

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Motives Towards Consumer-to-Consumer Online Marketplaces: A Latent Profile Analysis of Users' Relationships With Home and Material Possessions

Emanuele Esemplio^{1,2}  | Flora Gatti³ 

¹Università degli Studi di Foggia, Foggia, Italy | ²Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa, Naples, Italy | ³Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, Naples, Italy

Correspondence: Emanuele Esemplio (emanuele.esempio@unifg.it)

Received: 12 June 2025 | **Revised:** 9 June 2026 | **Accepted:** 26 June 2026

Keywords: consumer-to-consumer (C2C) marketplace | *Eco-Social Circular Consuming* model | home | latent profile analysis | online marketplace | personal possessions

ABSTRACT

Consumer-to-consumer online marketplaces (C2CM) represent a growing phenomenon whose underlying psychosocial dimensions have been scarcely studied so far. The present study aims at identifying the patterns of psychosocial drivers underlying the main motives towards their use—that is, sale-related, purchase-related and well-being- and QoL-related—using a person-centred approach based on individuals' relationships with their home and personal possessions. An online questionnaire was administered to 318 adult participants, to detect motives towards C2CM, psychological home, clutter quality of life (QoL), self-extension tendency, person- and thing-orientation, economic insecurity, sustainable worldviews and satisfaction with life. The latent profile analysis revealed two profiles of relationships with home and personal possessions: *eco- and socially-oriented* (68.39%) and *uninterested in material possessions* (31.61%). Age and gender were not associated with profile membership. *Eco- and socially-oriented* individuals showed higher satisfaction with life and stronger motives towards C2CM use to sell and purchase items, also focusing on well-being and QoL. The results suggest that embedding several layers and focuses (the home, personal relationships, the whole ecosystem) in one's lifespace may represent a protective factor for individuals—who experience higher satisfaction with their life—but also for natural ecosystems at large. Indeed, this perspective may make individuals more careful about the short- and long-term impacts of their actions, motivating them towards C2CM and circular economy at large.

1 | Introduction

Consumer-to-consumer (C2C) second-hand—or secondary—marketplaces represent a global phenomenon that has been growing in the last decades due to the increasing demand for second-hand products (Guiot and Roux 2010; Singh and Zolkepli 2018). Among them, C2C online marketplaces (C2CM) include websites, mobile applications, and other online platforms and venues allowing users to buy and sell second-hand items (e.g., books, clothes, technological devices; Cano et al. 2022). These platforms represent practical infrastructures potentially enabling users to overcome a linear

model of consumption (i.e., the take-make-dispose model) in favour of a circular one. This is a model aimed 'to keep products, components and materials at their highest utility and value, at all times' (Webster 2015, 16)—based on collaborative exchanges and alternative markets wherein sellers and buyers are more careful to concrete green- and sustainability-related issues (Piscicelli et al. 2015). This may bring about implications not only for consumption practices but also for the development of more eco-friendly lifestyles (Hassen and Akponah 2023). Consistently, by enabling direct exchanges among consumers outside primary business-to-consumer channels (Moriuchi and Takahashi 2022; Zhang et al. 2023),

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2026 The Author(s). *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

these platforms may be tightly related to the ongoing deep re-definition of consumption practices towards more ecological ones (De Bruyne and Verleye 2023; Geissdoerfer et al. 2017; Kirchherr et al. 2017). Such shift can be helpful in addressing current global environmental and social challenges (Hassen and Akponah 2023).

The motives towards the widespread use of C2CM are complex (Guiot and Roux 2010; Hur 2020), as these platforms are linked to several psychosocial processes and factors shaping users' needs, goals and consumption decisions, but also to the role industries and companies can actively play in this (Hassaro and Chailom 2023). Such motives mainly revolve around economic (e.g., saving money; Halicki et al. 2024; Liang and Xu 2018; Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023), environmental (e.g., reducing waste; Calvo-Porrall et al. 2024; Halicki et al. 2024; Lane et al. 2009; Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023) and sustainability-related (e.g., avoiding excessive consumption of resources; Halicki et al. 2024; Liu et al. 2021; Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023) issues, in line with those underlying second-hand consumption at large. These themes are also consistent with what emerged from recent statistics about secondhand purchases and C2CM use in Europe (e.g., Future Market Insight Inc. 2025; Statista 2021) and worldwide (e.g., Statista 2022), as well as from C2CM communication campaigns (e.g., Wallapop's and Vinted's communication campaigns).

However, the psychosocial dimensions—for example, attitudes, cognitions and values—underlying these motives represent a relevant yet still understudied topic (e.g., Cervellon and Wernerfelt 2012; Hassaro and Chailom 2023; Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023). Nevertheless, psychosocial needs and dynamics play a relevant role in shaping how individuals select and use technologies (Katz et al. 1973; Ku et al. 2013; Wei and Lo 2006): they actively choose which technologies to use—or not—and how based on their needs, goals and gratifications sought, as well as on the affordances and characteristics of the available technologies and media (Dimmick et al. 2004; Haryadi et al. 2025; McQuail et al. 1972; Menon 2022). Therefore, a better understanding of the psychosocial drivers shaping users' and pre-users' motives towards C2CM is still needed in order to further unravel the needs, goals and gratifications sought underlying their use.

Based on this, the present study aims at exploring the psychosocial dimensions underlying the main motives towards C2CM use—which still represents a gap in the established literature (e.g., Cervellon and Wernerfelt 2012; Hassaro and Chailom 2023; Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023). In order to do so, based on C2CM's affordances and goals, the study will move from exploring the patterns of relationships with and attitudes towards home and possessions, which can represent critical dimensions to C2CM use. Indeed, home and objects can be experienced as extensions of the self (Ferraro et al. 2011; Sigmon et al. 2002), yet when individuals accumulate too many items this can become overwhelming, up to making them experience negative feelings towards their material possessions and homespace and lower levels of well-being (Rogers and Hart 2021; Roster et al. 2016). Therefore, the study uses an exploratory approach to address the role of Clutter QoL, economic insecurity, self-extension tendency, psychological home, person and thing orientation and

sustainable worldviews in this—as these dimensions refer to perceptions and attitudes compounding individuals' relationships with their homes and possessions.

Nevertheless, relationships with home and items within them can be as varied as individuals are (Rogers and Hart 2021). Therefore, a person-centred approach is adopted as the most suitable to detect the patterns in which these dimensions combine within individuals' experiences of home and personal objects, up to detecting response configurations differentiating among psychosocial profiles based on the considered meaningful components (Williams and Kibowski 2016). Indeed, differently from variable-centred approaches, such an approach to data allows to group and describe individuals based on the similarities or differences among them as to how the variables relevant to a given issue related to each other (Laursen and Hoff 2006). That is, to properly unravel the complexities underlying individuals' experiences with home and items, the study uses latent profile analysis (LPA) to address the heterogeneity of respondents' profiles through their complex patterns of psychosocial characteristics (Laursen and Hoff 2006), rather than focusing on the sole relationships among single variables (i.e., using a variable-centred approach; Masyn 2013). Additionally, since these dimensions can also be critical to individuals' satisfaction with life (Rogers and Hart 2021; Roster et al. 2016), the impact on this will be addressed too.

2 | The Relationship With the Home

A home is 'not only a physical place, but a locus of activities, an anchor of identity, a repository of memories bonding past and present, and a centre of stability and continuity' (Seamon 2014, 206), thus representing a symbolic expression of the self (Csikszentmihalyi and Halton 1981; Ferraro et al. 2011). This implies individuals experiencing a sense of belonging regarding their home—labelled as psychological home, having three main functions (Sigmon et al. 2002): (a) home as a safe place connoted by security, protection and privacy; (b) home as filled by objects consistent with one's self-identity and towards which one experiences attachment; (c) home as a driver for psychological well-being. Consistently, this concept comprises cognitive (e.g., meaning and beliefs about one's home), affective (e.g., security, attachment) and behavioural (e.g., construction, maintenance) dimensions (Roster et al. 2016; Sigmon et al. 2002), locating at the intersection of physical, social and historical-cultural dimensions (Cicognani 2011).

Indeed, individuals' experiences with their lifeplaces are the result of the intertwining of the material and social features characterizing such environments, as well as of individual subjective dimensions (Bonnes and Secchiaroli 1992). Therefore, the meanings individuals attribute to psychological home can change based on their characteristics (e.g., gender and age, with women and older individuals experiencing a stronger sense of psychological home than men; Crum and Ferrari 2019; Swanson and Ferrari 2022) and experiences (Roster et al. 2016), and are related to the items individuals collect over time, which can reflect their identity (Crum and Ferrari 2019; Jacobs and Malpas 2013). Consistently, since personal belongings can support the link with one's home (Jacobs and Malpas 2013; Mallett 2004), individuals

with a strong psychological home are more likely to collect items representing extensions of their identities. These items may be useful to decorate their homes and increase their QoL and satisfaction with life (Rogers and Hart 2021; Roster et al. 2016), as individuals may experience this abundance of items as a *blessing* (Löfgren 2017, 2).

However, collecting too many objects over time could also be experienced as a threat to psychological home, undermining the daily experience of at-homeness (Roster et al. 2016). This excessive collection of items and the related negative psychological experiences have been conceptualized in the construct of clutter, referring to an overabundance of items within the home that creates a chaotic home environment (Belk et al. 2007; Roster et al. 2016). What is experienced as clutter can vary across individuals (Dion et al. 2014), with the subjective experience being more relevant than the clutter levels (Rogers and Hart 2021). This can depend on their life experiences but also personal characteristics—for example, younger adults experience clutter more negatively than older adults (Swanson and Ferrari 2022), and men and women can assume different responsibilities as to the organization of their home settings (Patel et al. 2023).

Clutter could threaten people's health, mood, safety, sense of self, emotional life, well-being and satisfaction with life, also impacting their meaningful relationships (e.g., Belk et al. 2007; Prohaska et al. 2018; Rogers and Hart 2021; Roster et al. 2016; Saxbe and Repetti 2010; Swanson and Ferrari 2022). Indeed, it can interfere with everyday tasks and activities (Frost et al. 2012), causing a lack of connection between psychological home and at-homeness (Seamon 2014) due to the level of home pollution (Belk et al. 2007). Additionally, a cluttered home can also hinder individuals from inviting close ones at home due to feelings of embarrassment, discomfort, guilt and alienation (Belk et al. 2007; Löfgren 2017; Roster et al. 2016).

In the most serious conditions, this can produce forms of hoarding disorder, which can cause humiliation, distress and appalling effects on clutterers' mental health (e.g., depression, Sekhon and Leontieva 2023). Conversely, the act of decluttering—that is, tidying up environments by organizing, managing and discarding stuff (Cherrier and Belk 2015)—can promote individual well-being and QoL, reducing harmful experiences linked to cluttering (Rogers and Hart 2021; Roster and Ferrari 2023; Thacher et al. 2017) and leading to 'a happier, less stressful life' (Lee 2017, 455, 456). Indeed, when individuals experience their home as tidy and under control, they can more easily focus on other issues such as goal achievement, self-regulation and value-oriented behaviours (Rogers and Hart 2021).

3 | The Relationship With Personal Possessions

Personal possessions represent symbolic expressions of the self and identity markers, becoming a part of the extended self (Csikszentmihalyi and Halton 1981; Ferraro et al. 2011). These belongings can be both experienced as an extension of individuals' identity in its cognitive, affective and behavioural components (Belk 1988; Mallett 2004; Sigmon et al. 2002). Such a deep connection between the self and the material possessions can provide meaningful insight into why letting go

of meaningful objects can elicit negative feelings and distress (Ferraro et al. 2011).

The relationship between individuals and their objects has been studied over time in different fields (e.g., social sciences, environmental psychology, media psychology, consumer psychology) as it helps understand how people experience their meaningful environments and their lives. In the late 1800s–early 1900s, the process through which individuals include the objects they can define as theirs in their self was defined self-extension (James 1890), later specified also as the processes through which these objects could be 'asserted as a part of the Self' (Cooley 1902, 188). This concept was then systematized by Belk (1988) as the extent to which 'we regard our possessions as parts of ourselves' (p. 139). Moving from this, self-extension tendency has recently been conceptualized as 'consumers' overarching inclination to use brands to "extend themselves"' (Rabbanee et al. 2020, 2) in the field of media and marketing psychology.

Research has shown variability in the extent to which individuals embed their possessions into their selves (Ferraro et al. 2011). This can be linked to them being more prone to engage with individuals—that is, having a person orientation—or with objects—that is, having a thing orientation—in their surrounding environment (Graziano et al. 2012). However, individuals can potentially attend to both people and objects (Graziano et al. 2011; McIntyre and Graziano 2019), with women showing a stronger person orientation and a weaker thing orientation than men (Crum and Ferrari 2019). Thing-oriented individuals may be more inclined to surround themselves and fill their homes with meaningful objects that make them feel secure and that are experienced as extensions of their selves (Crum and Ferrari 2019). However, when this brings about an abundance of items in the home, individuals who are also person-oriented may experience discomfort and negative feelings due to the clutter disrupting their relationships (Crum and Ferrari 2019; Rogers and Hart 2021; Swanson and Ferrari 2022).

3.1 | Value-Related and Material Aspects

The link between self and possessions is related to individuals experiencing items as reflections of their identity and self-worth more than to their intrinsic monetary value (Ferraro et al. 2011). However, when individuals perceive that their needs outweigh their available resources (e.g., financial ones), they focus on obtaining what they lack and need as soon as possible (Mullainathan and Shafir 2013; Zhao and Tumm 2018). This can produce a focused vision (i.e., tunnel vision), since the demands linked to the perceived scarcity of resources can deplete cognitive ones (e.g., attention, mental bandwidth; Mullainathan and Shafir 2013; Zhao and Tumm 2017) up to undermining the ability to make rational decisions (Mullainathan and Shafir 2013; Zhao and Tumm 2017)—especially when long-term effects are addressed (De Bruijn and Antonides 2022; Mullainathan and Shafir 2014). However, this can also lead to behaviours that may rather strengthen their financial need (e.g., neglecting beneficial information such as discounts; Mullainathan and Shafir 2013; Zhao and Tumm 2017). For example, individuals experiencing financial scarcity may even become strongly concerned for basic

expenditures (e.g., groceries, bills; Shah et al. 2018). This could bring them towards considering selling possessions they experience as meaningful to address their financial need as soon as possible (Mullainathan and Shafir 2013; Zhao and Tomm 2018). Furthermore, when in need or willing to purchase something, perceiving financial need may also bring individuals towards second-hand purchases, as it can foster trade-off thinking when facing hypothetical purchases under tight budgets (Mullainathan and Shafir 2013; Shah et al. 2015).

A similar attitude towards second-hand purchases can stem when individuals adopt a perspective focused on the interaction between humans and environments (Lane et al. 2009; Liu et al. 2021; Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023)—that is, framing humans as a component of nature that should avoid damaging ecosystems (Dunlap et al. 2000). Indeed, individuals tend to extend themselves through possessions that allow them ‘to fulfil their personal goals or to gain a better understanding of their own identities’ (Ross and Bayer 2021, 490). Specifically, who has an environment-human interaction worldview is aware of the intertwining of human progress and nature conservation within the local–global dynamic and based on a diachronic (i.e., intergenerational) but also synchronic (i.e., intragenerational) perspective (Corral-Verdugo et al. 2008). Based on this, they are careful about overconsumption but also aware of the active role they should play in promoting the recovery of natural resources within ecosystems (Corral-Verdugo et al. 2008; Thompson and Barton 1994). In this vein, individuals led by sustainable, environment-human interaction worldviews could benefit from the second-hand opportunities and appreciate the circular model of consumption offered by C2CM. Indeed, these platforms may allow them to enhance more intensive uses of items and increase their efficiency by giving them new life (Potting et al. 2017), and may enable them to gain new possessions in a way they experience as consistent with their values, promoting a shift towards more eco-friendly lifestyles (Future Market Insight Inc. 2025; Hassen and Akponah 2023). Sustainable behaviours provide them with feelings of satisfaction and happiness (Jiménez-Marín et al. 2022).

4 | The Study

Home and personal belongings represent a symbolic extension of the self (Csikszentmihalyi and Halton 1981; Ferraro et al. 2011), which express relevant features of individual identities (Belk 1988; Mallett 2004; Sigmon et al. 2002). However, when the possessions become excessive, this can produce discomfort and undermine well-being—and this may be specifically relevant to person-oriented individuals based on potential disruptions in social experiences (Crum and Ferrari 2019; Rogers and Hart 2021; Swanson and Ferrari 2022). In this, C2CM can represent a valuable resource allowing users to get rid of dismissed belongings according to their ecological and economic needs by giving them a second life (Calvo-Porrà et al. 2024; Halicki et al. 2024; Lane et al. 2009; Liang and Xu 2018; Liu et al. 2021; Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023).

Based on this theoretical framework, the present study addresses two main topics through an exploratory approach: (a) the relationships with home and possessions and (b) the motives

towards C2CM, rooted in individuals' relationships with and attitudes towards their home and possessions. As to the first topic, LPA was chosen as the most suitable approach, as it allows to properly take into account the heterogeneity among participants by detecting response patterns among significant components—in this case, psychological home, clutter QoL, self-extension tendency, person and thing orientation, economic insecurity, environment-human interaction worldviews, as already discussed—and identifying and differentiating psychosocial profiles accordingly (Laursen and Hoff 2006; Williams and Kibowski 2016). As to the second topic, the main motives towards actual or potential C2CM use will be identified using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), and the differences in them will be deepened based on profile membership.

Therefore, the present study aims at: (a) exploring different patterns of relationships with and attitudes towards home and possessions, in order to identify distinct profiles of individuals based on a set of meaningful psychosocial dimensions—as suggested by the established literature; (b) testing whether gender and age distinguish among the emerged profiles, based on these demographic characteristics having already shown a significant effect as to cluttering/decluttering-related, items-related or home-related attitudes and behaviours in previous variable-centred studies (see Swanson and Ferrari 2022, for the role of age; Crum and Ferrari 2019 and Patel et al. 2023, for the role of gender); and (c) investigating whether differences in (c1) the satisfaction with life and (c2) the motives towards actual or potential C2CM use and the actual use of C2CM exist across profiles. Because no research has applied the LPA to the attitudes towards home, possessions or C2CM nor deepened the latter within a psychosocial perspective to the authors' best knowledge, no specific hypotheses were proposed.

Since the few studies addressing cluttering/decluttering practices, or C2CM, in a psychosocial perspective were all carried out in American contexts (e.g., Crum and Ferrari 2019; Ferrari et al. 2025; Roster and Ferrari 2020, 2023; Roster et al. 2016; Swanson and Ferrari 2022), the present study is rather focused on the European one—which will be addressed as a unique context based on recent statistics showing no relevant differences in second-hand consumption (e.g., clothing purchase) across different European countries (e.g., Italy, France, Germany and United Kingdom; Statista 2023). Indeed, to the authors' best knowledge, the only study addressing C2CM in European countries (Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023) focused on only one specific platform (i.e., Vinted) to provide a first exploration of the motives towards it through a qualitative approach.

5 | Method

5.1 | Participants and Procedures

Snowball sampling procedures were adopted to recruit 318 participants through social networks (e.g., Facebook, Instagram, Reddit), and word of mouth; as to the recruitment via social networks, an invitation to take part in the study and answer the questionnaire was posted in online communities dealing with C2CM applications and being of interest for their users (e.g., *Vinted Italia Community*; *Vinted for all—Sell, Buy and fun!*

Italia/France/Belgium/Spain and other...; Vinted & Wallapop; Ebay-Subito-Kijiji; Vinted, Wallapop, Subito; Vinted—Austria; r/Wallapop) by the researchers. Data was gathered between July and November 2024.

The questionnaire was available in Italian and English; the back-translation method was used to obtain Italian wordings when no validated version existed. Most participants were from Italy (66.04%), while others were from different countries (e.g., France, Switzerland, Portugal, Greece, Germany, Poland, Spain, Austria, United Kingdom); four participants did not disclose this information.

No compensation was given to participants. The study was carried out in compliance with APA ethical principles and in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Confidentiality and anonymity issues were explained at the start of the questionnaire, where participants had to express their informed consent to take part in the study. In the same section, researchers provided participants with their e-mail contacts and specified to contact them anytime in case of questions, doubts or discomfort, or to withdraw from their participation in the study.

Participants (28.9% males, consistent with recent statistics about C2CM use in Europe; Future Market Insight Inc. 2025) were aged between 18 and 76 ($M = 30.94$; $SD = 14.28$); 1 participant preferred not to disclose their gender. Most participants had a degree (46.3%) or a High School Diploma (25.8%), while 15.7% had a Secondary School Diploma and 11.3% had a post-degree title; three participants (0.9%) had a Primary School Diploma as the highest education title. Most participants were unmarried (45%) or involved in a non-cohabitant and unmarried couple (20.8%); only 27% were married or cohabitant couples, 5% were separated or divorced and 2.2% were widows. Most participants did not have children (80.8%). As to their main occupation, most participants were employees (33%) or students (51.3%), while 4.4% were unemployed, 4.4% freelance, 2.5% entrepreneurs, 1.6% retired and 2.5% had a managerial role; one participant preferred not to disclose their primary occupation. All participants were aware of C2CM, yet only 61% were already users.

5.2 | Measures

5.2.1 | Economic Insecurity

Petitta et al. (2020) four items about perceiving stressful economic conditions were used (e.g., ‘An unexpected event such as a car repair could cause a financial emergency for me’). Participants were asked to rate each statement on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *never*; 5 = *always*).

5.2.2 | Self-Extension Tendency

The self-extension tendency scale (Ferraro et al. 2011) was used to detect participants' tendency to develop a bond with their objects and consider the latter as a part of their identity. The measure includes eight items (e.g., ‘I consider my favourite possessions to be a part of myself’, ‘There are links between my

special possessions and how I view myself’); participants were asked to rate each of them on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*).

5.2.3 | Psychological Home

The Psychological Home scale (Sigmon et al. 2002) was used to detect participants' perception of their home as a personal, safe and customized place. The scale includes seven items (e.g., ‘I put a lot of time and effort into making a home my own’, ‘I work at making a place my own’); participants were asked to rate each of them on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*).

5.2.4 | Person and Thing Orientation

The Adult Person-Thing Orientation scale (Graziano et al. 2011) was used to detect participants' tendency to engage with their social and/or physical surrounding environment. The measure includes 13 items: eight refer to person orientation ($\alpha = 0.86$, e.g., ‘Listen in on a conversation between two people in a crowd’, ‘Attempt to comfort a total stranger who has had a disaster happen’) and five to thing orientation ($\alpha = 0.83$, e.g., ‘Take apart and try to reassemble a desktop computer’, ‘Try to fix your own watch, toaster, etc.’). Participants were asked to rate how much the activities described in each statement were enjoyable to them on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *not enjoyable at all*; 5 = *extremely enjoyable*). Following Graziano et al. (2011), the two dimensions were used as separate variables.

5.2.5 | Clutter QoL

The Clutter QoL scale (Roster and Ferrari 2020; Roster et al. 2016) was used to detect participants' perception that clutter in their house harmed their private and social life. It includes 11 items (e.g., ‘I have to move things in order to accomplish tasks in my home’, ‘I avoid having people come to my home because of the clutter’) to be rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*).

5.2.6 | Satisfaction With Life

The Satisfaction with Life scale (Diener et al. 1985) was used as a measure of subjective well-being, following Roster et al. (2016). It includes 5 items (e.g., ‘So far I have gotten the important things I want in life’, ‘The conditions of my life are excellent’) aimed at detecting global life satisfaction, to be rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*).

5.2.7 | Sustainable Worldviews

The New Human Interdependence Paradigm Scale (Corral-Verdugo et al. 2008) was used to detect participants' environment-human interaction worldviews. The measure includes six items (e.g., ‘Human progress can be achieved only by maintaining

ecological balance', 'We must reduce our consumption levels to ensure well-being of the present and future generations') to be rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*).

5.2.8 | Motives Towards C2CM Use

Due to the newness of psychosocial studies on C2CM, 22 ad hoc items were pooled to detect the main motives towards their use. These items were based on (a) the communication campaigns of some of the most used C2CM within the geographical area where the study was carried out (e.g., Vinted, Wallapop, eBay), (b) their affordances and functioning, as well as (c) previous studies on second-hand consumption (e.g., Hur 2020; Lane et al. 2009; Liang and Xu 2018; Liu et al. 2021) and C2CM (e.g., Hassaro and Chailom 2023; Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023). Due to the nature of this variable, the items were referred to actual or potential use based on a filter question detecting whether participants were already users of any C2CM or not. Participants were asked to rate the relevance of each motive towards C2CM on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *not at all*, 5 = *at all*).

After exploratory and confirmatory analyses, only 19 items were retained in the final version (see Table 1 for their wordings) and three factors emerged: (a) sales-related motives, that is, C2CM are meant as tools to sell one's objects for several reasons (e.g., to declutter, to save space, because one needs money, to recycle objects); (b) well-being- and QoL-related motives, that is, they are meant as tools to decorate and customize one's home and feel better in it by buying specific or rare objects or selling useless ones; (c) purchase-related motives, that is, C2CM are meant as tools to buy objects at an affordable price, or that are hard to find, or second-hand due to ecological reasons.

5.2.9 | C2CM Use

A single dummy item was used to detect whether participants had ever used any C2CM (0 = *No*; 1 = *Yes*).

5.3 | Data Analyses

5.3.1 | Preliminary Analyses

EFA with principal axis factoring and promax rotation was run first for the scale about the motives towards C2CM use; the sphericity was checked using Bartlett's test, and the adequacy of sampling using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure.

Then, Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) was used to run Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) for all the measures. In order to ensure that all the measures properly worked in both language-based versions of the questionnaire, CFAs were run separately for the Italian and English versions as well. The Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI)

and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) were used to evaluate the model fit (MacCallum and Austin 2000): if TLI and CFI are equal to or greater than 0.90 and 0.95, the fit is good or excellent respectively; if SRMR is equal to or smaller than 0.06 and 0.08, the fit is good or reasonable respectively (Hu and Bentler 1999). Additionally, when it came to the scale about the motives towards C2CM use, the composite reliability (CR), the average variance extracted (AVE) and the Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio of correlations (HTMT) were calculated too, so to verify whether the items showed acceptable internal consistency: in order to confirm that more variance in the items is explained by the latent factor than by measurement error, CR should be higher than 0.60 (Hair et al. 2010), AVE higher than 0.50 (Fornell and Larcker 1981) and HTMT lower than 0.85 (Kline 2011). Cronbach's alpha (α) was used as a measure of reliability for each scale as to the total data, but also as to the language-based sub-samples separately.

5.3.2 | Latent Profile Analysis

Psychological home, economic insecurity, self-extension tendency, person and thing orientation, clutter QoL and sustainable worldviews were used as indicators to identify common patterns in the relationships with the home and personal possessions using the LPA.

Multiple models with different numbers of profiles were tested, following Ferguson et al. (2020). In this study, this only implied testing a two- and a three-profile model, since fit indices for the three-profile model showed that the additional profile worsened the model fit rather than improving it. The fit indices observed for this assessment were (Ferguson et al. 2020; Tein et al. 2013): Sample-size-adjusted BIC (ssBIC), Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC), Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test (LMR-LRT) and bootstrap likelihood ratio test (BLRT). For ssBIC and AIC, the lower the value, the better the fit; for LMR-LRT and BLRT, significant results show that the least parsimonious model better represents the data than the most parsimonious one (Ferguson et al. 2020). In addition, entropy was observed as a measure of uncertainty in the classification: models with entropy lower than 0.70 show too high uncertainty in the classification of individuals in the profiles considered. Once the model best describing the response patterns in the data had been identified, the authors checked the consistency and interpretability of the emerging profiles (Ferguson et al. 2020). The latent profiles that emerged were interpreted and labelled based on the patterns of mean scores in each profile, as these represent a critical basis for understanding their meaning (Lanza et al. 2013; Masyn 2013).

Then, the three-step procedure (Asparouhov and Muthén 2014) was used to test the effect of age and gender (0 = *male*, 1 = *female*) on profile membership probabilities. In the last step of analysis, the motives towards C2CM use, actual use of C2CM, and satisfaction with life were included in the model as distal outcomes, estimating and comparing their means across the profiles through pairwise comparisons run using the Wald's test.

6 | Results

6.1 | Preliminary Results

As to the EFA, Bartlett's test, *Chi-square* (171)=3078.518, $p<0.001$ and KMO measure, 0.893, reported good results. Three items were deleted from the initial pool due to too low (i.e., lower than 0.3) loadings or high loadings on more factors. As mentioned above, three factors emerged; loadings, explained variance and reliability for each factor are in Table 1.

Overall indices of model fit and reliability for all the measures used in the study, as well as those specific for the Italian and

English versions, are in Table 2. As to the scale on C2CM, all factors showed AVEs ranging between 0.439 and 0.558, CRs between 0.844 and 0.885 and HTMTs between 0.542 and 0.706. Therefore, all indicators met the recommended thresholds except for the AVE in the case of the factor *Sales-related motives*, which was 0.439. However, this factor showed a CR of 0.863, therefore suggesting that the convergent validity of the construct can be still considered adequate (Fornell and Larcker 1981; Huang et al. 2013). Overall, these results supported using these sets of items as reasonably reliable, and convergently and discriminantly valid, indicators of the underlying constructs (Fornell and Larcker 1981; Hair et al. 2010; Kline 2011). Descriptive statistics and correlations for all the variables included in the model are in Table 3.

TABLE 1 | Factor loadings for EFA with principal axis factoring and promax rotation for the scale about the motives towards C2CM use.

Item	Sales-related motives	Well-being- and QoL-related motives	Purchase-related motives
To declutter	0.819		
Because I need money	0.405		
To recycle objects I no longer use	0.817		
To have an external stimulus for decluttering	0.533		
Because it is convenient for interested people to come and take the objects I no longer use	0.622		
Because I have too many objects that I do not use	0.677		
To free up space in the home	0.731		
To give new life to objects	0.446		
To purchase items at a bargain price			0.741
To purchase items that are difficult to find in shops			0.680
To buy second-hand items for ecological reasons			0.564
To buy second-hand items to save money			0.839
To check available offers before making a purchase (window shopping)			0.550
To buy items for home furnishing		0.617	
To give my house a personal touch		0.746	
To buy objects that give me a sense of well-being		0.691	
To obtain satisfaction from rare/cheap items		0.475	
To make my house more presentable to guests		0.867	
To achieve a sense of peace in my home		0.782	
Explained variance (%)	37.22	9.31	5.24
Cronbach α	0.86	0.88	0.84
Total Cronbach α		0.91	

Note: $n = 318$.

Abbreviations: C2CM, consumer-to-consumer online marketplaces; QoL, quality of life.

TABLE 2 | Indices of model fit and reliability for all the study measures.

Variables	α			CFI			TLI			SRMR		
	Total ^a	Italian version ^b	English version ^c	Total ^a	Italian version ^b	English version ^c	Total ^a	Italian version ^b	English version ^c	Total ^a	Italian version ^b	English version ^c
Clutter QoL	0.95	0.94	0.96	0.96	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.92	0.92	0.03	0.04	0.04
Motives towards C2CM use	0.91	0.92	0.89	0.92	0.91	0.92	0.91	0.90	0.91	0.06	0.07	0.08
Economic insecurity	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.01	0.01	0.01
Self-extension tendency	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.01	0.01	0.01
Psychological home	0.92	0.91	0.92	0.98	0.98	0.99	0.96	0.96	0.98	0.02	0.03	0.03
Person-thing orientation	0.86	0.88	0.79	0.95	0.94	0.92	0.93	0.93	0.90	0.05	0.05	0.08
Sustainable worldviews	0.91	0.92	0.86	0.97	0.97	0.96	0.94	0.94	0.91	0.03	0.03	0.04
Satisfaction with life	0.91	0.90	0.91	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.95	0.01	0.02	0.02

Abbreviations: α , cronbach alpha; C2CM, consumer-to-consumer online marketplaces; CFI, Comparative Fit Index; QoL, quality of life; SRMR, standardized root mean square residual; TLI, Tucker–Lewis Index.
Total^a = 206.
Italian version^b = 118.
English version^c = 112.

TABLE 3 | Descriptive statistics and correlations for all the study variables.

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Clutter QoL	2.33 ^a	1.43	—									
2. Sales-related motives towards C2CM use	2.79 ^b	0.91	0.033	—								
3. Well-being- and QoL-related motives towards C2CM use	2.30 ^b	0.99	0.206***	0.480***	—							
4. Purchase-related motives towards C2CM use	2.98 ^b	1.03	0.135*	0.537***	0.615***	—						
5. Economic insecurity	2.58 ^b	1.18	0.275***	0.184***	0.164**	0.227***	—					
6. Self-extension tendency	3.32 ^a	1.65	0.280***	0.262***	0.293***	0.256***	0.193***	—				
7. Psychological home	4.25 ^a	1.55	0.068	0.325***	0.244***	0.288***	0.148**	0.505***	—			
8. Person orientation	3.00 ^b	0.88	0.170**	0.269***	0.265***	0.282***	0.148**	0.301***	0.394***	—		
9. Thing orientation	2.35 ^b	0.99	0.139*	0.090	0.225***	0.240***	0.009	0.188***	0.198***	0.354***	—	
9. Sustainable worldviews	3.84 ^b	0.96	−0.006	0.207***	0.056	0.279***	0.169**	0.172**	0.322***	0.398***	0.225***	—
10. Satisfaction with life	3.65 ^a	1.41	−0.079	0.166**	0.047	0.131*	−0.181***	0.180***	0.407***	0.224***	0.229***	0.198***

Note: $n = 318$.

Abbreviations: C2CM, consumer-to-consumer online marketplaces; M, mean; QoL, quality of life; SD, standard deviation.

^a1–7 range scale.^b1–5 range scale.*** $p < 0.001$ (2-tailed).** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed).* $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed).

TABLE 4 | Model fit statistics for latent profile analysis models with two to three latent profiles.

Model	LL	SCF	LMR-LRT (<i>p</i>)	BLRT (<i>p</i>)	AIC	ssBIC	SSS	Entropy
Two-profile	−3446.989	1.237	235.143 (<i>p</i> = 0.032)	−3567.111 (<i>p</i> < 0.001)	6937.977	6950.963	98	0.746
Three-profile	−3380.250	1.243	130.643 (<i>p</i> = 0.082)	−3446.989 (<i>p</i> < 0.001)	6820.500	6838.208	64	0.818

Note: *n* = 318.

Abbreviations: AIC, Akaike information criterion; BLRT, bootstrapped likelihood ratio test; LL, log likelihood; LMR-LRT, Lo–Mendell–Rubin likelihood ratio test; SCF, scaling correction factor of the robust maximum likelihood estimator; ssBIC, sample-size adjusted Bayesian information criterion; SSS, smaller class numerosity.

TABLE 5 | Means and class prevalence rates for the two-profile latent profile analysis model.

Variables	Latent profiles	
	Eco- and socially-oriented	Uninterested in material possessions
Self-extension tendency ^a	3.80	2.27
Psychological home ^a	4.86	2.95
Clutter QoL ^a	2.52	1.92
Person orientation ^b	3.39	2.17
Thing orientation ^b	2.60	1.81
Economic insecurity ^b	2.74	2.22
Sustainable worldviews ^b	4.16	3.15
Estimated prevalence	68.39%	31.61%

Outcome variables	Means of outcome variables per profile	
	Eco- and socially-oriented	Uninterested in material possessions
Sales-related motives towards C2CM use ^b	2.95	2.43
Well-being- and QoL-related motives towards C2CM use ^b	2.45	1.98
Purchase-related motives towards C2CM use ^b	3.20	2.51
Actual use of C2CM ^c	0.64	0.55
Satisfaction with life ^a	3.93	3.03

Note: *n* = 318.

Abbreviations: C2CM, consumer-to-consumer online marketplaces; QoL, quality of life.

^a1–7 range scale.

^b1–5 range scale.

^c0 = No, 1 = Yes.

6.2 | Identification and Interpretation of Latent Profiles

The two-profile and three-profile models were compared, since the latter showed a non-significant LMR-LRT. Since decreases in AIC and ssBIC were small and entropy was already good for the two-profile model (see Table 4), this model (see Table 5) was selected as the one best representing the patterns in the data

while providing distinguishable, consistent and theoretically sound profiles (Ferguson et al. 2020).

Most participants (68.39%) fit into the *eco- and socially-oriented* profile, showing high levels of psychological home (*M* = 4.86; 1–7 range scale), person orientation (*M* = 3.39; 1–5 range scale) and sustainable worldviews (*M* = 4.16; 1–5 range scale), yet low levels of clutter QoL (*M* = 2.52; 1–7 range scale). The remaining participants (31.61%) fit into the *uninterested in material possessions* profile, characterized by low levels of self-extension tendency (*M* = 2.27; 1–7 range scale), psychological home (*M* = 2.95; 1–7 range scale) and thing orientation (*M* = 1.81; 1–5 range scale); consistently, they showed low levels of clutter QoL too (*M* = 1.92; 1–7 range scale). Individuals in the second profile also showed quite high sustainable worldviews (*M* = 3.15; 1–5 range scale).

6.3 | Associations of Latent Profiles With Covariates and Outcomes

Once latent profiles had been identified and interpreted, the effect of age and gender on profile membership was tested. However, both covariates did not show significant effects on class membership (age: *B* = 0.02, *SE* = 0.01, *p* = 0.073; gender: *B* = −0.14, *SE* = 0.46, *p* = 0.681), suggesting that males and females, as well as younger and older participants, had the same probability to fit in the *eco- and socially-oriented* or *uninterested in material possessions* profile.

As to the outcomes (i.e., motives towards C2CM use, actual use of C2CM and satisfaction with life), estimated means for each latent profile are in Table 5. The differences between the two profiles were significant for the three motives towards C2CM use (sale-related: $\chi^2 = 19.97$, *p* < 0.001; well-being- and QoL-related: $\chi^2 = 14.88$, *p* < 0.001; purchase-related: $\chi^2 = 28.85$, *p* < 0.001) and for satisfaction with life ($\chi^2 = 26.32$, *p* < 0.001), yet not for the actual use of C2CM ($\chi^2 = 1.86$, *p* = 0.173). Specifically, participants fitting the *eco- and socially-oriented* profile showed higher scores in all the motives towards C2CM, as well as in satisfaction with life.

7 | Discussion

Using a person-centred approach, this study addressed (a) the relationships with home and possessions and (b) the motives towards C2CM and their actual use. First, two profiles emerged: *eco- and socially-oriented* and *uninterested in material possessions*. On the one hand, participants in the first group focused on making their home a safe and comfortable

environment, on interacting with others, and on the human ecological impact on the natural ecosystem. On the other hand, participants in the second group were uninterested in material possessions and yet quite mindful about human ecological impact. Profile membership was not related to age and gender. Second, *eco- and socially-oriented* participants were more motivated towards using C2CM to both sell and purchase, also focusing on well-being- and QoL-related impacts of the sold and bought items. Consistently, they also showed higher levels of satisfaction with life than the members of the other profile. No differences emerged as to the actual use of C2CM.

What emerged suggests that *eco- and socially-oriented* individuals may be aware of the short- and long-term impacts of their actions and behaviours. For example, consistent with their person orientation, they may focus on decorating their home and keeping it tidy, uncluttered, and welcoming not to threaten their relationships (Belk et al. 2007; Löfgren 2017; Swanson and Ferrari 2022). Accordingly, their focus on sustainable worldviews could make them more oriented towards preferring C2CM as a means to buy items useful to decorate their home and sell those that no longer are. On the one hand, this could contribute to the orderly maintenance of their home environment, avoiding negative experiences with others (Belk et al. 2007; Löfgren 2017; Rogers and Hart 2021; Swanson and Ferrari 2022), and enhancing their feelings of happiness and satisfaction with life (Jiménez-Marín et al. 2022; Lee 2017). On the other hand, their focus on short- and long-term impacts of their consumer behaviours may also lead them to sell items—for example, via C2CM—not only to get rid of them, but also to give them a second life, consistent with a responsible and sustainable consumption (De Bruyne and Verleye 2023; Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023). This could also make them more satisfied with their life (Lee 2017), based on different potential psychosocial processes: (a) because of their positive experiences with their home (Rogers and Hart 2021; Roster et al. 2016); (b) due to such a positive environment allowing them to sustain their person-orientation through making it a space for social relationships (Belk et al. 2007; Löfgren 2017; Prohaska et al. 2018; Roster et al. 2016; Swanson and Ferrari 2022); (c) based on their perception that their behaviours are consistent with their ecological values (Corral-Verdugo et al. 2008; Jiménez-Marín et al. 2022).

These individuals may experience a multilayered lifespaces—consistent with the ecological and systemic perspective (Bronfenbrenner 1979): their home, their social context and the natural ecosystem could all represent parts of it, perceived as equally important to their present and future well-being. This stands consistent with the established conceptualization of well-being as comprising personal, relational, organizational and collective dimensions (Prilleltensky 2024). Accordingly, C2CM may catch their attention because at the individual level, they may allow users to enhance their home environment, while, in a collective perspective, C2CM may represent means to give new life to objects (Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023) playing out sustainable consumption behaviours. This may allow *eco- and socially-oriented* individuals to avoid the *make-take-waste* model, which can threaten the ecosystem. Since the latter may be perceived as one important layer of their lifespaces by *eco- and*

socially-oriented individuals, endangering it could represent a loss in terms of present and future resources and well-being to them.

Conversely, *uninterested in material possessions* individuals could tend to focus less on objects and not to embed them in their self. Therefore, they may acquire less items and experience less clutter. Their lack of engagement with things and their only moderate interest in people may also make them less interested in the potential of C2CM, since making their home environment pleasant to others may not represent an incentive for their use to them. Furthermore, even if C2CM are currently advertised as a means to buy and sell objects while helping the planet by consuming sustainably, they still seem not to perceive C2CM as a tool to meet their ecological worldviews. This may depend on them perceiving companies' focus on the ecological perspective as still secondary or being concerned about it (Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023), maybe experiencing such focus as greenwashing (de Freitas Netto et al. 2020). However, even though they are less motivated than *eco- and socially-oriented* individuals towards C2CM as a means to sell, buy or enhance their QoL, they do not report a lower probability of actually using these platforms. Additionally, this second group also shows significantly lower satisfaction with life, which may depend on them being more focused on environmental-related issues than on their daily life environment—that is, their home. Accordingly, their satisfaction with life may depend on their engagement with actions concretely addressing ecological issues rather than on their experiences with home and personal possessions, in an eudaimonic perspective (Venhoeven et al. 2013)—which links individual self-realization to the achievement of meaningful life goals (Deci and Ryan 2008; Ryan and Deci 2001).

This may suggest that experiencing a more complex and multi-layered lifespaces—and proactively taking care of it in physical, social and ecological terms—may enhance individuals' well-being. Such care may shape as either reducing home clutter, but also increasing personal possessions when they are experienced as meaningful to one's self and identity (Ferraro et al. 2011; Jacobs and Malpas 2013; Mallett 2004) and not threatening interpersonal relationships (Belk et al. 2007; Löfgren 2017; Rogers and Hart 2021). A vision of continuously evolving lifespaces emerges, consistent with the relationships with objects changing over time (Roster 2015). Therefore, purchases may need to be based on a reflective and critical perspective—consistent with *eco- and socially-oriented* individuals being more satisfied with life, probably due to their capability to better ponder their consumer behaviours in order to make them better fit their personal and social life and system of values. This may also be consistent with their satisfaction with life depending not only on improving their life conditions, but also on pursuing others' benefits (e.g., by addressing environmental-related issues; Corral-Verdugo et al. 2011; Haviland-Jones et al. 2005).

Overall, these results suggest that a mindful attitude towards consuming behaviours could support personal well-being and ecosystem preservation at the same time. Therefore, C2CM may represent practical infrastructures serving a shift towards a different, empowering and collaborative way of consuming based on a mindful attitude (Sheth et al. 2011) that allows individuals to buy and sell consistent with their needs but also with

the awareness that items can have a second-life. This may lead to a new consuming model, which relies on three main pillars compounding a multilayered lifespace: (a) a mindful attitude about human ecological impact; (b) the relevance attributed to one's physical lifespace as a place to foster social relationships and life satisfaction; (c) a collaborative network relying on the shared intention to give a second-life to dismissed items. Indeed, a mindful and ecologically careful attitude towards C2CM use can allow users to engage in concrete daily behaviours aimed at reducing one's green- and sustainability-related impact on the environment (Piscicelli et al. 2015) in a more direct and efficient way (Moriuchi and Takahashi 2022; Zhang et al. 2023). In a similar vein, maintaining a tidy, personalized and welcoming lifespace can represent another relevant trigger to engage in mindful behaviours aimed at reducing the cluttering in one's home (Belk et al. 2007; Jiménez-Marín et al. 2022; Rogers and Hart 2021). Last, having access to a collaborative network sharing an attitude towards giving a second-life to dismissed items can support the intention to adhere to a more mindful consuming behaviour too (Sheth et al. 2011). Therefore, based on these pillars and on the *eco- and socially-oriented* profile emerged from this study, this model can be referred to as an *Eco-Social Circular Consuming* model—that is, a preliminary conceptual model consistent with the already ongoing shift towards more ecologically-oriented practices of consumerism (Geissdoerfer et al. 2017; Kirchherr et al. 2017) and a circular economy model (De Bruyne and Verleye 2023; Future Market Insight Inc. 2025; Piscicelli et al. 2015).

It can have two main implications. On the one hand, this could lead not to accumulating objects in one's home based on a mindful perspective (Sheth et al. 2011) rather than keeping buying relying on heuristics (Del Campo et al. 2016; Hassaro and Chailom 2023; Hauser 2011). In this vein, items could be acquired and sold based on their reckoned accordance with one's identity, home environment and life. This attitude could then result in a potentially protective factor useful to maintain a tidy and welcoming house, preventing negative clutter consequences and the need to continuously declutter one's lifespace. Indeed, the beneficial effects of decluttering could decrease over time if it is too frequent, suggesting that it is not the actual decluttering behaviour that matters to enhancing individuals' well-being, but the outcome of experiencing a tidy, welcoming and personalized home (Rogers and Hart 2021). On the other hand, when items are reckoned as no more relevant to identity, home environment and life, this attitude may not just lead to discarding them (i.e., avoiding the *make, take, discard* consuming model).

Relying on a critical evidence-based perspective (De Vincenzo et al. 2024), psychologists and other professionals working in this field should move within such a preventative perspective aimed at enhancing—or establishing—people's mindful consumption. This could also help in facing current concerns about present rates of consumption being unsustainable and threatening for the well-being of society (McDonagh and Prothero 2014), meeting the need to curb overconsumption by encouraging behavioural changes supporting mindful consumption (Sheth et al. 2011). This mindful attitude could be achieved by promoting a critical perspective on items' lifecycle and consuming behaviours as related to personal, social and ecological lifespace,

which could hinder individuals from rather relying on heuristics due to situational, contextual and personal factors (Del Campo et al. 2016; Hassaro and Chailom 2023; Hauser 2011). Additionally, another relevant factor may lie in enhancing a planetary sense of community (Francescato 2020), focusing more on the intertwinement between individuals' responsibility to protect the ecosystem, consuming behaviours and impact on the planetary socio-ecological community.

C2CM can represent suitable tools towards this aim, as they can favour purchasing and selling second-hand items (Palomo-Domínguez et al. 2023). As to this, C2CM can create a psychological space useful to unravel the potential second-life of their possessions, based on thinking about the value of the possession they aim to buy and sell. Additionally, these insights could also represent an interesting context for developing new technologies aimed at fostering such a psychological space and mindful behaviours. This stands consistent with individuals' use of new technologies in order to meet their unsatisfied needs (e.g., Gatti et al. 2023), allowing psychologists—and professionals at large—to embed them in their interventions aimed at meeting such needs in turn (e.g., Gatti and Procentese 2024; Gatti et al. 2026). Indeed, from professionals' perspective, technologies could represent a bridge towards community experiences, as well as useful tools to enhance individuals' mindful actions for personal, social and community empowerment and well-being in an onlife perspective, when they are used in a mindful and reflexive way (Esemplio et al. 2024).

7.1 | Limitations and Future Directions

Some limitations of the present study should be acknowledged. First, findings rely on self-report data. Therefore, response fatigue and memory biases may have been an issue. Furthermore, a self-selection bias should be considered due to the recruitment procedures (e.g., individuals being already somehow aware of or interested in C2CM may have been more prone to take part). However, the latter allowed to reach a broad and heterogeneous group of participants, providing higher validity to the results. Despite this, it should be reckoned that the pool of participants is not representative of C2CM users or European citizens at large, as it is skewed as to Nationality (with a prevalence of Italian participants) and gender (with males being underrepresented). Such characterization may have impacted the results, producing some biases and making the findings not generalizable to the whole population. Therefore, future studies should aim to further test the motives towards actual or potential C2CM use also in light of cultural specificities and values characterizing the different European countries (e.g., The Culture Factor n.d.).

In addition, due to the cross-sectional design of the study, inferences about the direction of causality cannot be suggested. Therefore, further longitudinal or mixed-methods research is needed to shed further light on the psychosocial dynamics underlying C2CM actual and potential use and its implications for individuals' well-being. Lastly, based on few studies existing about C2CM and the psychosocial processes underlying their actual and potential use, future studies should (a) provide further evidence on the overall and cross-cultural validity of the

newly developed measure about the motives towards C2CM actual and potential use, and (b) endeavour to further unravel the relevant psychological and social dimensions revolving around C2CM use, up to better understanding their role in shaping attitudes and behaviours in this practice, as well as the patterns of response related to individuals' relationships with their homes and material possessions. Therefore, further studies should merge contributions of consumer, environmental and media psychology while focusing on a person-centred approach.

In this way, C2CM's role in promoting the *Eco-Social Circular Consuming* model could be better unravelled, fulfilling a current gap in the established literature and supporting a more sustainable, mindful and proactive consumption to the benefit of individual and global ecosystem well-being. Indeed, this model may represent a further development in the ongoing shift from a linear to a circular model of consumerism (Piscicelli et al. 2015), embedding not only the economic- and sustainability-based issues but also psychosocial aspects and considerations. However, it still represents a preliminary conceptual model, thus requiring further operationalization and testing. Specifically, its power in predicting consumers' behaviours requires further attention, so as to better unravel the relevance of the three pillars identified at its core. In this vein, its connection with psychosocial dimensions—such as satisfaction with life and well-being—should be deepened too in an interdisciplinary perspective resulting from the intertwining of heterogeneous psychological perspectives, such as Consumer Research and Social, Marketing, Media and Environmental Psychology. Such an interdisciplinary perspective may open new venues for further research and practical interventions aimed at reducing waste as well as sustaining a concrete change in individuals' attitudes and behaviours towards an ecologically based perspective. This would be consistent with the need to address current global environmental concerns and social challenges (Hassen and Akponah 2023).

Acknowledgements

Open access publishing facilitated by Università degli Studi di Foggia, as part of the Wiley - CRUI-CARE agreement.

Funding

The authors have nothing to report.

Ethics Statement

The authors declare that the research is conducted ethically, responsibly, and legally; the results are reported honestly; the submitted work is original and not (self-)plagiarized; funding sources and conflicts of interest are disclosed.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

- Asparouhov, T., and B. Muthén. 2014. "Auxiliary Variables in Mixture Modeling: Three-Step Approaches Using Mplus." *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 21, no. 3: 329–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2014.915181>.
- Belk, R. W. 1988. "Possessions and the Extended Self." *Journal of Consumer Research* 15, no. 2: 139–168. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209154>.
- Belk, R., J. Yong Seo, and E. Li. 2007. "Dirty Little Secret: Home Chaos and Professional Organizers." *Consumption Markets & Culture* 10, no. 2: 133–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10253860701256208>.
- Bonnes, M., and G. Secchiarioli. 1992. *Psicologia ambientale*. Carocci.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. 1979. *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Harvard university press.
- Calvo-Porral, C., J. Orosa-González, and N. Viejo-Fernández. 2024. "Second-Hand Online Stores: An Examination of Consumers' Purchase Behaviour." *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research* 34, no. 4: 489–512. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593969.2023.2301582>.
- Cano, J. A., A. Londoño-Pineda, M. F. Castro, H. B. Paz, C. Rodas, and T. Arias. 2022. "A Bibliometric Analysis and Systematic Review on e-Marketplaces, Open Innovation, and Sustainability." *Sustainability* 14, no. 9: 5456. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14095456>.
- Cervellon, M. C., and A. S. Wernerfelt. 2012. "Knowledge Sharing Among Green Fashion Communities Online: Lessons for the Sustainable Supply Chain." *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal* 16, no. 2: 176–192. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09590551211274946>.
- Cherrier, H., and R. Belk. 2015. "Decluttering." In *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Consumption and Consumer Studies*, edited by D. T. Cook and J. M. Ryan, 1–2. John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118989463.wbeccs201>.
- Cicognani, E. 2011. "Psychological Home and Well-Being." *Rassegna di Psicologia* 2: 85–96.
- Cooley, C. H. 1902. *Human nature and the social order*. Charles Scribner & Sons.
- Corral-Verdugo, V., G. Carrus, M. Bonnes, G. Moser, and J. B. Sinha. 2008. "Environmental Beliefs and Endorsement of Sustainable Development Principles in Water Conservation: Toward a New Human Interdependence Paradigm Scale." *Environment and Behavior* 40, no. 5: 703–725. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916507308786>.
- Corral-Verdugo, V., J. F. Mireles-Acosta, C. Tapia-Fonllem, and B. Fraijo-Sing. 2011. "Happiness as Correlate of Sustainable Behavior: A Study of Pro-Ecological, Frugal, Equitable and Altruistic Actions That Promote Subjective Wellbeing." *Human Ecology Review* 18: 95–104.
- Crum, K. P., and J. R. Ferrari. 2019. "Toward an Understanding of Psychological Home and Clutter With Emerging Adults: Relationships Over Relics." *North American Journal of Psychology* 21, no. 1: 45–56.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., and E. Halton. 1981. *The Meaning of Things: Domestic Symbols and the Self*. Cambridge University Press.
- De Bruijn, E. J., and G. Antonides. 2022. "Poverty and Economic Decision Making: A Review of Scarcity Theory." *Theory and Decision* 92, no. 1: 5–37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11238-021-09802-7>.
- De Bruyne, M. J., and K. Verleye. 2023. "Realizing the Economic and Circular Potential of Sharing Business Models by Engaging Consumers." *Journal of Service Management* 34, no. 3: 493–519. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-08-2021-0318>.

- de Freitas Netto, S. V., M. F. F. Sobral, A. R. B. Ribeiro, and G. R. D. L. Soares. 2020. "Concepts and Forms of Greenwashing: A Systematic Review." *Environmental Sciences Europe* 32: 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12302-020-0300-3>.
- De Vincenzo, C., N. Stocco, and R. Modugno. 2024. "A Critical Sociocultural Understanding of Evidence-Based Research and Practice Paradigm in Contemporary Psychology." *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science* 58: 160–177. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-023-09798-5>.
- Deci, E. L., and R. M. Ryan. 2008. "Hedonia, Eudaimonia, and Well-Being: An Introduction." *Journal of Happiness Studies* 9, no. 1: 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9018-1>.
- Del Campo, C., S. Pauser, E. Steiner, and R. Vetschera. 2016. "Decision Making Styles and the Use of Heuristics in Decision Making." *Journal of Business Economics* 86: 389–412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11573-016-0811-y>.
- Diener, E. D., R. A. Emmons, R. J. Larsen, and S. Griffin. 1985. "The Satisfaction With Life Scale." *Journal of Personality Assessment* 49, no. 1: 71–75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13.
- Dimmick, J., Y. Chen, and Z. Li. 2004. "Competition Between the Internet and Traditional News Media: The Gratification-Opportunities Niche Dimension." *Journal of Media Economics* 17, no. 1: 19–33. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327736me1701_2.
- Dion, D., O. Sabri, and V. Guillard. 2014. "Home Sweet Messy Home: Managing Symbolic Pollution." *Journal of Consumer Research* 41: 565–589. <https://doi.org/10.1086/676922>.
- Dunlap, R. E., K. D. Van Liere, A. G. Mertig, and R. E. Jones. 2000. "New Trends in Measuring Environmental Attitudes: Measuring Endorsement of the New Ecological Paradigm: A Revised NEP Scale." *Journal of Social Issues* 56, no. 3: 425–442. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00176>.
- Esempio, E., F. Gatti, S. Carnevale, M. Autiero, C. Arcidiacono, and M. F. Gonzalez Leone. 2024. "Community Psychology Competencies and Onlife Participatory Team Building: The 9th International Conference of Community Psychology (9ICCP) Case Study." *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 34, no. 6: e70006. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.70006>.
- Ferguson, S. L., E. W. G. Moore, and D. M. Hull. 2020. "Finding Latent Groups in Observed Data: A Primer on Latent Profile Analysis in Mplus for Applied Researchers." *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 44, no. 5: 458–468. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025419881721>.
- Ferrari, J. R., H. L. Swanson, J. Laurentowski, and D. A. Patel. 2025. "Bedroom Clutter by Adolescents: Stress and Emotional Exhaustion as Predictors." *North American Journal of Psychology* 27, no. 3: 491–507.
- Ferraro, R., J. E. Escalas, and J. R. Bettman. 2011. "Our Possessions, Our Selves: Domains of Self-Worth and the Possession-Self Link." *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 21, no. 2: 169–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2010.08.007>.
- Fornell, C., and D. F. Larcker. 1981. "Evaluating Structural Equation Models With Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error." *Journal of Marketing Research* 18, no. 1: 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104>.
- Francescato, D. 2020. "Why We Need to Build a Planetary Sense of Community." *Community Psychology in Global Perspective* 6, no. 2: 140–164.
- Frost, R. O., G. Steketee, and D. F. Tolin. 2012. "Diagnosis and Assessment of Hoarding Disorder." *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology* 8, no. 1: 219–242. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032511-143116>.
- Future Market Insight Inc. 2025. "Second-Hand Apparel Market in Europe Size and Share Forecast Outlook 2025 to 2035." https://www.futuremarketinsights.com/reports/second-hand-apparel-market-in-europe?utm_source=chatgpt.com.
- Gatti, F., and F. Procentese. 2024. "Ubiquitous Processes Strengthening Neighborhood Communities: How Neighborhood-Related Social Media Can Foster the Active Involvement of Citizens and Build Resilient Communities." *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 34, no. 5: e2862. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2862>.
- Gatti, F., F. Procentese, and A. P. Schouten. 2023. "People-Nearby Applications Use and Local Community Experiences: Disentangling Their Interplay Through a Multilevel, Multiple Informant Approach." *Media Psychology* 26, no. 3: 278–305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2022.2139272>.
- Gatti, F., F. Procentese, and A. P. Schouten. 2026. "Ubiquitous Local Community Experiences: Unravelling the Impact of People-Nearby Applications on Users' Social Capital, Local Involvement, and Sense of Community." *New Media & Society*: 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448251413287>.
- Geissdoerfer, M., P. Savaget, N. M. Bocken, and E. J. Hultink. 2017. "The Circular Economy—A New Sustainability Paradigm?" *Journal of Cleaner Production* 143: 757–768. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.048>.
- Graziano, W. G., M. M. Habashi, D. Evangelou, and I. Ngambeki. 2012. "Orientations and Motivations: Are You a "People Person," a "Thing Person," or Both?" *Motivation and Emotion* 36: 465–477. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-011-9273-2>.
- Graziano, W. G., M. M. Habashi, and A. Woodcock. 2011. "Exploring and Measuring Differences in Person-Thing Orientations." *Personality and Individual Differences* 51, no. 1: 28–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.03.004>.
- Guiot, D., and D. Roux. 2010. "A Second-Hand Shoppers' Motivation Scale: Antecedents, Consequences, and Implications for Retailers." *Journal of Retailing* 86, no. 4: 355–371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2010.08.002>.
- Hair, J. F., W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, and R. E. Anderson. 2010. *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective*. 7th ed. Pearson Educational Inc.
- Halicki, D., P. Zaborek, and G. Meylan. 2024. "Sustainable Fashion Choices: Exploring European Consumer Motivations Behind Second-Hand Clothing Purchases." *Administrative Sciences* 14, no. 8: 174. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14080174>.
- Haryadi, A., J. C. Listyorini, and D. Elsadi. 2025. "A Systematic Literature Review: Exploring Variables and Contextual Applications of the Uses & Gratifications Theory Framework in Digital Media Platforms." *Akselerasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional* 7, no. 3: 14–34. <https://doi.org/10.54783/jin.v7i3.1407>.
- Hassaro, K., and P. Chailom. 2023. "Motives of Social Media Use for Online Marketing: A Uses and Gratification Approach." *International Journal of Computing and Digital Systems* 13, no. 1: 415–425. <https://doi.org/10.12785/ijcds/130134>.
- Hassen, H., and P. Akponah. 2023. "The Intersection of Sustainability and Technology in the Context of the Digital Marketplace." In *The Future of Consumption: How Technology, Sustainability and Wellbeing Will Transform Retail and Customer Experience*, edited by K. Bäckström, C. Egan-Wyer, and E. Samsioe, 21–38. Springer International Publishing.
- Hauser, J. 2011. "A Marketing Science Perspective on Recognition-Based Heuristics (And the Fast-And-Frugal Paradigm)." *Judgment and Decision Making* 6, no. 5: 396–408. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S193029750001352>.
- Haviland-Jones, J., H. Rosario, P. Wilson, and T. McGuire. 2005. "An Environmental Approach to Positive Emotion: Flowers." *Evolutionary Psychology* 3: 104–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147470490500300109>.
- Hu, L. T., and P. M. Bentler. 1999. "Cutoff Criteria for Fit Indexes in Covariance Structure Analysis: Conventional Criteria Versus New Alternatives." *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 6, no. 1: 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>.

- Huang, C. C., Y. M. Wang, T. W. Wu, and P. A. Wang. 2013. "An Empirical Analysis of the Antecedents and Performance Consequences of Using the Moodle Platform." *International Journal of Information and Education Technology* 3, no. 2: 217–221.
- Hur, E. 2020. "Rebirth Fashion: Secondhand Clothing Consumption Values and Perceived Risks." *Journal of Cleaner Production* 273: 122951. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122951>.
- Jacobs, K., and J. Malpas. 2013. "Material Objects, Identity and the Home: Towards a Relational Housing Research Agenda." *Housing, Theory and Society* 30, no. 3: 281–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2013.767281>.
- James, W. 1890. *The Principles of Psychology*. Vol. 1. Henry Holt and Co. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10538-000>.
- Jiménez-Marín, G., A. Galiano-Coronil, and L. B. Tobar-Pesántez. 2022. "Organizational Communication and Social Marketing Strategies Targeting Spanish Consumers of Fashion. Sustainability as a Form of Happiness Management." *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society* 22, no. 3: 506–520. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-05-2021-0187>.
- Katz, E., J. G. Blumler, and M. Gurevitch. 1973. "Uses and Gratifications Research." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 37, no. 4: 509–523.
- Kirchherr, J., D. Reike, and M. Hekkert. 2017. "Conceptualizing the Circular Economy: An Analysis of 114 Definitions." *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 127: 221–232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourcon.2017.09.005>.
- Kline, R. B. 2011. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. Third ed. Guilford Press.
- Ku, Y.-C., T.-H. Chu, and C. H. Tseng. 2013. "Gratifications for Using CMC Technologies: A Comparison Among SNS, IM, and e-Mail." *Computers in Human Behavior* 29: 226–234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.08.009>.
- Lane, R., R. Horne, and J. Bicknell. 2009. "Routes of Reuse of Second-Hand Goods in Melbourne Households." *Australian Geographer* 40, no. 2: 151–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049180902964918>.
- Lanza, S. T., B. C. Bray, and L. M. Collins. 2013. "An Introduction to Latent Class and Latent Transition Analysis." In *Handbook of Psychology*, edited by J. A. Schinka, W. F. Velicer, and I. B. Weiner, 691–716. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118133880.hop202024>.
- Laursen, B. P., and E. Hoff. 2006. "Person-Centered and Variable-Centered Approaches to Longitudinal Data." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 52, no. 3: 377–389. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mpq.2006.0029>.
- Lee, H. H. M. 2017. "In Pursuit of Happiness: Phenomenological Study of the KonMari Decluttering Method." *Advances in Consumer Research* 45: 454–457.
- Liang, J., and Y. Xu. 2018. "Second-Hand Clothing Consumption: A Generational Cohort Analysis of the Chinese Market." *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 42, no. 1: 120–130. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12393>.
- Liu, W., W. Shao, and Q. Wang. 2021. "Psychological Distance From Environmental Pollution and Willingness to Participate in Second-Hand Online Transactions: An Experimental Survey in China." *Journal of Cleaner Production* 281: 124656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124656>.
- Löfgren, O. 2017. "Mess: On Domestic Overflows." *Consumption Markets & Culture* 20, no. 1: 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10253866.2016.1158767>.
- MacCallum, R. C., and J. T. Austin. 2000. "Applications of Structural Equation Modeling in Psychological Research." *Annual Review of Psychology* 51, no. 1: 201–226. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.201>.
- Mallett, S. 2004. "Understanding Home: A Critical Review of the Literature." *Sociological Review* 52, no. 1: 62–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00442.x>.
- Masyn, K. E. 2013. "Latent Class Analysis and Finite Mixture Modeling." In *The Oxford Handbook of Quantitative Methods in Psychology: Vol. 2: Statistical Analysis*, edited by T. D. Little. Oxford Library of Psychology. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199934898.013.0025>.
- McDonagh, P., and A. Prothero. 2014. "Sustainability Marketing Research: Past, Present and Future." *Journal of Marketing Management* 30, no. 11–12: 1186–1219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2014.943263>.
- McIntyre, M. M., and W. G. Graziano. 2019. "A Snapshot of Person and Thing Orientations: How Individual Differences in Interest Manifest in Everyday Life." *Personality and Individual Differences* 136: 160–165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.08.005>.
- McQuail, D., J. G. Blumler, and J. R. Brown. 1972. "The Television Audience: A Revised Perspective." In *Sociology of Mass Communications*, edited by D. McQuail, 135–165. Penguin.
- Menon, D. 2022. "Uses and Gratifications of Educational Apps: A Study During COVID-19 Pandemic." *Computers and Education Open* 3: 100076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2022.100076>.
- Moriuchi, E., and I. Takahashi. 2022. "The Role of Perceived Value, Trust and Engagement in the C2C Online Secondary Marketplace." *Journal of Business Research* 148: 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.04.029>.
- Mullainathan, S., and E. Shafir. 2013. *Scarcity: Why Having Too Little Means So Much*. Macmillan.
- Mullainathan, S., and E. Shafir. 2014. "Freeing UP INTELLIGENCE." *Scientific American Mind* 25, no. 1: 58–63.
- Palomo-Domínguez, I., R. Elías-Zambrano, and V. Álvarez-Rodríguez. 2023. "Gen Z's Motivations Towards Sustainable Fashion and Eco-Friendly Brand Attributes: The Case of Vinted." *Sustainability* 15, no. 11: 8753. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15118753>.
- Patel, D. A., V. Graupmann, and J. R. Ferrari. 2023. "Reactance, Decisional Procrastination, and Hesitation: A Latent Class Analysis of Clutter Behavior." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 20, no. 3: 2061. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20032061>.
- Petitta, L., T. M. Probst, V. Ghezzi, and C. Barbaranelli. 2020. "Economic Stress, Emotional Contagion and Safety Outcomes: A Cross-Country Study." *Work* 66, no. 2: 421–435. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-203182>.
- Piscicelli, L., T. Cooper, and T. Fisher. 2015. "The Role of Values in Collaborative Consumption: Insights From a Product-Service System for Lending and Borrowing in the UK." *Journal of Cleaner Production* 97: 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.07.032>.
- Potting, J., M. P. Hekkert, E. Worrell, and A. Hanemaaijer. 2017. "Circular Economy: Measuring Innovation in the Product Chain." <http://www.pbl.nl/sites/default/files/cms/publicaties/pbl-2016-Circular-economy-measuring-innovation-in-product-chains-2544.pdf>.
- Prilleltensky, I. 2024. "Wellness as Fairness." In *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*, 7713–7716. Springer International Publishing.
- Prohaska, V., D. Celestino, T. Dangleben, P. Sanchez, and A. Sandoval. 2018. "Assessing "Clutter" and Related Constructs With a Non-White, Urban Sample." *Current Psychology* 37: 432–435. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-017-9680-y>.
- Rabbanee, F. K., R. Roy, and M. T. Spence. 2020. "Factors Affecting Consumer Engagement on Online Social Networks: Self-Congruity, Brand Attachment, and Self-Extension Tendency." *European Journal of Marketing* 54, no. 6: 1407–1431. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-03-2018-0221>.
- Rogers, C. J., and R. Hart. 2021. "Home and the Extended-Self: Exploring Associations Between Clutter and Wellbeing." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 73: 101553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2021.101553>.

- Ross, M. Q., and J. B. Bayer. 2021. "Explicating Self-Phones: Dimensions and Correlates of Smartphone Self-Extension." *Mobile Media & Communication* 9, no. 3: 488–512. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2050157920980508>.
- Roster, C. A. 2015. "'Help, I Have Too Much Stuff!': Extreme Possession Attachment and Professional Organizers." *Journal of Consumer Affairs* 49, no. 2: 303–327. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12052>.
- Roster, C. A., and J. R. Ferrari. 2020. "Does Work Stress Lead to Office Clutter, and How? Mediating Influences of Emotional Exhaustion and Indecision." *Environment and Behavior* 52, no. 9: 923–944. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916518823041>.
- Roster, C. A., and J. R. Ferrari. 2023. "Having Less: A Personal Project Taxonomy of Consumers' Decluttering Orientations, Motives and Emotions." *Journal of Consumer Affairs* 57, no. 1: 264–295. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12499>.
- Roster, C. A., J. R. Ferrari, and M. P. Jurkat. 2016. "The Dark Side of Home: Assessing Possession 'Clutter' on Subjective Well-Being." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 46: 32–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2016.03.003>.
- Ryan, R. M., and E. L. Deci. 2001. "On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being." *Annual Review of Psychology* 52, no. 1: 141–166. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141>.
- Saxbe, D. E., and R. Repetti. 2010. "No Place Like Home: Home Tours Correlate With Daily Patterns of Mood and Cortisol." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 36, no. 1: 71–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167209352864>.
- Seamon, D. 2014. "Physical and Virtual Environments: Meaning of Place and Space." In *Willard & Spackman's Occupational Therapy*, edited by B. A. Schell, G. Gillen, M. Scaffa, and E. S. Cohn, 202–215. Wolters Kluwer Health.
- Sekhona, A. K., and L. Leontieva. 2023. "The Impact of Hoarding Disorder on Family Members, Especially the Significant Other." *Cureus* 15, no. 9: e45871. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.45871>.
- Shah, A. K., E. Shafir, and S. Mullainathan. 2015. "Scarcity Frames Value." *Psychological Science* 26, no. 4: 402–412. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614563958>.
- Shah, A. K., J. Zhao, S. Mullainathan, and E. Shafir. 2018. "Money in the Mental Lives of the Poor." *Social Cognition* 36, no. 1: 4–19. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2018.36.1.4>.
- Sheth, J. N., N. K. Sethia, and S. Srinivas. 2011. "Mindful Consumption: A Customer-Centric Approach to Sustainability." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 39: 21–39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-010-0216-3>.
- Sigmon, S. T., S. R. Whitcomb, and C. R. Snyder. 2002. "Psychological Home." In *Psychological Sense of Community: Research, Applications, and Implications*, edited by A. T. Fisher, C. C. Sonn, and B. J. Bishop, 25–40. Plenum.
- Singh, S., and I. A. Zolkepli. 2018. "New Wave in Mobile Commerce Adoption via Mobile Applications in Malaysian Market: Investigating the Relationship Between Consumer Acceptance, Trust, and Self Efficacy." *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (iJIM)* 12, no. 7: 112. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v12i7.8964>.
- Statista. 2021. "Reasons for Consumers in Selected European Countries to Buy More Second-Hand Items Online as of 2021." <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1308182/reasons-european-consumers-buy-more-secondhand/>.
- Statista. 2022. "Drivers of Secondhand Consumption Worldwide in 2022." <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1235030/secondhand-consumption-reasons-worldwide/>.
- Statista. 2023. "Reasons Consumers Purchased Second-Hand Clothing in Selected European Countries in 2023." <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1418668/second-hand-clothing-purchase-motivation-europe/?srsltid=AfmBOorB33sSV2XjLzRWCqehFKJIAFJowR3ggNLWdj0ZlithCQFIOFFP>.
- Swanson, H. L., and J. R. Ferrari. 2022. "Older Adults and Clutter: Age Differences in Clutter Impact, Psychological Home, and Subjective Well-Being." *Behavioral Science* 12, no. 5: 132. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12050132>.
- Tein, J. Y., S. Coxe, and H. Cham. 2013. "Statistical Power to Detect the Correct Number of Classes in Latent Profile Analysis." *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 20, no. 4: 640–657. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2013.824781>.
- Thacher, P., S. Onyper, and J. Tuthill. 2017. "Decluttering the Bedroom as a Possible Sleep Hygiene Step to Improve Sleep Quality." *Sleep* 40, no. suppl_1: A138–A139. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sleepj/zsx050.372>.
- The Culture Factor. n.d. "Country Comparison Tool." <https://www.theculturefactor.com/country-comparison-tool?countries=>.
- Thompson, S. C. G., and M. A. Barton. 1994. "Ecocentric and Anthropocentric Attitudes Toward the Environment." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 14, no. 2: 149–157. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944\(05\)80168-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944(05)80168-9).
- Venhoeven, L. A., J. W. Bolderdijk, and L. Steg. 2013. "Explaining the Paradox: How Proenvironmental Behaviour Can Both Thwart and Foster Well-Being." *Sustainability* 5, no. 4: 1372–1386. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su5041372>.
- Webster, K. 2015. *The Circular Economy: A Wealth of Flows*. Ellen MacArthur Foundation.
- Wei, R., and V. H. Lo. 2006. "Staying Connected While on the Move: Cell Phone Use and Social Connectedness." *New Media & Society* 8, no. 1: 53–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444806059870>.
- Williams, G. A., and F. Kibowski. 2016. "Latent Class Analysis and Latent Profile Analysis." In *Handbook of Methodological Approaches to Community-Based Research: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods*, edited by L. A. Jason and D. S. Glenwick, vol. 15, 143–151. Oxford University Press.
- Zhang, L., Z. Shao, J. Benitez, and R. Zhang. 2023. "How to Improve User Engagement and Retention in Mobile Payment: A Gamification Affordance Perspective." *Decision Support Systems* 168: 113941. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2023.113941>.
- Zhao, J., and B. M. Tumm. 2017. "Attentional Trade-Offs Under Resource Scarcity." In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 10285, 78–97. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58625-0_6.
- Zhao, J., and B. M. Tumm. 2018. "Psychological Responses to Scarcity." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Psychology*, 1–21. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190236557013.41>.