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Hypotheses

Are there relations between the medias and ecocitizenship?
- What type of links between media exposure and ecocitizenship?
- Are the media able to influence environmental practices in the domestic or the political sphere?
- If so, is this influence the same for the different kinds of media, as TV, radio, newspaper, Internet,…

There are few hypotheses concerning this question.
- Downs (1972): the mass media make up spreading organs at the social movements disposal.
- Bourdieu (1996): the media make up a frame in which opinions, attitudes and practices are embedded.
  - Concepts of legitimacy, symbolic power, meta-capital (Couldry, 2003)
  - Non-bourdieusian concepts of acceptability (of public policies) (Steg & alii, 2005)

Note: These 2 hypotheses aim to explain attitudes, but not practices.
So difficult problem => work in progress.
Method

- Data: *European Social Survey* (ESS-2002-2003)
- 20 European countries.
- Samples with at least 1000 individuals for each country.
- 42359 Europeans surveyed.
Definitions: concepts and indicators

Ecocitizenship: 2 types of ecocitizens according to the social frame of their commitment:

Collectively committed into a environmental organization: belonging, donator, participant, or voluntary working,…
- They act inside a sociopolitical frame.
- They are typical of the modern era of organization, with restricting social links.
- Indicators (ESS): Question E7:
  “For each of the voluntary organisations I will now mention, please use this card to tell me whether any of these things apply to you now or in the last 12 months, and, if so, which.
  None,
  Member
  participated
  donated money
  done a voluntary work
  …an organisation for environmental protection, peace or animal rights?“

Individually committed:
- They act inside the market world.
- They are typical of the postmodern era.
- Indicators (ESS): Question B22
  "There are different ways of trying to improve things in [country] or help prevent things from going wrong. During the last 12 months, have you done any of the following?"
  "Deliberately bought certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons“ Yes - No
  "Deliberately boycotted certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons“ Yes - No
Ecocitizenship in European Countries

Nordic countries (+ Germany and Austria) have the highest level of ecocitizenship, as far as environmental bought or boycott, membership and donation, in short market acting.

But some countries have a higher level of organization participation, principally Austria (6% of organization participation), and also Belgium (4%), Germany, United Kingdom, France or Ireland (3%): that is an other way of citizenship based on sociopolitical practices.

Eastern and Mediterranean European countries have the lowest levels of ecocitizenship in general.

These differential ways of citizenship seem to be linked to political culture (Bozonnet & Jacquiot 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Voluntary work</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Donation</th>
<th>Boycott</th>
<th>Bought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Ecocitizenship index

Building an ecocitizenship cumulative index by adding the five items of previous questions:

- Bought ecologically friendly products
- Boycotted products for ecological or political reasons
- Membership of an environmental organisation
- Donation to such an organisation
- Participated to such an organisation
- Done voluntary work for it

* This index has 6 positions may be transformed

Into another index with 20 positions, in order to obtain average out of 20.

- Into a binary variable (in order to calculate logistical regression)

3. No environmental action
4. At least one environmental action.
1. Media exposure: Indicators

ESS questions:

- “On an average weekday, how much time, in total, do you spend
  • watching television?
  • listening to the radio?
  • reading the newspapers?”

- “How often do you use the internet, the World Wide Web or e-mail – whether at home or at work – for your personal use? On an average weekday, how much time, in total, do you spend

See media exposure for each European country
Average weekly number of Internet uses in Europe

Internet use clearly involves a **geographical divide**:

- Northern countries in the lead with the highest mean of Internet practice;
- Southern and oriental countries at the back.
- In the middle, come France, United Kingdom, Belgium.
I

Are There Correlations Between Ecocitizenship and Media Exposure?
Ecocitizenship index according to TV looking
(average number of hours by weekday)

The more the Europeans look at TV, the less there are ecologically committed.
Ecocitizenship index according to radio listening
(Average number of hours by weekday)

Radio listening in general has **little significance**, compared with ecocitizenship.
Those who never listen to radio are much less committed than others. Why? Public disinterest?
Ecocitizenship index according to newspapers reading
(Average number of hours by weekday)

Newspapers reading is **regularly correlated to ecocitizenship**: the more the Europeans read newspapers, the more they are ecologically committed. “Gutenberg galaxy”? 
Ecocitizenship index according to personal Internet use (Average number of times)

At last, Internet is the media with the highest correlation to ecocitizenship.
First discussion

- These correlations are confirmed inside almost every **the 20 European countries.** (=> See the correlations?)

- Correlations between media exposure and ecocitizenship are **contradictory:** Ecocitizenship **is increasing** in direct ratio to **newspapers** reading and Internet use; conversely, it **decreases** as duration of TV’s exposure.

- Now, there is **no evidence to think that some media contents will be more or less ecologically oriented than others.**

- Therefore:

  … these correlations are based **not on the content of the media, but on their form.** Medium is message! (Mac Luhan)

  …there is a **hierarchy in the form of the media** regarding ecocitizenship, from the less ecologically friendly as TV, to the most as Internet.

- Consequently these correlations are **not relevant with Down’s and Bourdieu’s theses, concerning practices.**

  (to learn more about the deficiency of Bourdieu’theory, click there)
Are these correlations true?

Correlation is not causality. Maybe these correlations are illusions.

Example: Links between Internet use and ecocitizenship may be fake, due to the real fact that ecocitizens are younger or wealthier, and consequently use more the Internet.

So, before interpreting these correlations, we have to control them by other variables, especially sociodemographics as age, household income, education level,…

…thanks to a logistical regression: factors are studied ceteris paribus.
II

Medias Influence Among Other Factors: Toward New Hypotheses
### Logistical Regression: Significant Sociodemographic Variables by Ecocitizenship Index (1st part) (p > 0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Signif.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal high</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not completed primary education</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or first stage of basic</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower secondary or second stage of basic</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post secondary, non-tertiary</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First stage of tertiary</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second stage of tertiary</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area in Europe: political national culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d quartile</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d quartile</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th quartile</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24 years</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39 years</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59 years</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years and +</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Logistical Regression: Significant Medias Variables by Ecocitizenship index (2d part: continuation) (p > 0,05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Signif.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal use of internet</strong></td>
<td>No access at home or work</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never use</td>
<td>0,16</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>0,55</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>0,61</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>0,54</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>0,53</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>0,68</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>0,61</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newspaper reading, total time on average weekday</strong></td>
<td>No time at all</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 0,5 hour</td>
<td>0,16</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,5 hour to 1 hour</td>
<td>0,24</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 1 hour</td>
<td>0,31</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TV watching, total time on average weekday</strong></td>
<td>Less than 0,5 hour</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,5 hour to 2 hour</td>
<td>-0,17</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 2 hours</td>
<td>-0,34</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second discussion

All in all, there are undeniable correlations between ecocitizenship and media exposure. But these relations are slight:

- Internet use increases twofold chances of ecocitizenship,
- … newspaper reading increases them by one third,
- … and watching TV cut them by one third.

How these relations work?
They are linked to cognitive mobilization...

The weakening of relations between media exposure and ecocitizenship (from raw data) is principally due to the influence of education level and political culture of each European country.

Now, these fields implies two major hypotheses:

- **Cognitive mobilization**: education \(\Rightarrow\) open-mindedness + ability to militate…
- **Propensity to act personally**, linked to political culture.

As a result, these two hypotheses can also explain the correlation between media exposure and ecocitizenship: the media complete education and cultural influences.

What is exactly this link?

- Because of their content, media likely add to cognitive mobilization: widening of consciousness, opening up to public debate, and therefore “civic literacy” (Milner, 2002).
- But it is not enough: cognitive mobilization cannot explain differential influence of medias on ecocitizenship. So we must go further and consider their anthropological side.
...and to the physical and anthropological side of media

Each of these relations implies a specific social morphology, more or less favourable to autonomous individual action (Leroi-Gourhan, 1965).

- Newspaper reading or radio listening appeals only one sense, either view or hearing: that gives a large way for personal interpretation.
- Conversely TV watching appeals these two senses, and does not give way for imagination or interpretation, and consequently for individual initiative or action.
- In the same way, Internet use makes interaction possible for the users, and therefore individual initiative.

Moreover, reading implies

- need of attention,
- possibility of slowness (the reader imposes his own tempo),
- possibility of linear analysis
- possibility of step backwards.

So it furthers thought, and detachment necessary to cognitive mobilization and individual and critical action (Gutenberg Galaxy)

In the end, these anthropological explanations make up a rough sketch for hypotheses likely to give an account of the hierarchy of media, as for their relation to ecocitizenship.
...Completing the VBN theory

Theses results about the media, are consistent with VBN theory of environmentalism (Steg & alii), concerning the moving from personal values to environmental practices.

VBN theory confines analysis to personal attitude or opinion level, without reference to institutions shaping them.

We propose here to add two major institutions which improve the analysis of attitudes inside the VBN model.
Conclusion

The media influence is often overestimated by common sense, and even by scholars or pundits.

In fact, our results show that globally, media have a real but slight influence, compared to heavy factors as education and political culture specific to each European country.

A deeper analysis shows that the principle of the media influence is not very different of these latter factors: it is based essentially on cognitive mobilisation.

These results for ecocitizenship are rather similar to those for political and civic literacy in general. They should be extended to other forms of citizenship, as defence of human rights, immigrants or consumers, charities, humanitarian action, …
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ANNEXES
Media Exposure in European Countries
(Average number of current information hours at TV, radio or newspapers)

Reading political news in newspapers is the most significant point, and the most relevant with other indicators as listening to radio as well as looking at TV.

Trend-setting links appear between Northern European countries, more interesting in media information, and Southern and Eastern countries.
## Media exposure by ecocitizenship index in Europe (p > 0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>TV watching, total time on average weekday * Ecocitizenship index</th>
<th>tvtot3 * Ecocitizenship index</th>
<th>Radio listening, total time on average weekday * Ecocitizenship index</th>
<th>Radio listening, news/politics/ current affairs on average weekday * Ecocitizenship index</th>
<th>Newspaper reading, total time on average weekday * Ecocitizenship index</th>
<th>Newspaper reading, politics/current affairs on average weekday * Ecocitizenship index</th>
<th>Personal use of internet/email/web * Ecocitizenship index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07 ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.08 ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.06 0.07</td>
<td>0.06 ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09 ns</td>
<td>0.09 ns</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.1 ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.1 ns</td>
<td>0.09 ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07 ns</td>
<td>0.12 ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08 ns</td>
<td>0.08 ns</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08 ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.08 ns</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.1 ns</td>
<td>0.13 ns</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07 ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08 ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.09 ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.07 ns</td>
<td>0.08 ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.08 ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why they are not relevant?

What about **Downs’ thesis**?
- Supposing media influence on environmental opinion is true, it is not verified on practices, because with a similar content, these ones are opposing according to the types of media.

What about **Bourdieu’s thesis**?
- Supposing the media, under State’s thumb, offer a legitimacy (or acceptability) framework for ecocitizenship promoted by authorities, this legitimacy remains at an ideological level; the theory cannot explain why this influence is contradictory according to the media.
Education level

Education is **by far the most important** factor explaining ecocitizenship: European the most educated have 8 times more chances to be committed than the less.

How does this factor work?

Environmentalism is principally acquired in the scope of **high school (or college)** education by **cognitive mobilisation** (Inglehart, 1970). This socialization process works as following...

- **Extension of general understanding**, and therefore ecological awareness, (Bozonnet, Jacquiot, 1998)
- **Exposition to political struggles** during young age, particularly environmentalism (Goul Andersen, 1990)
- In short, socialization is carried out by **teachers** and by **peers**.
Areas in Europe: political national culture

This geographical variable is the second most important one. There is a gap between Mediterranean or Oriental countries, and Occidental or Nordic countries: the latter have 5 times more chances to be environmentally committed than the former.

The cause of this cleavage does not lie in the wealth of nations (GDP):

- the correlation is true “ceteris paribus”, i.e. all things being equal, and the household income being neutralized.

The explication is most likely to refer to different political national cultures in each European country.

- These ones are linked to different public policies in each country (different in North/West and South/East)
- …and inherited from religion.
  - countries rooted in Protestantism, principally in northern Europe, emphasize personal responsibility, especially towards political action; which is why individuals have more propensity to be environmentally committed.
  - …countries rooted in Catholicism, (mainly in Mediterranean Europe), place the responsibility on the public institutions, especially the State: they rely on the latter and don’t think about personal action, which is not legitimate.
Household Income

Contrary to the apparent correlations, household income has little influence on ecocitizenship: at the most the third quartile amount to 1.42. Why?

- Simple correlations with income reveal in actual fact:
  - The influence of education level: higher educated people, who are more environmentalist, are also wealthier.
  - The cultural influence of Northern and Occidental countries, which are more environmentalist ...and have a higher GDP.

- Moreover, this residue of correlation is likely due to a survey artifact: correlation is blurred by indicators as ecological bought and donation, included in ecocitizenship index.

Incidentally, the 1st thesis of Inglehart (1995) (borrowed from Maslow), claiming that environmentalism is an effect of affluent society, seems invalidated, and objections raised by Dunlap (1995, 1997) confirmed.
Age

Age has very little influence on ecocitizenship.

– At the most, we discover that 40-59 age bracket, shows a little more (1.21) ecocitizenship than others: that is the effect of ecological movements of the seventies and eighties.

In fact, the apparent age influence in the simple correlations comes from the higher education level among youngsters.

These data invalidate the age effect, often put forward to explain environmentalism.
Personal Use of Internet: E-mail & Web

Simple correlation with Internet use is rather reduced by logistical regression; but it remains clearly correlated to ecocitizenship: those who use it have twice more chances to be committed than others (even if these latter have an Internet access without using).

That is not the intensity of using which has influence, but the using itself, whatever the length.
Newspaper reading: total time on average weekday

In spite of the logistical regression, newspaper reading keeps a little influence: those who spend more than 1 hour on average weekday have 1.37 chances more to be environmentally committed.

The previous simple correlation has been diminished by incorporating education level in the logistical regression.
**TV watching, total time on average weekday**

Despite the logistical regression, TV *watching keeps also a modest influence*: those who watch more than 2 hours on average weekday have 0.71 chances less to be committed than non-watchers.

The simple correlation has been strongly reduced: that is the effect of taking education level into consideration. The lower educated are more TV addicts than others.