

<div class="logo logo-mobile"> [1]</sup>. However, the percentage of households with children is much higher (almost half of the sample, compared to 35% nationally). The majority of respondents are women (66%), a common bias in other studies conducted during the lockdown^[2]. The most represented group is 36-to-55-year-olds (53%), which corresponds to working ages.

Logically, there is a strong over-representation of working adults (74%, compared to 63% at the national level). The lack of students (3% vs. 10% nationally) is a reflection

of the geographical areas where the survey was conducted, further compounded by the fact that urban students who went to their parents' rural home for the lockdown were intentionally excluded. There is also an over-representation of retirees (14% vs. 7% nationally) which doesn't appear in other lockdown surveys. This is due to the fact they are usually heavily present in rural areas and also more willing to respond to surveys. Finally, the unemployed and other inactive individuals are under-represented (6%, compared to 19% nationally).

The analysis of socio-professional categories shows that higher-ranking intellectual and artistic professions are over-represented, which is a classic bias of online surveys. Employees are also over-represented, while farmers, craftsmen, traders, entrepreneurs, intermediate occupations and factory workers are under-represented. This distribution partly reflects the heterogeneity of lockdown situations according to socio-professional categories, and the unequal availability of time during this particular situation. As a result, the social categories that were the most able to respond to the survey were those that engaged the most in telework.

Key results

This synthesis of the results is based on three entries: the expected elements, the main surprises and the open questions.

The main elements confirmed

As in many other online studies, the share of socio-professional categories who enjoy Internet access is over-represented. And while the lockdown caused an increase in the use of digital tools, the fact that many essential workers continued working outside of the home limited the dissemination of the survey in some areas. The serious inequalities revealed by the lockdown tended therefore to be tempered here, as in many other surveys. The results must be interpreted with this in mind: the full diversity of opinions and experiences of the lockdown isn't accounted for.

At the same time, the very definition of the respondent's geographical affiliation is subject to interpretation. This old debate on the boundary between the urban and rural is pervasive in the answers and will merit further study. Nevertheless, the vast majority clearly identifies the countryside as a favorable environment to be in during lockdown. Having easy access to nature, space, and a garden is overwhelmingly

viewed as an advantage, but despite what people might think, not all respondents could benefit from it. Indeed, for some, the restriction on accessing open nature was particularly tough.

Although not representative, our survey confirms inequalities that were uncovered in how people experienced the lockdown. People's situation with respect to employment during the lockdown was strongly linked to their socio-professional category: while 80% of the management-level civil servants and intellectual and artistic professions that were interrogated were teleworking, factory workers and employees were much more exposed to partial unemployment (45% and 48% respectively), while private practice professionals and business leaders mainly suffered from reduced activity.

Overall, people felt that they handled the lockdown pretty well (the proposed scale ranged from 1 - very negative experience, to 10 - very positive experience). Indeed, the most selected modalities were 7/8/9, for almost 60% of respondents. Less than 20% chose one of the modalities ranging from 1 (very negative) to 5. However, there are significant differences according to employment situation, which in turn impacts how people perceive the future and influences how they experience the lockdown. Among those who are employed, a third reported not fearing the future, while another third feared for their job. The analysis of the socio-professional categories reveals that those who are the most worried are craftspeople, traders and related workers, followed by factory workers and employees, and private practice professionals. In contrast, civil servants are the least worried, while managers and intermediate occupations have mixed feelings. The analysis found a very significant and positive correlation between people who are worried about the future and those who are in a situation of partial unemployment or reduced/lost activity; the same correlation is observed between people who are confident about the future and those who are teleworking or whose job situation hasn't changed. This perception of the future is then strongly correlated to how positively/negatively one experiences the lockdown.

Similarly, people aged 55-65 had a better experience of the lockdown than those aged 18-25, and those who spent the lockdown with family likewise had a better experience than single people.

The lockdown caused a massive reduction of mobility. As a result, the average weekly mileage was reduced more than six fold. Trips became both rarer and shorter. This situation didn't result in a massive modal shift, but it's worth noting that many

respondents walked a lot more, which is something people more usually do for short distance trips in urban areas. The use of cars, on the other hand, sharply decreased: while before, 50% of respondents used their car every day, only 4.5% did so during lockdown. Conversely, while only 7% used it less than once a week before the lockdown, this share rose to 29%. The proportion of people who report never using it also increased threefold (from 4 to 12%). However, it should be noted that, contrary to what occurred in cities, while people used their cars less, they didn't use their bicycles more. Indeed, overall the use of bikes also decreased: while 26% of respondents used it one or more times a week before the lockdown, this proportion decreased by ten points, while those who "never" use a bike rose from 50% to 71%. Three reasons can explain this decline in cycling: first, teleworking eliminated many trips for certain categories of the population that would otherwise likely be using their bicycle on a daily basis^[^3]. Secondly, in the countryside, bicycles are mainly used for leisure activities^[^4], which were not one of the authorized reasons for going outside, while cars are perceived as the ultimate mode of transportation^[^5]. Finally, the government's inconsistencies and uncertainties^[^6] regarding cycling discouraged any widespread modal shift.

For respondents, the main challenge they reported was maintaining a normal social life. In rural areas in particular, sociability requires various mobilities that couldn't be compensated for through the massive development of digital tools. It should also be noted that few respondents expressed a desire to maintain such high levels of digital use. Indeed, while 38% of respondents reported being part of an online conversation group, only 13% wanted it to continue after the lockdown. Conversely, 48% of respondents claimed that neighborhood solidarity initiatives were positive innovations that emerged during the lockdown and that should remain for the long term. Because of the particular situation caused by travel restrictions and more broadly the questioning of the economic system and its resilience, there has also been a strong demand for greater consumption of local products: just over half (56%) of the respondents said they bought more local products, citing mainly solidarity initiatives with producers (59% of respondents). This shift occurred in a context of greater solidarity and with the emergence of new forms of local relations, and the vast majority of people want these changes to endure. It's worth noting also that delivery services weren't very popular: 65% reported never using them. Similarly, drive-throughs were cited by 39% of respondents, but only 23% want them to continue. This clearly reveals a desire for spatial proximity but also for a physical

<div class="logo logo-mobile">

[^1]: Insee, 2012. [^2]: Bourdeau-Lepage Lise, Le confinement et ses effets sur le quotidien, 2020 ; Bès et al., Enquête Vie en Confinement, 2020. [^3]:

<https://theconversation.com/le-velo-peut-il-se-developper-hors-des-grandes-villes->

131982 [^4]: <https://www.banquedesterritoires.fr/le-velo-est-lactivite-physique-preferee-des-francais> [^5]: Hubert Jean-Paul, Pistre Pierre, Madre Jean-Loup, « L'utilisation de l'automobile par les ménages dans les territoires peu denses : analyse croisée par les enquêtes sur la mobilité et le Recensement de la population », Economie et Statistiques, 2016, p.179-203. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01313813> [^6]: https://www.bfmtv.com/auto/peut-on-faire-du-velo-pendant-le-confinement_AN-202004180034.html

Chapô

The lockdown and its strict restrictions on people's movements led many French people to live and organize themselves differently, especially in rural areas where mobility is a crucial resource. This study, which is part of a larger project, aimed to understand the impact of this unprecedented situation. How did people in rural areas experience this restriction of their movements? Did the lockdown foster the emergence of new aspirations in terms of rhythms of life and mobility, as it did for people living in cities?

Envoyer une notification

Désactivé

Thématique

Cars / motorcycles

Aspirations

Living environments

Change in practices

Proximity

Rhythms of everyday life

Crises

Work