Having street level data at three intervals (pre, post and during the campaign period) enabled Campaign Officers to identify houses that could be targeted further to evoke a change in behaviour.
Section 6: Step 5 - Large scale demonstration

6.1 The fifth step is to deliver each campaign on a large scale.

The Up and Forward project was broken down into 42 campaigns over two phases. Each campaign had three main aims:

a) To increase resident participation in kerbside recycling schemes.
b) To increase tonnage yields in these schemes.
c) To increase resident awareness of these schemes.

With the exception of student campaigns) each one targeted a total of 6,000 households, split between four different District Council areas to demonstrate scale, repeatability and relevance to multiple Municipalities. The student campaigns took place on campus and aimed to cover a minimum of 3,000 students.

6.2 Project plan

The project was driven by community engagement, with each campaign focused on a small target area of approximately 1500 households.

Each campaign included three targeted streams - pulpables, commingled and organics. The project covered two phases. Phase 1 campaigns were carried out between June 2013 and September 2014 and Phase 2 campaigns February to December 2014.

Table 8: Campaigns and areas (Phase 1 and 2)
6.3 Campaign delivery

The delivery of each campaign followed three set phases: research, engagement and behavioural change, with pre and post monitoring occurring before and after the main campaign periods. Each campaign lasted 22 weeks.

6.2.2 Research Period

The research period ran for approximately six weeks and was used by Project Officers to:

a) get to know the targeted community by walking the area and carrying out participation and contamination monitoring;

b) contact key groups (Resident groups, Youth groups) and recruit recycling ambassadors from the local area;

c) link in with Council officers (including Community Workers, Enforcement Officers) to find out more about the history of the area and understand previous issues;

d) locate the main community focal points (including community centres and local shops) for planned community engagement.

6.2.3 Engagement

The engagement period (approximately eight weeks) was used to reach out to the community to understand behaviour and develop communications to deliver targeted waste related campaigns that appealed to the community. It followed a bottom up approach with micro level engagement. Strategies used included:

a) door knocking and surveys to enable officers to gather data as well as opinion, here officers became familiar and known in the area;

b) attendance at events, community groups and the holding of pop-up stands to enable officers to build up relationships and become known within the community;

c) holding focus groups to allow officers to understand barriers to recycling, gather opinion, learn more about the community, develop campaign materials and to gain and test ideas;

d) consulting with all agencies to build relationships with organisations to aid in campaign delivery and share knowledge about the area.

Image 10: Door step engagement
6.2.4 Behavioural Change

The behavioural change period ran for approximately 8 weeks and was used to deliver targeted communications developed during the above engagement period. Whilst each campaign had a different approach (dependant on outcomes of engagement) the main elements included:

a) distribution of communication materials that had been developed following community engagement;
b) involving the community as much as possible in the delivery of campaign messages especially through the use of recruited Recycling Ambassadors;
c) continuing with face to face engagement to overcome identified barriers;
d) gaining further feedback from the community and refocus the communications if they were not being effective.

Case studies

Individual case studies for all 42 campaigns are available for download on the Up and Forward website. Case studies include:

a) selection of campaign area;
b) demographic and Acorn data;
c) campaign approach, results and key learnings;
d) breakdown of costs.

Website: www.recycleforgreatermanchester.com/upandforward
Section 7: Step six - Monitoring and evaluation

7.

7.1 Between January 2013 and December 2014 GMWDA commissioned the Environment and Waste Department at M·E·L Research to carry out a comprehensive evaluation of the forty two campaigns that were being carried out under the LIFE+ Up and Forward project. This work covered two phases per campaign, pre and post intervention.

The following covers methodological approaches to sampling, target setting and evaluation activities.

A number of factors need to be considered when organising the sampling framework right through to the evaluation of each campaign. These factors ensured as far as possible that the overall evaluation was as robust as possible.

a) **Target setting** - Used to provide realistic targets to aspire to each campaign was assessed using pre campaign set out monitoring data and actual round collection tonnages (see 7.2 - 7.3).

b) **Weight monitoring** - Used to provide tonnage data prior to and following the campaign to assess how each campaign had performed based on individual targets (see 7.4).

c) **Set out rates** - This activity was used to assess how each campaign had performed based on individual targets. Pre campaign set out rates were also used to inform target setting (see 7.5).

d) **Face to Face Surveys** - These were carried out to determine resident awareness of individual campaigns, barriers to recycling and whether there had been any behaviour change based on WRAP’s ‘committed recycler’ programme (see 7.6).

7.2 Target Setting For Two Weekly Set Out

For a household to be defined as a participant, it must set out its recycling or composting at least once in a defined period. This period should normally be three consecutive collection opportunities (WRAP, 2010). However, for the case of this project participation is defined as setting out once in two consecutive collection opportunities that has been named as 2 weekly set out. All campaign types required this type of assessment except student and apartment campaigns which included multi-occupancy dwellings only.

7.2.1 Factors to consider in setting monitoring targets

There were a number of variables that could have impacted on kerbside scheme performance that needed to be taken into account for the GMWDA LIFE + project. These are listed below:

a) **Communication approach/coverage (e.g. face to face/postal/leaflet)** - For instance the campaigns may only make contact with a proportion of households meaning that some might not have an opportunity for behaviour change. The communication approach is also important; research has shown that face to face engagement is more likely to change behaviour than other forms.

b) **Types of messages (what material stream)** - Each campaign looked to target three materials streams (pulpables, commingled and organics) with all being targeted through some form of communication.
c) **Profile of households** - Household make up has significant bearing on scheme performance. These details were taken into account for setting the targets.

A two weekly set out was used as the primary evaluation tool in determining the success of each campaign. Originally the targets for increasing set out were based on the following:

a) The mid-point between high and low performance.
b) Increase participation in low performing areas towards those of the best performing areas with a target to at least half the difference.

As set out monitoring was only taking place on a selected low performing collection round it was not possible to use the above standards based on high and low performance. Therefore the following procedure was devised to set the targets.

### 7.2.2 Previous pre and post monitoring experience

M·E·L collated all of its pre and post communication campaign monitoring data since 2005 to help understand what an achievable target would be in terms of kerbside usage from households. The information is based on a mixture of waste streams from approximately 40,000 households. The vast majority of communication campaigns were through face to face door stepping with varying contact rates from 30-50%.

Figure 2 set outs the increases in participation from these, collating all the monitoring data. In summary greater gains in participation are experienced when the baseline participation is below 50%.

**Figure 2: pre and post participation monitoring increases (3 consecutive collections)**

![Projected kerbside Participation pre and post intervention campaigns](image)

Figure 3 provides the expected change in undertaking 2 consecutive weeks of kerbside monitoring. Again the greatest gains in usage are from those households with initial lower set outs.
Figure 3: Pre and post participation monitoring increases (2 consecutive collections)

Preliminary 2 weekly set out targets

Based on the details provided above, setting targets for the campaigns was a complicated process due the number of variables that could have a bearing on set out. The targets in table 6 below are based on the information in Figure 3 above alongside local barriers specific to this project.

Table 9: Target rates based on initial set out rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre intervention 2 weekly set out rate</th>
<th>Expected set out increase (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus 80%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking the known two weekly set out rate at the pre campaign stage, a target increase for participation monitoring was determined (for example where two weekly set out is between 31% and 40% then a target increase of 4% was set).

3 Overcoming Barriers to Recycling at Home, WRAP, 2008
7.3 **Overview of calculating tonnage targets**

As with the set out targets, the method for calculating tonnage targets for the collected recyclate was originally based on identifying the following:

a) The mid-point between high and low tonnage performance.

b) Increase tonnage in low performing areas towards those of the best performing areas with a target to at least half the difference.

To set targets based on the above criteria each authority supplied current baseline recycling collection tonnages for high and low performing rounds. These were used to determine the mid-point between tonnage arising’s between these rounds. The number of dwellings per round was taken into account during this data analysis and a final tonnage and percentage increase target was determined for each low performing campaign round based on the ‘half the difference’ rule.

However, using this method produced targets that were unrealistically high in most instances with some creating targets that were impossible to reach (e.g. where the target exceeded the total amount of recyclate estimated to be available in that area).

It was therefore agreed between M·E·L and GMWDA that a new and more sophisticated method was required to provide a set of more realistically achievable targets. The targets were then re-set by GMWDA based on M·E·L’s professional advice.

7.3.1 **Collection Tonnage Target Setting**

A realistic achievable increase in collection tonnage, above the pre-campaign baseline tonnage, was proposed based on the campaigns achieving two separate impacts:

a) Getting more non-recyclers to participate (improving participation).

b) Getting more tonnage out of existing recyclers (better capture).

By considering the most realistic expectations of the percentage tonnage increase deriving from these two factors separately, and then adding them, an achievable target tonnage increase was calculated. This was done by multiplying the current pre-campaign baseline tonnage collected by the expected percentage increase, to calculate the absolute amount of additional recyclate tonnage to be expected from the campaign. This was then taken to be the measurable campaign outcome target.

The method for calculating the expected percentage tonnage increase over baseline, deriving from the two separate factors (increased participation, and increased capture form existing participants) was calculated from the following two assumptions:

a) That the percentage increase in baseline tonnage created by new participants, is numerically the same as the expected percentage increase in the total population participation (double-set-out) rate.

As explained earlier, these population participation rate increases are on a
sliding scale such that the lower the present participation rate, the larger the % increase achievable. Note that this assumption allows for the expectation that new recyclers will not often be as efficient at recycling as existing recyclers. The effect of this is to apply a ‘damping factor’ or safety net on the impact of increased participation, when measured in terms of a percentage increase in tonnage.

b) To this percentage in achievable tonnage increase, we need to add another allowance for the impact of the campaign on improving capture from existing recyclers.

There is little comparable research evidence to quantify this, so again a broad assumption had to made, which is that the % increase in the baseline recyclate tonnage deriving from better recycling capture amongst existing recyclers is assumed as half that of the additional % tonnage from new recyclers.

This is a rough rule-of-thumb assumption, but to test its validity M·E·L Research ran a comparative analysis based on a range of national and local data. This test is explained below.

Firstly it is known that around 75% of the household waste stream by weight is recyclable with the collection systems operating in GMWDA (this is broadly the same as the most recent compositional analysis for GMWDA as a whole as shown in the AMEC compositional data). Currently, national recycling rates are at 43% of total household waste tonnage, i.e. when compared to the 75% potentially recyclable, this represents a capture of 43/75= 57% of the available recyclate.

The current national (English) average recycling participation rate is estimated at around 70% of the population (we have taken this figure from the annual WRAP 3Rs Tracker 2013). Therefore, despite 70% participation, only 57% of recyclable waste is captured. From this it can be inferred that the average current recycler captures just over 80% (57/70) of their own available recyclate. This suggests about 20% of an average recyclers’ recyclate is not currently diverted.

This finding allows a sense-check to be made in relation to the assumptions above about the additional capture that might be achieved through a campaign impacting on existing recyclers, shown as follows. By applying the ‘rule of thumb’ assumptions to the GMWDA campaigns, that additional capture would create a % increase in baseline tonnage about half that of the participation increase, and applying this hypothetically to a worked example for an area with a current 40% participation, column (c) in Table 4 below shows that a 2% increase in the existing tonnage would be estimated to be created by the impact campaign on existing recyclers.

If it is correct to assume that 20% of the recyclate generated by existing recyclers is currently not captured, then the ‘rule of thumb target’ of a 2% increase represents a target equating to the campaign having the effect of capturing about a tenth of the non-captured recyclate amongst existing recyclers. While there is no established robust research yet available in the field to verify this expectation, it would seem at face value a reasonable and modest assumption to make, in order-of-magnitude terms.
The table below therefore shows the percentage values of existing and new participants and total expected percentage tonnage increase above baseline, therefore representing the reasonably achievable target for the GMWDA campaigns. At first sight there is a further apparent anomaly in the table, appearing to show a higher % increase in the capture from existing recyclers, the lower the existing participation rate. This follows from applying the simple ‘half as much % again’ rule of thumb assumption. This again is in fact logical, in that it follows from the assumption that existing recyclers, in areas with low general participation, are more likely to be ‘sub-optimal recyclers’ than the existing recyclers in areas of high participation. If this is so then they would have a higher-than-average percentage of no-captured recyclate still available for capture, and so the impact of the campaign in generating additional capture, is likely to be higher than average for areas of low participation, and lower than average for the higher participation areas.

Table 10: Target tonnage increases by percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre intervention 2 weekly set out rate</th>
<th>(a) Expected set out increase (%)</th>
<th>(b) New participants estimated tonnage increase (%)</th>
<th>(c) Existing participants estimated tonnage increase (%)</th>
<th>(d) Total expected tonnage increase (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus 80%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total target % increase in ‘column d’ was then applied to the existing baseline tonnage to generate an expected absolute target tonnage target increase for that area. In the evaluation, the pre and post tonnages for each recycling stream in each campaign area were then compared to determine if the total expected tonnage increase had in fact been reached. This showed which campaigns were best suited to helping residents hit these improved recycling generation targets.

6 ‘The Composition of UK Household Waste’ (2009); Resource Futures meta-analysis for Defra.

7.4 Waste Weight Monitoring

To measure the success of each campaign, tonnage data was collected in the three kerbside recycling streams (pulpables, commingled and organics) before activities commenced and compared to what had been collected after.

Round information was provided by each individual district (using gate weigh data) 2 weeks prior to the campaign and 2 weeks after. The information provided was specific to
the targeted campaign area as each intervention area was selected based on one recycling round.

7.4.1 Dwellings with Communal Bins

The original brief required target setting and weight monitoring for all campaign types. This included flat complexes where communal bins were used to enable the evaluation of individual campaign effectiveness. There are several ways of carrying out this activity where communal bins are in place.

a) The material from individual bins is weighed from each bin store to evaluate the tonnage differences pre and post campaign. This could include all bin types including residual waste to determine if the weight of material placed in designated bins, and therefore diversion had reduced, increased or remained largely the same.

b) Carry out a visual inspection of the waste in all the bins in situ to compare their fullness and where required their contamination levels.

It was not possible for M·E·L to carry out option one due to the specific vehicle types required. Also Districts could not provide these vehicles to carry due to logistical, time and expenditure requirements. Therefore it was agreed that option 2 would be carried out by the usual collection crews in each District using a visual inspection proforma sheet. The proforma was in the form of tick boxes and was designed to be quick and relatively straightforward to complete. A method sheet explaining how to complete the sheet was also provided.

Once completed the sheets were returned for data input and analysis. After reviewing the data it was quickly discovered that the sheets were completed differently by Districts and/or collection crews. The points below highlight this:

a) Often flat complexes bins are emptied multiple times per week or do not have systematic collections. To compare like for like data pre and post campaign the same number of tips were required. Often collection dates were missing off proformas. This meant that like for like comparisons could not be guaranteed.

b) It was apparent that some crews recorded the fullness of bins that were not being emptied as they were not full enough whereas other crews correctly only recorded bins that were being emptied.

c) Different bin numbers for specific materials in the same bin store were cited.

d) Bin crews stated there were no food bins in a particular bin store but a subsequent crew recorded bins for food waste.

e) Sometimes different flat complexes were recorded in the pre or post campaign but not both.

After careful consideration of all the data available for these dwellings it was decided that no meaningful or comparable information was forthcoming. It was therefore decided that no useful further work could be carried out and this activity was no longer pursued.
7.5 Set out (participation) monitoring

Participation monitoring is the technique for monitoring uptake of kerbside schemes. It is an exercise in counting the number of households that take part in the scheme over a predefined period and is a powerful tool in assessing scheme effectiveness and identifying any areas of disproportional low participation. The basic aim of monitoring is to establish set out and participation rates using standard defined parameters. The WRAP monitoring and evaluation toolkit recommends that three consecutive collections are monitored to calculate a participation rate. This is due to the fact that many people that participate in recycling may not present their container on every occasion. The WRAP Monitoring and Evaluation toolkit can be viewed via the following link: [http://www.wrap.org.uk/content/monitoring-and-evaluation-guidance](http://www.wrap.org.uk/content/monitoring-and-evaluation-guidance)

Due to the timeframes of the Up and Forward project and budget, only two consecutive collections were monitored, therefore this has been referred to as a two weekly set out rate and not a participation rate for this project. The rate was determined by the number of households that presented their waste on either the first or second occasion. It is important to note that this is not an average, and the figure will always be higher than the figures reported on the two separate participation monitoring occasions.

Table 11: Example of set out rate results for commingled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set out rate overall (burgundy wheeled bin/green box)</th>
<th>Set out week 1</th>
<th>Set out week 2</th>
<th>2 Weekly set out rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess overall %</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set out burgundy wheeled bin %</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set out green box %</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess %</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5.1 Timings of fieldwork

The best practice for monitoring the impact of evaluation campaigns is to carry out the baseline monitoring just before the campaign is due to start and again four weeks after the campaign has finished. This time period is to allow the campaign to bed in (for behaviours to become norms) and activities such as bins to be delivered. For this project, there was no bed in period, this was due to GMWDA wanting to evaluate the immediate effect of the campaign (short term), therefore upon campaign completion, the post monitoring took place on the next scheduled collection.
Other factors to consider are the timings of monitoring for particular waste streams that are seasonally affected such as garden waste collections. It is best practice for the pre and post monitoring of this waste stream to be carried out during similar annual time periods; this was not always viable for this project due to the timings of the campaigns. This should be taken into account when interpreting the results. Finally, monitoring during school holidays, bank holidays and Christmas periods should be avoided. Again this was not always viable for this project due to the timings of the campaigns.

7.5.2 Sampling

The figure below indicates the accuracy of sample sizes; a sample of 250 has a presumed accuracy of +/- 7% at the 95% confidence interval. Caution should be taken when interpreting the results regarding sampling accuracy. WRAP’s best practice guidance for monitoring states that any sample of 1,100 households or above is statistically representative, providing an accuracy of +/- 3%. For this project all round sample areas exceed 1,100 households. All final data analysis and reporting was carried out on the more precise intervention zones. Some of these zones were smaller than the whole round and therefore in some intervention zones, the sample was below 1,100 households.

Figure 4: Sample size accuracy graph

7.5.3 Preparation

Before any fieldwork was undertaken the police were notified that the monitoring was taking place. The monitors were issued with ID badges and M·E·L high-visibility jackets. Monitors were also provided with a letter from the local/disposal authority and M·E·L explaining the work that was being carried out. The letter also provided contact numbers for a member of staff from the council and the Client Services Manager at M·E·L. Each monitor was briefed by the Project Manager which covered the following issues:

a) Aims and objectives of the project.

b) Collection container types.
c) Overview of area/round monitoring.
d) Materials that can and cannot be collected in the service.
e) Completion of data record sheet.
f) Frequency of collection.
g) Depot details.
h) Start times of crew and arrival of monitor.
i) Supervisor and crew contact details.
j) Logistical issues (if applicable).

To ensure the project ran as smoothly as possible each monitor stayed at accommodation near the depot/District to minimise the possibility of disruption to the project - by being caught up in traffic or potential vehicle issues. A further measure to be considered in ensuring smooth delivery of the monitoring process is for monitors to pre-walk the route the day before the survey, to identify and anticipate any possible constraints to the monitoring operation. A provision for this was originally considered in the project plan but to make best use of the limited resources, the time allocation for this was deployed instead on greater effort in determining accurate local campaign targets and systematic reporting of the evaluation findings.

7.5.4 Fieldwork

For each collection round one monitor was assigned, although some of the rounds selected were large and complex. In some instance there were over +2,000 households on a round. Therefore on occasion two monitors were assigned per round. Each monitor liaised with the collection crews before the start of each day of monitoring to ensure they knew the daily route so that no households were missed. The monitor worked +/- 15 minutes ahead of the collection vehicle following the route discussed, although the gap between the vehicle and monitor is dependent on the type of housing stock i.e. where rounds included a large proportion of detached properties the average collection time for individual households would probably be slower whereas semi-detached/terraced properties could be slightly quicker. Each round was monitored on two consecutive collections. This identified (a) households which participated in any one of the two collection weeks (2 weekly set out rate); and (b) the proportion of households setting out recycling in any one collection (weekly set-out rate).

7.5.6 Data recording

On each day of the monitoring, all households that were covered by the crews were monitored. The section below presents the standard method used in recording the data (please Appendix B for an example of a monitoring sheet):

a) Whenever a property on the round selected had a recycling container present, it received a tick in the set-out box.
b) Suitable gaps were left at the end of the data record sheets, so that any additional properties could be accommodated if they were not listed.
c) Any missed households or streets, flats receiving a communal collection or commercial properties on the round were highlighted on the data sheet and removed at the analysis stage.
d) For properties receiving a rear collection such as where terraced households were located the monitor assessed set out in the back alley.
and assigned containers accordingly.
e) If containers were clustered, this is mainly encountered in walkways/rear collections the monitor would assign containers to households to the best of their ability. This method would have been kept consistent throughout the monitoring weeks, such as checking if containers have house numbers on them and allocating the remaining to the nearest property.
f) As monitors did not visually inspect containers, all bins presented for collection were recorded as set out. In some cases where it was blatantly obvious that the container was contaminated i.e. full of black bag waste with bin lid up/open, this was not recorded as set out.

For the pre and post monitoring a direct household comparison was carried out for the analysis of the intervention zone. Therefore only households’ monitored pre and post campaign within the intervention were included; which also provided a more accurate evaluation of the campaigns.

7.5.7 Potential Risk register

The following were identified as potential risks for this activity:

a) Round restructures - M·E·L checked with each district that there had been no round restructures or service changes subsequent to the pre monitoring that took place. However this was found to be the case for some campaign areas. These have been highlighted in the individual campaign reports.
b) Assisted collection data - all assisted collections should be removed from the data set at the analysis, although this information was not always retrievable from councils.
c) Large round sizes - Hard to cover with one monitor, therefore two were required.
d) Assistance vehicles joining round, monitor not being notified resulting in streets being missed.
e) Speed of collection crew/route change - low set out rates and type of collection containers can have impacts on how quickly the route is covered.
f) Weather conditions - can impact on reduced set out rates

g) Monitoring over holiday periods - can impact on set out rates and tonnages collected.
h) Round layout/housing stock i.e. rear collections, clustered bins, sharing of bins - difficult to assign container to correct household or even sometimes the right street.
i) Collection operatives buy-in - in some cases operatives believe monitors are assessing their performance and will change route to avoid monitor. This impacts on delivery as streets are often missed or round has to be re-monitored.

7.5.8 Data checking and processing

Once the fieldwork was completed the data was brought back to the office and a debrief session was held with the monitor. The data was checked by the project manager and the monitor and then sent for entry. 10% of the data was double entered to ensure accuracy of the results. Once the quality assurance and data checking was completed the data was provided in an excel spread sheet and the following information was provided, comparing
pre and post results:

a) Weekly set out rate - the percentage of households that put their container out in any one collection.

b) 2 weekly set out rate - the percentage of households that put their container out at least once in the monitoring period.

c) Excess recycling (outside containment system).

d) 2 weekly set out rates at street level.

e) 2 weekly set out rates by ACORN Category.

7.6 Face to Face Surveys

The information below presents the standard methodology for the face to face survey activities, which were carried out for the following campaigns; B4, B5, B6, B10, B11 and B12 (see section 6 for campaigns). An overview of the campaigns and their primary focus is presented below:

a) B4 campaign - surveys carried out at kerbside collection households with residents who rent their home.

b) B5 campaign - surveys carried out at student occupied kerbside households receiving communal collections.

c) B6 campaign - surveys carried out at student halls of residence receiving communal collections. Surveys were carried out in the main foyer area.

d) B10, B11 & B12 campaigns - surveys carried out on multi occupancy properties receiving a communal collection.

The objective of this activity was to measure, pre and post campaign, residents claimed usage, awareness, attitudes, motivators and barriers to using the recycling services provided by the council. In addition, during the post evaluation, residents’ recall of the campaign and effects this has had on behaviours were assessed.

Primarily for the B6, B10, B11 and B12 campaigns specific arrangements had to be made in order for successful project delivery, this is discussed below.

7.6.1 Arranging access to flatted developments and halls of residence

All management agencies/caretakers/housing associations needed to be notified prior to the fieldwork taking place to ensure that access was adequately arranged. It is notoriously difficult in gaining access to these developments without prior permission. Therefore two weeks before the fieldwork was due to commence M·E·L asked GMWDA to provide contact details for each flatted development within the intervention zone so this could be arranged. For the halls of residence, access was arranged so the surveyors could stand in the foyer area for each hall and carry out the interviews. This was done on specific days/times when foot fall was known to be high i.e. students coming back from lectures, sport activities.

Before any fieldwork was undertaken the police were notified that the fieldwork was taking place. The surveyors were issued with ID badges and an M·E·L high-visibility jacket. They were also provided with a letter from the local/disposal authority and M·E·L explaining the work that was being carried out. The letter also provided contact numbers for a member of staff from the council and the Client Services Manager at M·E·L. Each surveyor was briefed
by the Fieldwork Manager which covered:

a) brief objectives of the campaign;
b) questionnaire review;
c) sampling;
d) access arrangements;
e) timelines.

### 7.6.2 Sampling and target areas

For each campaign area the quota was 150 face to face surveys, in addition to this all households where there was no response had a postcard posted through the letterbox. This provided another opportunity for residents to answer a core set of questions and post back the card or to carry out the full survey online via a link provided. The overall response rate for online and postal surveys was very low for all campaign areas. It should be noted that the B5 and B6 campaign areas postal and online survey options were not made available due to the likelihood of students being less likely to complete these.

### Confidence intervals

Respondents of a survey are only a sample of the total ‘population’ of an area. It cannot be completely certain that the figures obtained are exactly those that would have been gained if every user had been interviewed (the “true” values). We can be confident that the calculations are 95% accurate, i.e. in 95 out of 100 times the “true” value will fall within a specified range. The table below sets out the ranges for different sample sizes and percentage results at the “95% confidence interval”. Overall, for a confidence level of 95% the results are within +/-8% of the calculated response. For example a figure such as 50% being fairly satisfied with queuing could in reality lie within the range of 42% to 58%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12: Sampling Tolerances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of sample</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,100 surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.6.3 Target areas

For the B4 Private Rental campaigns the target area used was based on the areas selected for the monitoring activities (collection round based). During the post evaluation period for this campaign, priority streets were highlighted that:

a) had higher levels of campaign engagement;
b) were included in the pre survey area.

These factors enabled responses from similar demographics to be gained.
Surveys were only carried out with residents who rented their home, and this information was not known prior to the survey being carried out. Therefore surveyors had to ask for this information at the doorstep and close the conversation if they did not meet the criteria. In some cases it proved difficult to meet the quota because of this and a degree of re-canvassing was required in some areas.

As the B5 Golden Bin campaign targeted kerbside households, GMWDA provided street lists, which, based on their local knowledge, had higher proportions of student residents. During the surveying period, this information had to be asked for at the doorstep, again this caused a degree of re-canvassing to achieve the required quota.

For the B6 Recycling Games campaign area, halls of residence were identified by GMWDA, where surveying was required during semester periods. As surveyors were situated in the foyer, surveyors approached individuals entering the hall and asked if they resided there, if so the survey was conducted.

The B10, B11 and B12 Apartment campaigns focused on multi occupancy dwellings. Initially, GMWDA provided a sample of 1,500 households which met the objectives of the campaign. As the sample for these campaigns were spread over various areas, two issues became apparent:

a) Delivering campaign materials.
b) Interpreting the results.

The latter proved more of an obstacle. Therefore, GMWDA reduced the sample size to approximately +/- 600 households. Although this assisted in overcoming the problems above, it provided a smaller sample to achieve the same quota (n=150), thus resulting in more field work days and re-canvassing to achieve the sample. In addition to this, it was apparent that some of the multi occupancy dwellings did not allow doorstep activities; therefore postcards were left for residents to partake in the study. During the post survey period a set of priority flats/streets were highlighted where the majority of the surveys were completed in the pre activities. This assisted in re-contacting a similar demographic population to the pre survey period.

7.6.4 Questionnaire design

For each campaign area, surveys were developed for each pre and post evaluation period (see Appendix C and D). All surveys were signed off by GMWDA and trialled in house before being sent out into field. Upon completion of the phase 1 campaigns, a brainstorming session was held to improve the design and evaluation of the phase 2 surveys. Each questionnaire looked to capture the following information:

a) Demographics - The main demographic data chosen are age, no of people per household and ethnicity since this gives us a general idea about whether the campaign may focus on young people, families, or whether there are likely to be language/cultural barriers.
b) Committed Recycler - The committed recycler question is very useful because there is national data to compare it against. Generally, commitment levels are usually around 75%, whilst many of our campaign
areas have much lower levels than this.

c) **Awareness** - Awareness levels are generally very high. Although people do not use a service they generally know it exists. Therefore, awareness of general rubbish would be expected to be around 100%, and awareness of other services should be above 90% if not higher. Low levels of awareness give a clear indication that there is a communication issue.

d) **Frequency of use** - It is difficult to interpret high levels of usage, as this could be due to a commitment to recycling, exaggerated claimed behaviour or low levels of storage space. However, comparison of the levels of residual waste usage against recycling usage can give an indication of commitment. For example, a large percentage using the residual waste daily against a smaller percentage.

e) **Barriers to recycling** - Previous WRAP studies have identified four main barriers to recycling - physical, behavioural, lack of knowledge and attitudes/perceptions. To date the questionnaires have focused on the physical barriers, which are usually the first barrier to recycling i.e. it doesn’t matter how much you communicate if they cannot physically recycle.

**Post questionnaires**

During the post evaluation all residents were also asked whether they could recall any type of information around waste and recycling. Initially this recall was low, so a decision was made to develop a showcard (see Appendix E) visually presenting the types of communications for each campaign i.e. leaflet. This gave residents a prompt and aided recall of campaign materials.

7.6.5 **Fieldwork**

As an MRS company partner M·E·L ensured that customer care standards were met throughout the fieldwork. In accordance with the MRS Code of Conduct we only interviewed residents aged 16 and over. Interviewers called at different occasions spread over daytime, evening (up to 8pm) and weekend daytimes, to ensure maximum opportunity of contact and to ensure local population quotas were met (project dependent). Interviewers recorded attempts to contact each household, refusals, call backs and completed interviews. Interviewers were provided with street lists and from this they then worked door-to-door until they had completed the required quota. Interviewers worked on their own but in a similar area to other interviewers for safety reasons; they were able to call on each other if any issues arose. Daily quotas were kept by our Fieldwork Manager and general project progression calculated.

7.6.6 **Data Processing**

All completed questionnaires were checked upon data transfer return to M·E·L by the field control staff for completeness and consistency. We have a tough QA system which spots and removes any individual from our team who is identified as not meeting these highest professional standards. Our QA system included a 10% call back to respondents by telephone (provided they had consented to this), to ensure the interviewer met customer courtesy standards and was wearing ID etc. Once verified, the survey questionnaires were validated and analysed.
Section 8: Project Results

8.

8.1 Using a bottom up approach, and targeted communications, the LIFE+ project has seen positive results in ‘hard to reach’ areas.

8.1.1 Participation (Put out rates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pulpables</th>
<th>Commingled</th>
<th>Organics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+8%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>+54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1.2 Attitudinal recycling surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super committed</th>
<th>Committed</th>
<th>Non-committed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+80%</td>
<td>+83%</td>
<td>-83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1.3 Tonnages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pulpables</th>
<th>Commingled</th>
<th>Organics</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+70.2</td>
<td>-29.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 Other achievements:

a) 42 campaigns completed  
b) Minimum of 64,000 GM residents directly engaged  
c) 183 Recycling Ambassadors recruited and trained  
d) Active relationships developed with over 120 partner organisations  
e) 130 focus groups and 4800 attitudinal surveys completed  
f) Over 190 individually targeted communication materials produced  
g) Getting Wasted App - Over 1500 downloads  
h) 8 films released

A full report on the results of the project can be found at:  
Section 8: Key Learnings

8.

8.1 Understanding performance

a) A more strategic approach to data collection in terms of continual collection of round data is required.
b) There needs to be accurate data on the number of properties in a round to enable comparison.
c) To support data collection there needs to be consistent approach to collection.

8.2 Household surveys

a) The Committed Recycler measurement did not work well in low performing areas, especially due to the relatively small sample size.
b) Access to apartment blocks proved difficult in most cases.
c) The demographics of population can differ significantly from street to street. Therefore, the survey is best measured by returning to the same households particular in small areas; however this can be costly because only a small proportion of those interviewed pre would then answer their doors post so a very large sample is required. A compromise is to return to selected streets that are more intensively monitored.
d) Apartment blocks vary widely both in demographics and the set-up of waste recycling facilities, so they need to be treated separately as far as practical.
e) Surveys were carried out in campaign areas with communal bins (or where additional data was required). These gave a good indication as to whether there had been a change in attitudes to recycling, but there is evidence that more people will say that that they recycle compared to observed data. We could therefore see if one campaign was successful relative to another but the actual results couldn’t necessarily be taken at face value.
f) It was difficult to assess a single measure of success; therefore a range of factors should be analysed including: Awareness and claimed usage; Barrier to using the service; Do they recall the campaign (provides a good indication about whether the campaign has been successful in term of reaching the target audience); Do they recycle more post campaign (gives an indication about whether the campaign has been successful)
g) In order to be successful the campaign has to both reach people and change the behaviour so both need to be measured. For example, some ambassador campaigns were good at changing behaviour but there are too few volunteers to reach many people.

8.3 Participation monitoring

a) Participation monitoring is highly variable at low geographical levels. Whilst it is good for assessing general scheme performance, and confirming areas of low performance it is probably not sensitive enough to measure the effect of a campaign. Some of the campaign for example may only expect a 1-2% increase, yet audit of the campaign monitoring showed that even without considering seasonality, weather etc. then the accuracy of the individual monitoring on the ground can vary by around 5%.
b) It is very difficult to measure an organics campaign success due to seasonality over a period less than a year long.
c) Participation monitoring is very expensive.
d) Campaign areas or measurement can be limited by round boundaries, and the poor overlap between different round types.

8.4 Tonnage monitoring

a) Tonnage monitoring was also highly variable over a small geographical area, and affected significantly by changes in seasonality.

b) There was often a common overlap between the three rounds - Pulpables, Commingled and Organics (where the intervention took place) which meant there were households on the rounds that fell outside the intervention zone.

c) Tonnage monitoring is often affected by operation issues.

d) Tracing tonnage data to rounds may be difficult where Districts rely on manual crew records.

8.5 Contamination monitoring

a) Contamination monitoring was again highly variable. It only reflected what monitors could see, and unfortunately contamination may be deliberately hidden. It is also highly subjective to what the person on ground, as it may not always be clear from looking in a bin.

b) No measure of weight/volume so only gives a very partial picture, which is not accurate enough to compare with tonnage data to see if increase/decrease in tonnage may be due to changes in contamination.

c) Contamination monitoring was beneficial to officers. Whilst it only gives a partial picture it allows officers to gather an understanding of resident behaviour and recycling knowledge.

8.6 Overall lessons

a) Engagement-led campaigns that are developed from within the community can have positive effects on behaviour especially where big picture campaigns have not previously reached.

b) A data-driven approach to identify low performing properties enables campaign officers to tightly target an area and focus efforts.

c) The project has found that monitoring can have many variables and is not always a definite measure of campaign success - it does however build an understanding of an area and changing behaviours.

d) A larger mass of data is required over a longer period to: reduce variability due to seasonality and operational issues; so that the campaign can be compared against a control for the same peaks and troughs in seasonality; some campaigns had relatively low contact rates indicated by low campaign recall, and much longer is needed to get the message through to householder. This could then be compared against a control over a longer period of time to see whether a rise or fall in tonnage or participation is mirroring what is happening anyway. For example a smaller fall in tonnage compared to a control may still indicate a success.

e) The amount of recycling collected in an area is the manifestation of a series of changes that occur at the individual household level, and doesn’t necessarily directly link to the campaigns since it is also dependent on the amount of recyclable waste that is available in the first place. Glass bottles and garden wastes are good example. They are heavy and available in large quantities but there tends to be more in the affluent areas so recycling performance can appear to be better than it is.

f) To be cost effective monitoring probably needs to move to either in-cab technology or tonnage monitoring where the round is recorded at the weigh-
bridge.

g) We should not necessarily expect a definite measure of the campaign success because the impact of operations and seasonal changes may be higher than that expected by the campaign. Monitoring, however, should build an understanding of an area and changing behaviours over-time.
Appendix A: Campaign outlines

**Action B.1 Low performing areas with a high level of deprivation - Recycling rewards**

The aim of the campaign is to involve the community in promoting recycling behaviour through a community financial reward to schools. The campaign will encourage local people to recycle more and accurately in support of their local school. We expect to:

a) Increase the level of recycling for all of the current materials collected.
b) Raise awareness of the importance of recycling.
c) Embed correct recycling behaviour within identified low performing areas.

Community engagement workers will be tasked with developing and undertaking a survey of local residents to find out why people are not recycling. The results of the survey will form the basis for the development of a community led campaign to promote the recycling right and the recycling reward campaign. The rewards will be distributed through schools as families have been identified as a key target audience.

Campaign posters and materials will be designed and produced ready for use within one month of the survey being completed. Local Community Ambassador Volunteers will engage with residents to promote the rewards scheme using posters and door knocking as well as visiting local schools and groups in the area. Local schools will reinforce the message through a mixture of assemblies and activities that will keep the children informed of the schools reward totals.

The schools will be given the option of a visit to our education centre or a school assembly. It is expected that over the life time of the campaign residents will understand why they are asked to recycle and then continue to recycle as part of their normal routine.

Over the campaign period every uncontaminated recycling bin or container put out for collection on the correct collection day will be tagged with a reward tag (reward tags will be posted through doors if bags or boxes are used). Community Ambassador Volunteers will be out in the community finding out who is not recycling and why.

In many deprived areas there are existing networks and associations e.g. housing associations, which will be integrated into the campaigns to develop effective delivery mechanisms and incorporate existing local knowledge and experience.

The reward tags will be redeemed through local schools or dropped off at designated drop off points in the community such as local post offices or shops. All collected rewards will be returned to the local council or specified local facilities e.g. exchange trading scheme or credit union. Rewards will have no monetary value until they are returned to the designated reward exchange point.

The reward fund will be proportionally allocated depending on the number of rewards collected per school, and each school will be informed of the value of the reward collection at the end of the campaign. The reward scheme funds will be presented at a school assembly, including press coverage as a media anchor to further instil and disseminate the recycling message. This will include an acknowledgement of the increase in recycling participation and tonnes as a result of the scheme.
The results of the trial campaign will be advertised through local press, UP&FORWARD website (that will be incorporated into our Recycle for Greater Manchester website), council publications, schools websites, and community newsletters, community websites, and blogs. We will have an ongoing record of the recycling rewards returned. During the production of leaflets liaison with project designers will ensure that any creative/iconography designed will be accessible, with the option to be available in alternative formats e.g. large print, audio.

The areas will be chosen on the basis of low recycling performance measured by the waste vehicle collection weights, and local deprivation statistics.

The campaign will run in four target collection round areas of 1,500 households, and a total of 6,000 households will be targeted across all four campaign areas. The campaigns will be carried out in two phases to minimise the influence of seasonal waste fluctuations. The first phase (two areas) will occur in autumn/winter 2012/13, and the second phase (two areas) in spring/summer 2013. Each phase will run for a three month period.

**Action B.2 Low performing areas with a high level of deprivation - Celebrating recycling achievements**

The trial campaign will involve the establishment of a group of volunteers who will work with the local community and environmental groups to plan and run a community event. The aim of the campaign will be to help local residents to more clearly understand why they are asked to recycle and how to recycle correctly through a fun family and community event.

Feedback has the potential to be a cost effective mechanism to achieve behavioural change, as people may not always fully understand either what they are being asked to do, the reasons for doing it, or the impact their actions may have. The event provides an opportunity to deliver the message in a positive way using trusted members of the community that are likely to be able to deliver a more receptive message. It also shows residents that it is important to the Municipality and provides an opportunity to use visual aids to make the impacts of waste prevention and recycling real to them. Pertinently, it has been shown that people are more likely to take part in a social activity if they observe other people doing it, so that it becomes recognised as a normal everyday activity. A highly visual event raises the profile and importance in the community, helping to mould community recycling habits.

A group of local members of the community who are known in their neighbourhood will need to be established, and with the support of a Community Engagement worker the Recycling Ambassador Volunteers will be trained and tasked with developing and undertaking work within the community. If necessary, the recruitment of volunteers will be supported with a poster campaign. In order to harness the energy of the community then all residents that show an interest in becoming a volunteer would be given the opportunity to assist in the campaign.

In many deprived areas there are existing networks and associations e.g. housing associations, which will be integrated into the campaigns to develop effective delivery mechanisms and incorporate existing local knowledge and experience.

The volunteers will engage with residents through a combination of informal gatherings, surveys and door knocking. This will provide an opportunity to explore attitudes and experiences of waste and recycling practices, thus identifying specific issues and obstacles. They will also be trained in more advanced research techniques such as ‘walking’ the resident through waste
sorting practices. This will enable the interviewer to get a better feel for what the resident is doing right or wrong, and enables the resident to more clearly explain their habits, which can often be difficult to describe.

The insights developed during the engagement process will be incorporated into campaign posters and materials, and form the basis of a 'bottom up' approach to the development of a community led fun green event. Schools, community groups and local environmental organisations will be invited to take part in planning the event. They will be encouraged to inspire the community by getting people involved in the event. This provides a further opportunity to intervene in recycling behaviours, as the recycling message can be informally reinforced through designing, developing and staging the event. Residents will, of course, need to discuss recycling between themselves in order to stage the event, which provides a subtle 'bottom up' engagement method.

It is important that Community Ambassador Volunteers are recognised as working on behalf of the GMWDA, and will therefore carry leaflets explaining kerbside recycling facilities (carrying the LIFE+ logo) and contact details of the Campaign Officer or Engagement Worker in case they have any further questions that the ambassadors are unable to answer. The Officer will also make frequent visits to the areas, being available to support the development of the event and Community Volunteer Ambassadors.

The computer games developed should be available for this event, and may be played on a large screen.

During the production of leaflets, posters liaison with project designers will ensure that any creative/iconography designed will be accessible, with the option to be available in alternative formats, e.g. large print, audio.

The areas will be chosen on the basis of low recycling performance measured by the waste vehicle collection weights, and local deprivation statistics.

The campaign will run in four target collection round areas of 1,500, and a total of 6,000 households will be targeted across all four campaign areas.

The campaigns will be carried out in two phases to minimise the influence of seasonal waste fluctuations. The first phase (two areas) will occur in spring/summer 2013, and the second phase (two areas) in autumn/winter 2013/14. Each phase will run for a three month period.

**Action B.3 Low performing areas with a high level of deprivation - Community and business recycling campaign**

The aim of this campaign is to involve local businesses in a low performing area to support and reinforce kerbside recycling of cans, plastic bottles and paper/card, and recycling of small item like WEEE, through promotion at the point of sale. This is likely to be an effective mechanism as many low income families (many without cars) are reliant on local businesses.

GMWDA will train Community Engagement workers who will identify popular shops for inclusion in the campaign. A significant focus of the campaign will be attaining the 'buy in' from local shop owners, as their support will be crucial to delivery. Therefore, owners that are taking part in the campaign will be offered free environmental and waste audits that will be undertaken by a local community organisation. This will further help to reinforce the recycling
messages by getting the local shop on board in the long term. The results of the audit will be
discussed with shop owners and a follow up visit will be undertaken within three months of the
initial audit.

In addition the participating local shops will be named in the communication literature and
listed on the website, giving them a raised environmental profile and additional reason to
participate.

The owners will be expected to fully participate in the campaign and will be briefed on the
campaign aims and objectives. This will foster wider understanding and it is hoped it will
encourage them to stock less wasteful products in the future.

Campaign materials and messages will be developed through focus groups (that will include
shop owners). Once formalised, their suggestions will be developed into the campaign media.
Local shops included in the campaign will be briefed on the campaign materials and agreement
reach with the shop owner on where they may be displayed in the individual shops. During the
campaigns the Community Engagement worker making frequent visits to support the shop owner
and address any issues that arise. The shop owner will also be provided with contact details of
the Campaign Officer.

During the production of leaflets, posters liaison with project designers will ensure that any
creative/iconography designed will be accessible, with the option to be available in alternative
formats e. g. large print, audio.

The areas will be chosen on the basis of low recycling performance measured by the waste
collection vehicle weights, and local deprivation statistics. The campaign will run in four target
collection round areas of 1,500, and a total of 6,000 households will be targeted across all four
campaign areas.

**Action B.4 Low performing areas with a high level of transience, youth and students-
Private rental market**

The aim of the campaign is to increase waste prevention, reuse and recycling behaviours in
privately rented properties, as well as reduce contamination in the recycling bins by informing
residents of the correct materials to put in each bin, by:

- Providing information regarding waste prevention, reuse and recycling services available to
  rental properties.

- Educating transient residents within privately rented properties about the waste services
  available to them, and to promote the correct use of these services.

- Establishing a reuse and information support network for the private rental market.

- Reducing the volume of waste created in the private rental market when properties are
  vacated.

Residents in privately rented properties have been shown to be poor recyclers because they are
often new to the area and unaware of the facilities, and a high proportion of private renters are
at a life cycle stage where they do not engage with recycling.
The campaign will target the private rental market across Greater Manchester and will therefore take place in areas of Greater Manchester with a high proportion of rental properties, which have low recycling performance.

The individual properties to be targeted will be identified through letting agents, and private landlords, using the National Landlord Association local area representatives. These groups, alongside representative tenants, will also be included in pre-campaign focus groups to aid the design of campaign materials. All materials designed will be tested with the focus groups to ensure clear messaging and ease of understanding.

The private rental sector accounts for a significant proportion of transient populations in Greater Manchester. On average tenants reside in a privately rented property for just one and a half years. When tenants leave a property they may move to a new area of Greater Manchester where they are unfamiliar with the collection, and the new tenants replacing them in the property they previously lived may be new to that area. This reduces participation in kerbside collection and other waste services. Additionally, the relocation of residents in privately rented properties, itself, can generate a lot of wastes as unwanted items are often left in the previous property. Some of these are potentially recyclable waste materials, for example cardboard packaging, waste paper and glass kitchenware, as well as reusable materials, such as soft furnishings and white goods.

To address this issue the campaign will work through private landlords and letting agents to provide tenants moving to a new property with tailored information packs, covering all aspects of the recycling and reuse services available to residents. The packs will be provided through private landlords (through the National Landlord Association) and local letting agents. The packs will also be made available through our dedicated website (See Section D1) and also on the letting agents’ websites, where applicable, to reduce the production of paper information packs.

When tenants leave a property they will be offered a moving out pack. This pack will contain different collection bags for recyclable and reusable waste, and detail the recycling and reuse services available including any local council collection services. Details of local reuse and charity groups will be provided in the moving out pack to encourage residents to donate rather than dispose of items, and they will be encouraged to place items on a website for reuse. Information regarding this website is detailed below.

During the production of information liaison with project designers will ensure that any creative/iconography designed will be accessible, with the option to be available in alternative formats e. g. large print, audio.

The website will contain features that make it more accessible, for example, the text may be altered to an appropriate size to suit the reader. The website will also offers a text languages tool, which provides a text translation via the Google Translate website, and an option to ‘browse aloud’, which enables a text-to-speech functionality for the website.

The areas will be chosen on the basis of low recycling performance measured by the waste vehicle collection weights, and local deprivation statistics. The campaign will run in four target collection round areas of 1,500 households, and a total of 6,000 households will be targeted across all four campaign areas.
Action B.5 Low performing areas with a high level of transience, youth and students -
Golden bin

The aim of the campaign is to promote the use of the recycling facilities available to Greater
Manchester

The campaign will engage with University students living in private rental accommodation. This
will help to address the fact that low recycling levels and high contamination rates are
problematic in student populations.

The student population of Greater Manchester is ever changing, and growing. The majority of
1st year students move into halls of residence where their waste is managed for them via
communal bins. Students in their 2nd and 3rd years move out in to private rental
accommodation. Here they are responsible for managing their own waste. This is where there
is a continuous problem of low participation and contamination.

The majority of student private rental houses follow the same system as normal domestic
properties. Students are often unfamiliar with the recycling system and what bins/containers
they should have and use. Often this confusion and a lack of prioritisation by the students leads
to low recycling levels. Student houses generally comprise of multiple occupancy so everyone
in the house needs to take part to ensure waste is recycled correctly.

The campaign will be split across two semesters. Students in private rental will be identified
through the local authority. The campaign will engage with already existing student
environment groups and the university to help advertise the project. Student ambassadors will
be recruited to carry out door knocking and leaflet drops to promote the campaign to identified
student private rental properties. The campaign will also be promoted by posters around
campus, student events and also in relevant student magazines and publications. Engagement
of landlords will take place to further promote the campaign to the student population.

During the production of information liaison with project designers will ensure that any
creative/iconography designed will be accessible, with the option to be available in alternative
formats e.g. large print, audio.

The campaign will run for a period of between 8 -12 weeks over 2 semesters. Bins will be
monitored for correct use and randomly selected.

A winning property will be selected at random from one of the streets in the campaign area
every week. The property will be contacted either by telephone or face to face and asked to
answer a recycling question. If they get it right they will win an on the spot prize for the
household of £20. If the prize is not won in any week it will roll over to the next week, and so
the prize pot will increase.

Details will be taken of all participants so that they can be entered into an end of project prize
draw. The campaign will take place in student private rental properties covering 1500 houses.
Action B.6 Low performing areas with a high level of transience, youth and students - Recycling games

The aim of the campaign is to promote recycling amongst Greater Manchester students to increase recycling from students living in both university halls of residence and privately rented properties.

A competition will be run within Greater Manchester whereby students are invited to invent sports or games based around the theme of recycling. The sports can be individual or team sports and must promote the Greater Manchester recycling rules e.g. plastic bottles only, cartons in with paper etc.

The inventors of the best ten sports or games (as judged by an independent judging panel, to be recruited as part of the campaign) will win £50 of student vouchers, for use in the university facilities. The best game or games will be made into a real life model or virtual computer game. The game will be launched at a promotional event at the University where the game will be available (to be played on a large screen if it is a computer game). To promote this event in a way that will appeal to students an inflatable obstacle course will be designed as part of the campaign to represent the MRF. It is envisaged that the obstacle course will be a competitive game, whereby students dress as either a plastic bottle, a tin can, or a glass bottle or jar, promoting which materials can be placed in the commingled dry recycling bins. Recycling representatives will be on-hand at the event to promote Greater Manchester’s recycling service, as well as existing university environmental groups and student services.

During the production of information liaison with project designers will ensure that any creative/iconography designed will be accessible, with the option to be available in alternative formats e.g. large print, audio.

The campaign will be targeted at the student campus sites, and the launch event will take place on university grounds. The event will be filmed, for use on You Tube and the R4GM website for future promotion. The campaign will run for a total of six months, split between four months in the first semester (starting September 2013) and two months in second semester (starting in February 2014) and will provide a fun way to promote recycling to students.

Action B7 Low performing areas with a high level of different cultures - Faith campaign

The aim of this campaign is to increase recycling in low performing areas that have a high proportion of a particular faith, and where the place of worship is the focal point for the community.

In many urban areas across Europe residents of particular faiths often live in a cluster around a place of worship e.g. Christian Churches, Jewish Synagogues, Hindu Temples, and Muslim Mosques. These places of worship often form a focal point for the local community, and for those living in these communities religion has a deep meaning, forming the core beliefs and attitudes, which shape their life. Since pro-waste prevention and recycling behaviour is inextricably linked to attitudes, beliefs and practices it makes sense to explore whether they are aligned to religious beliefs, and to better understand how these communities relate to such messages.

A combination of local statistics and the knowledge of individual districts will be used to identify communities where religious faith forms a focal point for the community. Community
Engagement workers will then recruit Recycling Ambassador Volunteers from within the targeted community, which may be supported by specialist Engagement workers with specialist language skills. The Recycling Ambassador Volunteers would be given training to ensure they have understood local recycling facilities and the aims of the campaign. They will then carry out local research to understand the practices and obstacles to recycling. These interviews will be less formal and rigid relying on the local knowledge of the Ambassadors to understand how to approach their own community with the aim of collecting rich, in depth information that explores the attitudes, beliefs and practices.

The second part of the community engagement recognises the important part that religious leaders have in these communities, and will engage them in developing the campaign messages and seeing whether messages that explain how to overcome barriers to recycling are aligned to their core religious beliefs. They will also act as a focus group for campaign messages to ensure that they have been developed with religious sensitivity, and there is nothing within them that could inadvertently cause offence.

Faith leaders will then be encouraged to promulgate the message, with religious gatherings being used as a focal point for the campaign. Community Engagement workers, supported by Community Ambassador Volunteers, will attend events e.g. at the end of Worship to distribute campaign materials, which will also be backed up by focused door knocking.

It is widely recognised that these areas are likely to have a high proportion of Non-English speakers so pictorial images will be used, alongside simple language. Where the community feels it would benefit from the material being made available in several languages then multi-lingual information packs can be produced.

During the production of information liaison with project designers will ensure that any creative/iconography designed will be accessible, with the option to be available in alternative formats e.g. large print, audio. Where necessary, multi-lingual information can be made available.

The areas will be chosen on the basis of low recycling performance measured by the waste vehicle collection weights, and local statistics on the percentage of particular faiths within the community. The campaign will run in four target collection round areas of 1,500 households, and a total of 6,000 households will be targeted across all four campaign areas.

**Action B.8 Low performing areas with a high level of different cultures - Culture campaign**

The aim of this campaign is to increase recycling in low performing areas that have a high proportion of a particular culture, and may therefore be responsive to a cultural message e.g. Bollywood campaign.

In many urban areas across Europe people from similar cultures and backgrounds tend to converge in particular geographical areas. The reasons for this are difficult to explain, often being a result of the natural expansion of a small immigrant community, where people are drawn to live with others of the same cultural ideals as themselves. The initial migration is often linked to finding work, sometimes encouraged by employers to fill gaps in particular industries. In several northern England towns, for example, large Asian heritage communities were born from the need to fill labour shortages in a once thriving textile industry. Similar legacies exist around Europe.
Evidence has shown that people living in these communities have the potential to be good recyclers, so it is important that Municipalities, Cities and Regions understand how to tailor communications to them.

Local areas statistics on the percentage of ethnic groups will be used in combination with waste vehicle collection weights to identify areas with low recycling rates that would benefit from tailored communications to a specific ethnic group. Research will be undertaken by locally recruited Community Engagement workers aided by Recycling Ambassador Volunteers on two fronts: Firstly, to identify the barriers to recycling through a combination of door knocking and informal meetings, and secondly, to identify cultural themes to which the local community may relate. This, for example, could mean using a cultural icon as the voice of a campaign, or an existing local drama group. The Volunteers may be assisted by Community Engagement workers with specific language skills where initial research indicates this may be necessary.

The campaign media will be developed from within the community through using established local ethnic community leaders and groups to act as a focus group. This will ensure the campaign is directly relevant to the community. For example, it has been shown that one of the reasons for low food waste collection is that people don't realise they can compost their food scrapings, and even if they do understand they often don't separate them because they don't like the mess. It would, however, be pointless to incorporate a message about scraping leftover meat into the separate food collections bins in a largely vegan community. This may appear a relatively simple issue but it is one that is often overlooked when Municipalities develop campaigns from the 'top down' without the involvement of the community.

This method will ensure the campaigns are directly relevant to the community and will aim to deliver the message through a range of media routes as identified by them. It is likely that this will include community radio, cultural posters, leaflets, bus shelter ads. Importantly, the community will know of existing events and meeting places that can be used as vehicle to deliver the campaign.

It is widely recognised that these areas are likely to have a high proportion of Non-English speakers so pictorial images will be used, and where the community feels it will benefit then multi-lingual information packs will be made available.

During the production of information liaison with project designers will ensure that any creative/iconography designed will be accessible, with the option to be available in alternative formats e. g. large print, audio. Where necessary, multi-lingual information can be made available.

The areas will be chosen on the basis of low recycling performance measured by the waste vehicle collection weights, and local statistics on the percentage of ethnic groups within the community. The campaign will run in four target collection round areas of 1,500 households, and a total of 6,000 households will be targeted across all four campaign areas.
**Action B.9 Low performing areas with a high level of different cultures - Diverse communities**

The aim of this campaign is to increase recycling in low performing areas that have a high proportion of households with a mix of different faiths and cultures.

Many urban and inner-city areas across Europe are becoming increasingly diverse communities. A complex range of interacting demographic factors has led to a combination of small pockets of particular ethnic backgrounds, amidst a sporadic disbursement of different cultures as populations have shifted or settled over time. This raises a particular problem with respect to understanding how to deliver a culturally sensitive campaign that can also appeal across the community, or how to target multiple segments of the community.

The area will be identified by using a combination of waste vehicle collection weights, local ethnic statistics and local knowledge. The first step will be to understand the underlying characteristics of the community. It is likely that existing statistics may be slightly out-dated, and therefore some scientific research will need be undertaken prior to the campaign. This will also help to identify common target audiences to which the campaigns may be marketed. It may be, for example, identify that the community has a significant Eastern European population, or that the community is made up of mainly families. This type of information will be useful in developing a campaign that will appeal across the community, and may lead to one of two approaches.

**Approach one:** Given the need to address a range of cultural sensitivities then more weighting will be given to developing the campaigns through groups that are reflective of the demographics. Therefore, a series of focus groups will be developed, and the makeup of those groups will be compared against the demographics of the community. Where any specific group is under-represented then further community engagement will take place to recruit the missing cultural backgrounds. The campaign materials will be developed and tested by the focus groups.

**Approach two:** If the research undertaken identifies that the community is made up of relatively few ethnic groups, then a different approach can be undertaken to develop separately tailored campaigns. This would involve setting up separate focus groups to represent the individual ethnic groups and then develop the campaigns to be delivered at meeting places specific to the groups.

It is widely recognised that these areas are likely to have a high proportion of Non-English speakers so pictorial images will be used, and there is likely to be a greater focus on direct face to face engagement as translation into leaflets and media is unlikely to be cost effective across a range of languages.

During the production of information liaison with project designers will ensure that any creative/iconography designed will be accessible, with the option to be available in alternative formats e. g. large print, audio. Where necessary, multi-lingual information can be made available.

The computer games developed under implementation action (814) will be available for this campaign. They will therefore be tested by the focus groups, prior to any wider dissemination.
The areas will be chosen on the basis of low recycling performance measured by the waste vehicle collection weights, and local statistics on the percentage of ethnic groups within the community. The campaign will run in four target collection round areas of 1,500 households, and a total of 6,000 households will be targeted across all four campaign areas.

**Action B.10 Low performing areas with high density housing (apartments) - Bags and caddies**

The aim of this campaign is to encourage residents in apartments to recycle paper and card, commingled (cans, glass, jars and plastic bottles) and food waste.

Apartments are commonplace in urban areas across Europe. The main difference being that some EU countries have existing infrastructure built in (sometimes as a requirement of advanced planning systems), while others, particularly accession countries, will need to build this infrastructure to meet EU targets.

Although many high rise apartments are provided with recycling facilities some residents have difficulty using them due to space constraints, and a lack of ownership. They are also generally more difficult to use as residents often have further to carry materials, and may have limited space to separate and store within their apartments. This campaign aims to resolve this issue by providing residents with bags and caddies. This will help residents carry their recycling to the communal facilities, and importantly, provide them with a storage aid that also acts as a visual reminder to recycle, and gives them a sense of ownership.

In Greater Manchester recycling rates in apartment properties are lower compared to properties with individual kerbside collections. This is commonly due to the limited space available that may only allow communal recycling facilities, which lack ownership. To overcome these following items will be distributed to apartments with existing recycling facilities:

- A recycling bag with split sections for paper and card and commingled (cans, glass, jars, plastic bottles);

- A separate food caddy with a compostable liner.

The recycling bags will be split into two, one half for paper and card and one half for commingled (glass, cans, jars and plastic bottles). Residents will be expected to store the bag inside their property and use it to recycle items inside their apartment. This will save the resident time as they can carry the full recycling bag down to the communal facilities. Residents will be asked to keep hold of their recycling bag and continue to use this to store their recycling.

Initially, the food caddy would be accompanied with a roll of 50-200 compostable liners. This will enable residents to insert one compostable liner into the caddy and then fill the liner with any leftover food. Once the liner is full residents will be able to remove it from the caddy and carry it down to the communal recycling containers.

The recycling bags and food caddies will be distributed with an information pack, which will be posted through each door in an envelope. The pack will be an A5 6 page leaflet explaining to residents how to use the recycling bag and food caddies, and why they are being asked to do it. The information will use clear images of the recycling facilities and inform them where the communal recycling facilities are located.
Contact details will be provided to the resident in case they would like more information on recycling or how to report a lost, damaged or stolen food caddy or recycling bag. Initially residents will be provided with around 50-200 free liners with the information pack and will be informed about where they can be purchased in future.

During the production of information liaison with project designers will ensure that any creative/iconography designed will be accessible, with the option to be available in alternative formats e. g. large print, audio.

The areas will be chosen on the basis of low recycling performance measured by the waste vehicle collection weights, and local statistics on the percentage of apartments, as well as local knowledge of individual District councils.

The campaign will target 1,500 households in four target areas, and a total of 6,000 households will be targeted across all four campaign areas. Since apartments are likely to be incorporated into a collection round then the geographical boundary may need to be extended to cover multiple collection areas/blocks of apartments to attain the 1,500 households.

**Action B.11 Low performing areas with high density housing (apartments) - Ambassadors**

The aim of this campaign is to encourage residents to recycle paper and card, commingled (glass, cans, jars and plastic bottles) and food waste using local community volunteers.

It has been shown that blanket type communications do not necessarily work in apartment’s blocks, so there is a need to demonstrate how micro-level communications can work.

Apartments tend to have much lower recycling rates compared to individual properties with kerbside collections. This can be due to a number of reasons, which primarily evolve around the fact that space is limited, leading to many different tailored collection systems. This means that communications also need to be tailored to individual apartment blocks. The campaign will therefore involve the recruitment of residents from the local community to become Recycling Ambassador Volunteers to encourage recycling. Volunteers will be encouraged to join up using posters and community engagement workers. In particular, landlord and caretakers will be targeted to actively engage in the campaign encouraging residents to become volunteers.

The Recycling Ambassador Volunteers will be given training to ensure they have an understanding of recycling and what the campaign is trying to achieve. They will be provided with leaflets to hand out on site about what they are trying to achieve and the communal recycling facilities that are available on site. The leaflet would also include contact details in case residents want to obtain more information directly from the council.

The Recycling Ambassador Volunteers will engage with residents by door knocking and informal chats to ascertain if they recycle, and if so, whether they are doing it right. If they don't recycle then they would seek to find out what is preventing them. They will be trained in interview techniques to make sure they do not prompt answers and that the information provided by residents is recorded and fed back. They may also assist residents that need help to recycle due to ill health or the elderly.
A representative would be available on site every two weeks for 1-2 hours to meet with the Recycling Ambassador Volunteers to ascertain campaign progress, and assist in any further training that may require, as well as receive information provided by residents.

During the production of information liaison with project designers will ensure that any creative/iconography designed will be accessible, with the option to be available in alternative formats e.g. large print, audio.

The areas will be chosen on the basis of low recycling performance measured by the waste vehicle collection weights, and local statistics on the percentage of apartments, as well as local knowledge of individual District councils.

The campaign will target 1,500 households in four areas, and a total of 6,000 households will be targeted across all four campaign areas. Since apartments are likely to be incorporated into a round then the geographical boundary may need to be extended to cover multiple collection areas/blocks of apartments to attain the 1,500 households.

**Action B.12 Low performing areas with high density housing (apartments) - Facilities**

The aim of this campaign is to encourage residents in high rise apartments to recycle paper and card, co-mingled (glass, cans, jars and plastic bottles) and food waste.

The provision of recycling facilities to apartment blocks is not a simple matter, and each block needs to be assessed on a case by case basis. The project looks at the benefits of two way communication with residents to get community 'buy in' when providing new facilities. It will therefore examine how residents feel recycling facilities should be designed to increase access and opportunities to recycle, and then test whether this 'community buy in' results in increased recycling rates.

Apartments tend to have much lower recycling rates compared to properties with individual kerbside collections. This can be due to number reasons, for example: limited space for recycling leading to the provision of communal or no recycling facilities, and limited communications. This campaign examines how to develop recycling facilities that are accepted and used by residents. Evidence would suggest that residents are more likely to recycle if the opportunities to recycle are increased while the opportunities to dispose of waste without separating it are reduced. Therefore, communal recycling facilities for paper and card, commingled (glass, cans, jars and plastic bottles) and food waste will be provided on site with easy access for residents to increase the opportunities to recycle. At the same time discussions will take place with residents about how to balance this against reducing the residual waste capacity available, as well as explaining how to use the facilities.

To assist with the implementation of the communal recycling facilities, this campaign will be supported heavily by communications, signage and engagement with the caretakers/landlords. The project partners will engage directly with the caretaker/landlords and explain the new recycling facilities to them so that they have an understanding as to why the facilities have been provided and can support their use by asking them to be a contact for the communal recycling facilities should any problems occur e.g. damage, overflowing.

The residents will be encouraged to recycle by making the experience as pleasant as possible through locating the communal recycling facilities in easily accessible well lit areas that are clean and, tidy. They will be clearly labelled with pictorial signs to encourage correct recycling
and reinforce the messages. An A5 6 page leaflet pack (in an envelope) will be distributed through every door. This leaflet will explain how to use the recycling facilities that have been provided, and what happens to their recycling. Additionally, posters will be displayed in communal areas and on notice boards detailing the new recycling facilities and where they are located.

Contact details for council representatives will also be provided to answer any questions residents may have. The computer games developed will be available for this campaign, and will be included in promotional information.

During the production of information liaison with project designers will ensure that any creative/iconography designed will be accessible, with the option to be available in alternative formats e.g. large print, audio.

The areas will be chosen on the basis of low recycling performance measured by the waste vehicle collection weights, and local statistics on the percentage of apartments, as well as local knowledge of individual District councils. The campaign will target 1,500 households in four areas, and a total of 6,000 households will be targeted across all four campaign areas. Since apartments are likely to be incorporated into a round then the geographical boundary may need to be extended to cover multiple collection areas/blocks of apartments to attain the 1,500 households.
Appendix B: Standard data record sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Number/name</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>POSTCODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missed property (please tick)</th>
<th>Commercial Property (please tick)</th>
<th>Flatted Property - Communal collection (please tick)</th>
<th>Set out - Brown wheeled bin</th>
<th>Excess</th>
<th>Set out - Black box</th>
<th>Excess</th>
<th>Set out - Brown wheeled bin</th>
<th>Excess</th>
<th>Set out - Black box</th>
<th>Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 1</th>
<th>WEEK 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRXXXX - DISTRICT - ROUND - WASTE STREAM - PERIOD</td>
<td>PRXXXX - DISTRICT - ROUND - WASTE STREAM - PERIOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix C: Pre campaign survey

12183 GMWDA B4 Private Rental Market Pre campaign questionnaire - STOCKPORT

Good morning/afternoon, my name is ________________ from M:E:L Research. I am working on behalf of Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority and your Local Council. Do you have a few moments to spare to answer a few quick questions about waste and recycling in your area?

Interviewer name: __________________________ Date: __________

Filter questions:

F1. Do any of the following apply to you? [SHOW CARD A / INTERVIEWER TO CLOSE IF NOT RENTED]

1. Social Rented; Rented from Council
2. Social Rented; Other Social Rented
3. Private Rented; Private Landlord
4. Private Rented; Letting Agency
5. Private Rented; Relative/Friend
6. Living Rent Free

F2. Are you solely or jointly responsible for dealing with your household rubbish & recycling?

1. Yes
2. No (If No, ask for person responsible, close if not available and put in postal survey)

Q1. Thinking about recycling household waste, which of the following statements best describes how important recycling is to you personally? (READ OUT)

1. Very important
2. Fairly important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important
5. Don’t know (DON’T READ OUT)

Q2. Which of these statements best describes your attitude to recycling? (READ OUT)

1. I recycle even if it requires additional effort
2. I recycle if it does not require additional effort
3. I do not recycle
4. Don’t know (DON’T READ OUT)

Q3. Which of these statements best describes how much you recycle? (READ OUT)

1. I recycle everything that can be recycled
2. I recycle a lot but not everything that can be recycled
3. I recycle sometimes
4. I do not recycle
5. Don’t know (DON’T READ OUT)

READ OUT: I would like you to start thinking about the waste and recycling services provided by your Council.

Q4A. What waste and recycling services does your council provide? [DO NOT READ OUT OPTIONS. INTERVIEWERS TO PROBE BASED ON RESPONSES PROVIDED]

Q4B. FOR ALL SERVICES AWARE OF ASK: How often do you put the XXX bin out for collection? [INTERVIEWER TO TAILOR DEPENDANT ON RESPONSES]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4A. Awareness of services</th>
<th>Q4B. Weekly</th>
<th>fortnightly</th>
<th>Four weekly</th>
<th>Less than four weekly</th>
<th>Never/Not used</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black bin for general rubbish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue bin for paper and card</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown bin for mixed recycling plastic bottles/cans/tins/glass/aerosols</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green bin for garden and/or food waste</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green food waste bin (23 litre) for food waste</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6. Based on the XXX bin used, what stops you from recycling more than you currently do, if anything? [INTERVIEWER TO TAILOR DEPENDANT ON RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS QUESTION] [INTERVIEWER TO USE BARRIERS CODING SHEET]  
Interviewer to note barrier code/s / specify other if barrier not coded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Black bin for general rubbish</th>
<th>Other (please specify):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Blue bin for paper and card</td>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Brown bin for mixed recycling plastic bottles</td>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/cans/plate/glass/aerosols</td>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Green bin for garden and/or food waste</td>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Green food waste bin (23 litre) for food waste</td>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Other (specify)</td>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Have you disposed/given away/sold any unwanted/surplus items such as clothes, textiles, children's toys, electronics, furniture etc.?  
1. Yes [GO TO Q7]  
2. No [GO TO Q9]  
3. Don't know [GO TO Q9]

Q7. How did you disposed/given away/sold these items? [DO NOT READ OUT / TICK ALL THAT APPLY]  
1. Take to charity shop  
5. Take to HWRC (tip)  
8. Leave item outside/at the property
2. Arrange for charity shop to collect item  
6. Give to friends/family  
9. Other (specify)
3. Arrange for council to collect item  
7. Put them in the rubbish bin
4. Leave clothes/items in charity collection bag

Q8. When was the last time you did this?  
1. Last week  
3. Last month  
5. Last 3 months
2. Last 8 months  
4. Last 12 months or longer

And now I'd just like to ask some questions about you and your household

Q9. How long have you been living at your property?  
1. 0-6 months [GO TO Q10]  
2. 6 months to 1 year [GO TO Q10]  
3. 1-2 years [GO TO Q11]  
4. 2-3 years [GO TO Q11]  
5. 3-4 years [GO TO Q11]  
6. 4-5 years [GO TO Q11]  
7. 5+ years [GO TO Q11]  
8. Not willing to say [GO TO Q11]  
9. Don't know [GO TO Q11]

Q10. Was your previous home located within Stockport?  
1. Yes  
2. No (specify where) ______________________________  
3. Don't know

Q11. To which age group do you belong?  
1. 18-24  
2. 25-34  
3. 35-44  
4. 45-54  
5. 55-64  
6. 65-74  
7. 75+  
8. Prefer not to say

Q12. How many people live in your household (including yourself)?  
Number of adults ___________________________________________
Number of children 18 & under ___________________________________
Prefer not to say _________________________________________  
1

Q13. To which ethnic group do you belong to?  
1. White British  
2. White Eastern European  
3. Any other White background  
4. Mixed White and other ethnic group  
5. Asian or Asian British  
6. Black or Black British  
7. Other ethnic background (please specify)
Q14. Interviewer to note gender:

- 1 Male
- 2 Female

Q15. The Council is looking to contact residents regarding future events to discuss recycling in your local area. Would you be willing for your details to be shared with your Council?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

**INTERVIEWER RECORD NAME, ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBER**

As part of our quality checking process, some of the people who answered the survey will be selected at random to check that they really were interviewed. Could I please take your name and telephone number so that you can be called if necessary? This will not be passed to anyone else.

Q16. Please could you provide the following details?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property number and/or name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full postcode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of respondent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Post campaign survey

### 12183 GMWDA B4 Private Rental Market Post campaign questionnaire

**STOCKPORT**

Good morning/afternoon, my name is [NAME] from M.E.L Research. I am working on behalf of Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority and your Local Council. Do you have a few moments to spare to answer a few quick questions about waste and recycling in your area?

**Interviewer name:**

**Date:**

**Filter questions:**

F1. Do any of the following apply to you? [SHOWCARD A / INTERVIEWER TO CLOSE IF NOT RENTED]

- [ ] Social Rented; Rented from Council
- [ ] Private Rented; Private Landlord
- [ ] Private Rented; Letting Agency
- [ ] Private Rented; Relative/Friend
- [ ] Living Rent Free

F2. Are you solely or jointly responsible for dealing with your household rubbish & recycling?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No (If No, ask for person responsible, close if not available and put in postal survey)

Q1. Thinking about recycling household waste, which of the following statements best describes how important recycling is to you personally? (READ OUT)

- [ ] Very Important
- [ ] Fairly important
- [ ] Not all important
- [ ] Don’t know (DON’T READ OUT)

Q2. Which of these statements best describes your attitude to recycling? (READ OUT)

- [ ] I recycle even if requires additional effort
- [ ] I do not recycle
- [ ] I recycle if it does not require additional effort
- [ ] Don’t know (DON’T READ OUT)

Q3. Which of these statements best describes how much you recycle? (READ OUT)

- [ ] I recycle everything that can be recycled
- [ ] I do not recycle
- [ ] I recycle a lot but not everything that can be recycled
- [ ] Don’t know (DON’T READ OUT)

READ OUT: I would like you to start thinking about the waste and recycling services provided by your Council

Q4A. What waste and recycling services does your council provide? [DO NOT READ OUT OPTIONS. INTERVIEWERS TO PROBE BASED ON RESPONSES PROVIDED]

[INTERVIEWER TO TAILOR DEPENDANT ON RESPONSES PROVIDED]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4A. Awareness of services</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Fortnightly</th>
<th>Four weekly</th>
<th>Less than four weekly</th>
<th>More than twelve weeks</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black bin for general rubbish</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue bin for paper and card</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown bin for mixed recycling plastic bottles/cans/jars/glass/aero/cans</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green bin for garden and/or food waste</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green food waste bin (23 litre) for food waste</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>[ ] 6</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5. Based on the XXX bin used, what stops you from recycling more than you currently do, if anything?

[INTERVIEWER TO TAILOR DEPENDANT ON RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS QUESTION]

[INTERVIEWER TO USE BARRIERS CODING SHEET]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interviewer to note barrier codes / specify other if barrier not coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Black bin for general rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blue bin for paper and card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brown bin for mixed recycling plastic bottles / cans/foil/ glass/wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Green bin for garden and/or food waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Green food waste bin (23 litre) for food waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Have you disposed/given away/sold any unwanted/surplus items such as clothes, textiles, children’s toys, electronics, furniture etc.?

|   | 1 Yes [GO TO Q7] | 2 No [GO TO Q8] | 3 Don’t know [GO TO Q8] |

Q7. How did you dispose/given away/sold these items? [DO NOT READ OUT / TICK ALL THAT APPLY]

|   | 1 Take to charity shop | 2 Arrange for charity shop to collect item | 3 Arrange for council to collect item | 4 Leave clothes/items in charity collection bag | 5 Take to HWRC (tip) | 6 Give to friends/family | 7 Put them in the rubbish bin | 8 Leave item outside/at the property | 9 Other (specify) |

Q8. When was the last time you did this?

|   | 1 Last week | 2 Last 6 months | 3 Last month | 4 Last 12 months or longer | 5 Last 3 months |

Knowledge of campaign

Q9. Within the last 3 months have you seen, heard or received any of the following information around waste and recycling in your area? INTERVIEWER TO PRESENT SHOWCARD

|   | 1 Yes [GO TO Q10] | 2 No [GO TO Q13] | 3 Don’t know [GO TO Q13] |

Q10. What was it? (INTERVIEW TO CODE BASED ON RESPONSES FROM SHOWCARD)

|   | 1 Saw an recycling information sticker on my black bin lid | 2 Received a leaflet about recycling | 3 Someone came to my door and spoke to me about recycling | 4 Completed an online/paper survey about recycling | 5 Don’t know | 6 Other (Specify below) |

Q11. Has this changed your behaviour towards waste and recycling? (DO NOT READ OUT)

|   | 1 Recycle more | 2 Recycling about the same | 3 Recycle less | 4 Don’t recycle | 5 Don’t know |

Q12. Do you now have a better understanding of recycling/waste services available to you?

|   | 1 Yes | 2 No |
And now I’d just like to ask some questions about you and your household

Q13. How long have you been living at your property?
☐ 1 6-8 months [GO TO Q14] ☐ 5 3-4 years [GO TO Q15]
☐ 2 6 months to 1 year [GO TO Q14] ☐ 6 4-5 years [GO TO Q15]
☐ 3 1-2 years [GO TO Q15] ☐ 7 5+ years [GO TO Q15]
☐ 4 2-3 years [GO TO Q15] ☐ 8 Not willing to say [GO TO Q15]
☐ 9 Don’t know [GO TO Q16]

Q14. Was your previous home located within Stockport?
☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No (specify where) ____________________________ ☐ 3 Don’t know

Q15. To which age group do you belong?
☐ 1 18-24 ☐ 5 55-54
☐ 2 25-34 ☐ 6 65-74
☐ 3 35-44 ☐ 7 75+
☐ 4 45-54 ☐ 8 Prefer not to say

Q16. How many people live in your household (including yourself)?
Number of adults ____________________________ Number of children 16 & under ____________________________ Prefer not to say ☐ 1

Q17. To which ethnic group do you belong to?
☐ 1 White British ☐ 5 Asian or Asian British
☐ 2 White Eastern European ☐ 6 Black or Black British
☐ 3 Any other White background ☐ 7 Other ethnic background (please specify) ☐ 4 Mixed White and other ethnic group

Q18. Interviewer to note gender:
☐ 1 Male ☐ 2 Female

INTERVIEWER RECORD NAME, ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBER
As part of our quality checking process, some of the people who answered the survey will be selected at random to check that they really were interviewed. Could I please take your name and telephone number so that you can be called if necessary? This will not be passed to anyone else.

Q19. Please could you provide the following details?

Property number and/or name ____________________________
Street ____________________________
Full postcode ____________________________
Name of respondent ____________________________
Telephone number ____________________________
Appendix E: Show Card

12183
B12 Tameside (Post)
Showcard

Option 1: Saw a poster about recycling

Option 2: Received a leaflet about recycling

Option 3: Received a letter about recycling
Appendix F: Topic Guide

1.1 WELCOME [10 MINUTES]
- Thank everyone for coming and taking part in the focus group.
- Introductions to people in attendance and to the campaign - I am Michelle Lynch, Campaign Officer for a new European project called Up and Forward.....
- Domestics - Position of toilets, fire exit etc.
- Talk about how the evening will run:

The way this focus group will work is that I will guide the conversation to cover a number of issues relating to recycling in your community. This is a very informal session, and all we ask is that you be open and honest with your answers. Please do allow other people to speak as we would like to hear everyone’s views.

I will be tape recording the meeting so I have an accurate record to work from when I come to write my report. No names will be used, so, please speak frankly. There are no right or wrong answers...just your opinions and ideas.

To get started, please could you tell us your first name, the number of people who live with you and why you came along this evening?

1.2 WARM UP - MOTIVATIONS [15 MINUTES]

ACTIVITY Handout sheet for people to mark answers.

On a scale of one to six, how good a recycler are you and the people you live with?

1 is “I don’t recycle at all,” and 6 is “I recycle all the time.”

Why do you think people recycle?

Why do you recycle?
- To help the environment?
- To keep area tidy?
- Saves council money?
- It’s what you’re supposed to do?
- Social awareness

What do you think puts people off recycling?
- Time
- No incentives

Can you think of any ways to reduce the amount of waste that you produce?
- More recycling?
- Choosing products with less packaging?
- Would more information help?

1.3 MAIN DISCUSSION - KNOWLEDGE/ISSUES [30 MINUTES]

ACTIVITY to stimulate discussion. Various items to be placed - recyclable and non-recyclable
How confident are you that you know what to recycle?

Show item and ask which bin it should be placed in.

Discuss answers. Activity designed to encourage people to think about how and what they recycle.

What, if anything, would make it easier for you to know what items can or cannot be recycled?

(A selection of literature can be shown here and views gathered on what works best)

- Information leaflet, fridge magnets
- Stickers on bins
- Notices in bin stores
- Reusable recycling bags

What are the main problems with recycling where you live?

- Are there problems with people putting their rubbish in the wrong bins?
- Are there problems with rubbish being left lying around?
- Are there access problems?

What do you think would help to solve these problems? (Go through problems cited one by one)

Is there anything else that you can think of that would help you or other people to recycle more than you do now?

- Would it help if you had more info about recycling?
- Would it help if you had more info on reducing the amount of waste that your household generated?
- Incentives?
- Recycling Ambassadors?

1.4 WRAP UP [10 MINS]

Do you have any additional comments that you would like to share on recycling? (This wrap up question could be eliminated if time were running short.)

*Ask each person if they have additional comments that they would like to share*

As part of the focus group, participants can be shown the Recycle for Greater Manchester educational video, which aims to encourage people to think about what they throw away and how they can help reduce waste. (This element could be eliminated if time were running short.)
Contact details
Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority
Medtia Chambers, 5 Barn Street, Oldham, OL1 1LP
UpandForward@gmwda.gov.uk
0161 770 1700

Useful websites
www.recycleforgreatermanchester.com/upandforward
www.gmwda.gov.uk/
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/
www.recycleforgreatermanchester.com