

1 **Introduction**

2

3 By 2030, more than 60% (4.98 billion) of the estimated world population (8.27 billion) will
4 live in cities (United Nations Population Division, 2001). In Europe, urban areas account for 25%
5 of land cover and 70% of the human population (European Environment Agency, 2006). Given that
6 urban areas have extraordinarily large and complex ecological footprints, with considerable direct
7 and indirect effects on surrounding natural ecosystems (Alberti et al., 2003), local strategies for
8 sustainable urban development have become important for global sustainability. Huang et al. (1998:
9 23) define a sustainable city as an “ecopolis rich in natural resources and biodiversity, safe, healthy
10 and liveable, and with high economic vitality and efficiency of energy use”. These concepts
11 correspond to three dimensions - social, economic, and ecological - which must be combined to
12 ensure a sustainable future.

13 To manage progress toward sustainable urban development, it is essential to develop
14 suitable indicators, one of which is the quality and quantity of green spaces and related elements in
15 the city (Huang et al., 1998; Schauman and Salisbury, 1998; Chiesura, 2004). We define green
16 spaces as pieces of vegetated land within or adjoining an urban area, including parks, gardens,
17 natural or semi-natural areas, green corridors, and other functional green areas (Scottish
18 Greenspace, 2008). Green spaces provide numerous physical, psychological, and recreational
19 benefits (Attwell, 2000; Eliasson, 2000; Millard, 2000; Gómez et al., 2001). Residents appreciate
20 their existence in a neighbourhood, and this is reflected in higher property prices (Tyrväinen, 1997;
21 Tyrväinen and Miettinen, 2000). Urban green spaces have intrinsic ecological value; they often
22 have a variety of habitat types, which allows for high species diversity, including rare and
23 threatened species (Caula et al., 2003; Caula, 2007; Chace and Walsh, 2006). However, high
24 human density in cities and the consequent social needs for spaces for recreation, building and
25 transportation, for example, make urban nature conservation difficult.

26 Fernandez-Juricic & Jokimäki (2001) point out that the public’s involvement in
27 environmental issues should be used as a great resource to tackle conservation problems. Urban

1 landscape problems could be viewed as a considerable opportunity to increase the public's
2 participation in the conservation of urban wildlife and natural habitats (Savard et al., 2000). For
3 example, seeking to improve and integrate existing urban environmental policies, the European
4 Union (Europa, 2008), in consultation with experts and citizens, aims to increase quality of life in
5 cities and to implement sustainable urban development through its 6th Environment Action
6 Programme.

7 The European Union's Thematic Urban Strategy (Europa, 2008) encourages an integrative
8 approach to landscape planning that considers social, economic, and environmental issues.
9 Regarding urban green spaces, this strategy focuses on reducing urban sprawl and loss of natural
10 habitats as well as raising citizens' awareness of these issues. This urban policy can be strengthened
11 by local stakeholders' initiatives. Although still not ratified by all the European Union member
12 states, the Lisbon treaty (Europa, 2007), through its Citizens' Initiative, allows citizens to bring
13 forward policy proposals to the European Commission. One could imagine that citizens or civil
14 society organisations could promote initiatives for the management of urban green spaces.

15 The main purpose of a conservation strategy for urban green spaces should be to restore the
16 link between people and nature which would offer urban people more possibilities to learn about
17 their immediate natural environment. Such endeavours would certainly benefit human well-being
18 and wildlife conservation (Fernandez-Juricic and Jokimäki, 2001). It would involve assessing how
19 people perceive those urban natural green spaces and the surrounding wildlife.

20 Regarding the ecological value of urban green, most studies on urban wildlife have focused
21 on birds (Marzluff, 2001; Chase and Walsh, 2006), as birds have characteristics that make them
22 good biodiversity indicators; they have a stable taxonomy, are subject to standardized techniques
23 for survey and sampling, and have high popularity among the public (Vuorisalo et al., 2001;
24 Clergeau et al., 2001). Since studies on bird communities are available for more and more cities
25 (see Kelcey and Rheinwald, 2000; Marzluff, 2001; Chase and Walsh, 2006), we used baseline
26 ecological information on birds to find out whether people's opinions on natural urban green spaces

1 changed when we gave them information about the importance of these areas for wildlife
2 conservation (Caula et al., 2008).

3 Thus, this paper aims to explore people's preferences toward natural urban green spaces and
4 to determine how those preferences are influenced by attitudes, socio-economic factors, and
5 knowledge about the capacity of green spaces to sustain urban avifauna. In this paper we want to
6 address the following questions: (1) what is resident's willingness to contribute financially to two
7 types of projects for urban green spaces? (2) how do people's attitudes and socio-economic
8 characteristics affect this willingness? and (3) is this willingness affected by the knowledge that
9 natural green spaces are important for bird conservation?

10

11 **Method**

12

13 *Study area*

14

15 Our study site is the city of Montpellier (population 244,500) in southern France (43°40'N,
16 3°50'E). This choice is relevant for our objectives because it is located in the Mediterranean basin
17 which is one of the 25 global biodiversity hotspots (Myers et al., 2000). Furthermore, Montpellier
18 has one of the fastest urban growth rates in France, at 1.88%/year between 1990 and 1999
19 (Groupement de la Statistique Publique, 2003). Montpellier covers about 5,700 ha, of which 741 ha
20 are public green spaces. Montpellier has an average of 33 m² of urban green space/inhabitant,
21 compared to 20 m² for all of France, 17 m² for Spain, and 15 m² for Italy (Staners and Bordeaux,
22 1995). The combination of high biodiversity value and rapid urban development make Montpellier
23 an appropriate study area for a socio-ecological evaluation of public green spaces. In Montpellier,
24 green spaces consist of natural habitats, public parks and squares, public and private gardens,
25 wooded areas, tree-lined streets and tramways, cultivated areas, and green areas surrounding public
26 or industrial buildings, shopping malls, sports facilities, and cemeteries. The following ten species
27 represent 82% of the tree cover in the city: *Platanus hybrida* Brot. (36%), *Pinus pinea* L. (10%),

1 *Celtis australis* L. (9%), *Arecaceae* (Palmaceae) (7%), *Sophora japonica* L. (6%), *Melia azedarach*
2 L. (4%), *Robinia pseudoacacia* L. (3%), *Quercus ilex ilex* L. (2%), *Acer negundo* L. (2%), and
3 *Morus kagayamae* Koidz. (2%) (Bourgery, 1996). Most of these species are exotic ornamentals.

4 There is a growing knowledge of communities in the urban Montpellier landscape (Caula,
5 2007; Caula et al., 2008). Sixty-one bird species have been recorded in Montpellier and can be
6 clustered into three groups: (1) species characteristic of areas with a high proportion of buildings,
7 such as *Columba livia*, *Passer domesticus*, *Larus cachinnans*, and *Phoenicurus ochruros*; (2)
8 species associated with a mixture of buildings and gardens, such as *Sylvia melanocephala*, *Sylvia*
9 *atricapilla*, *Parus major*, *Parus ater*, *Carduelis carduelis*, *Phoenicurus phoenicurus*, and
10 *Phylloscopus trochilus*; and (3) species typical of green spaces embedded in the urban matrix:
11 *Alectoris rufa*, *Falco tinnunculus*, and *Corvus monedula* were closely associated with urban
12 farmland areas, and *Erithacus rubecula*, *Fringilla coelebs*, *Turdus merula*, *Garrulus glandarius*,
13 and *Luscinia megarhynchos* were abundant in woodlands.

14

15 *Questionnaire design*

16

17 Our aim was to explore the contribution of attitudes, socio-economic factors, and
18 information on urban bird conservation toward preferences and willingness to financially contribute
19 to green spaces in Montpellier. Researchers have examined the link between public attitudes, the
20 provision of information, and valuation measures (Blamey 1998); environmental attitudes are
21 correlated with willingness to pay (Kotchen and Reiling, 2000). On the other hand, public attitudes
22 and willingness to pay measured with the Contingent Valuation Method (CVM) could be affected
23 by information provided in the questionnaire (Raybould, 2005). While we used the CVM (Carson,
24 2000), and suggested different amounts of money in order to assess people's willingness to
25 contribute financially, we did not try to estimate the economic value of this environmental good. In
26 terms of advantages, the CVM is simple, flexible, widely used, and easy to analyze
27 (Venkatachalam, 2004). In terms of disadvantages, critics are concerned about the validity and

1 reliability of CVM results, along with impacts of several potential biases and errors
2 (Venkatachalam, 2004).

3 Our questionnaire included information on the type and amount of green spaces in
4 Montpellier and allowed respondents to fill in answers themselves. We drafted two versions. In the
5 first, the “experimental questionnaire”, we provided information on the possible negative effects of
6 the loss of urban green spaces on avifauna; in the second, the “control questionnaire”, this
7 information was not included.

8 The questionnaire (Appendix 1) comprised three parts. First, we asked attitudinal questions
9 about the importance of green spaces and fauna in Montpellier. Variables of this type have proven
10 to be as strong as socio-economic variables in explaining the variability of willingness to contribute
11 financially (Spash et al., 2006). Second, we asked several standard demographic and socio-
12 economic questions. Third, we elicited valuation of two different scenarios for increasing green
13 spaces in Montpellier. We gave clear information about the types and percentage of green spaces in
14 Montpellier, followed by two questions on whether or not the amount of green spaces in
15 Montpellier should be increased. If the person wished to increase green spaces in Montpellier, we
16 presented two hypothetical scenarios for increasing: (1) the natural scenario, with green spaces for
17 leisure, where the natural landscape is conserved and most of the natural vegetation remains intact,
18 and (2) the ornamental scenario, where natural landscape is replaced by a new landscape that
19 resembles an urban square with big ornamental trees and decorative exotic plant species. We
20 explained that financial support was required for one year, due to the scarcity of local council
21 funding. Then we asked respondents what they preferred in terms of proportion of each green space
22 type (five categories from 100% natural to 100% ornamental, with 25% increments); their
23 willingness to contribute financially (WTCF; dichotomous variable: yes or no); and, in the case of a
24 positive answer, how many Euros they would contribute for each. We use a multiple choice format
25 by providing 10 options, ranging from 1 to >30 EUR/month. We used WTCF to determine a
26 respondents’ level interest in helping to increase green spaces, as opposed to willingness to pay
27 which is more often used to estimate economic value.

1

2 *Sampling and survey method*

3

4 The Montpellier municipality has a network of 27 local cultural centers (23 of which were
5 active). These “common houses” (locally known as “Maison pour tous”) are spatially distributed
6 according to population density. These municipal structures host socio-cultural activities (e.g.,
7 sports, music, and games), which are often managed by local associations. Since people of diverse
8 age, social, and educational backgrounds go to these centers, they were suitable to obtain a random
9 sample. A pilot test was conducted in four centers.

10 From 4 May to 19 June 2006, we left 30 questionnaires (15 control and 15 experimental), in
11 each of the 23 active cultural centers and asked the respondents to leave the completed
12 questionnaire at the reception desk. We verified the effectiveness of the randomization process and
13 the equivalence between the control and the experimental groups by means of tests on the
14 homogeneity of categorical data. We used self-response questionnaires because they are cheaper
15 and quicker than conducting in-person interviews. We acknowledge that a self response survey has
16 several disadvantages: it tends to include only those individuals who are most biased or most
17 interested in replying, the response rate cannot be controlled, and the potential for non-sampling
18 error can be high (e.g., replies forgotten, incomplete questionnaires). Still, they are considered
19 relevant for surveying people’s attitudes (Carson, 2000). In addition, this method is convenient for
20 the respondent and there are fewer interviewer effects (Azqueta, 1994).

21

22 *Questionnaire returns*

23

24 We distributed 690 questionnaires, of which 212 (30.7%) questionnaires were returned. Of
25 these, 53.3% belonged to the experimental group and 46.7% belonged to the control group. We had
26 100 fully completed questionnaires (44.6%), which was slightly less than completion percentages

1 in other studies (Pate and Loomis, 1997; Loomis and Ekstrand, 1998; Tyrväinen and Väänänen,
2 1998).

3 Most respondents (70%) were female and 45% were single. The average household size was
4 2.5 people and 65% of respondents had children in the household. The mean of number of children
5 in the household was 2.06. The mean age of the respondents was 43 years (ranging from 18 to 18).
6 When asked about their highest level of education, 24% had a five years degree, 12% had a
7 Bachelor's degree, and 20% had a high school diplome.. Regarding employment, 46% were
8 employees and workers, 19% were managers and teachers and 8% were students. Regarding
9 occupation, 30% were private sector salaried employees, 20% were public sector employees and
10 23% were retired. The monthly household income for 80% of the respondents was 600-2,300 EUR
11 and the average income bracket was 1,500 EUR/month/household.

12 For comparison, the 1999 French demographic census indicates that 54% of Montpellier
13 residents were women, 52.3% had children, and the average number of people/household was 1.9
14 (INSEE, 2002). The proportions of residents with various levels of higher education correspond to
15 the sample. However, the percentage of residents with little education (certificate of primary
16 studies or no diploma) is higher than in the sample (census 28.0%, sample 9.4%). The age
17 distribution of our sample corresponds to that of Montpellier residents over 20. The average
18 monthly household income for the population of Montpellier is 1,136 Euros.

19
20 *Data analysis*

21
22 Using multiple logistical regression methods, we analyzed the possible dependence of
23 WTCF (as a dichotomous variable) on (1) the provision of bird information and (2) the independent
24 socio-economic and attitudinal variables. We used multiple linear regression methods for other
25 variables, including “type of project” (PROJECT; consisting of percentages of natural or
26 ornamental vegetation and coded as a continuous variable: 1 (0% natural-100% ornamental), 2
27 (25% natural-75% ornamental), 3 (50% natural-50% ornamental), 4 (75% natural-25%

1 ornamental), 5 (100% natural-0% ornamental)), and “quantity to pay” (QTP) for the project
2 (regardless of project type). In all cases, we used backward elimination procedures (Zar, 1999).
3 Before running the regressions, we examined the multicollinearity among independent variables
4 using the Cramer coefficient. Multicollinearity between dependent variables was low and the effects
5 on the regression were negligible.

6 The regression analyses were used only with the aim of detecting the influence of the
7 independent variables (i.e., provision of bird information and socio-economic and attitudinal
8 variables) on the dependent variables (i.e., type of PROJECT preferred, WTCF, and QTP). We
9 developed a contingent matrix showing the relationships between the dependent variables and the
10 variables selected in the regression. We analyzed data using the Statistica® software package
11 (StarSoft, version 7).

12

13 **Results**

14

15 *Attitudes toward urban nature*

16

17 Respondents had a favorable attitude toward the existence of urban green spaces; 96% said
18 that green spaces are “important” or “very important” for improving the quality of life in the city
19 and 83% said that they use green spaces. The most frequently used green spaces were two natural
20 urban forests: Bois de Montmaur (26% of respondents) and Lac des Garrigues (18%). When asked
21 about perceptions of the quantity of green spaces in Montpellier, 12.2% of respondents answered
22 that there were few, 40.5% said that there was a moderate amount, and 40.5% considered that there
23 was a large amount. Air purification was considered the most important benefit provided by the
24 green spaces in the city, followed by the possibility of going out for a walk, running, or doing
25 outdoor exercise. Most respondents (68%) said that having the chance to enjoy wild animals in the
26 city was “important” or “very important”. Ninety-three percent of respondents agreed with
27 increasing the amount of green spaces in Montpellier.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Variables influencing types of green spaces preferred

Of the 208 respondents who expressed an opinion about the composition of urban green spaces, 30% preferred 100% natural areas, 43% preferred 75% natural - 25% ornamental areas, and 25% preferred a 50/50 split. Only two respondents preferred 100% ornamental, and only two respondents preferred 25% natural - 75% ornamental areas.

The multiple linear regression analysis (Table 1) indicates that “the perceived quantity of urban green areas in the city” (QGA), “the possibility of enjoying wild animals (WFAU)”, gender (SEX), and the presence of children at home (CHILDREN) influenced the preference for either the natural or ornamental project (PROJECT). As far as the attitudinal variables are concerned, the preferences for a natural project was higher among respondents who answered that there were few or moderate amount of green spaces in Montpellier and among respondents who gave more importance to wildlife conservation in the city. A higher percentage of women and people with children preferred the natural project.

Variables influencing willingness to contribute financially

Among the 209 interviewees who responded to the WTCF question, 52% expressed a value for WTCF. The logistical regression analyses (Table 2) showed three independent variables: frequency of use of green spaces (FUSE), profession (PROF), and gender (SEX). Seventy five percent of independent professionals and 80% of managers and teachers expressed a WTCF, compared to only 48% of employees and workers and 38% of students. This result is linked to monthly household income. Most self-employed professionals (55%), managers and teachers (86%) have a higher monthly household income (1500 – 4600 Euros), whereas most students (86%) and employees and workers (67%) have a lower monthly income (600-1500 Euros).

1 A higher proportion of men (59.0%) than women (49.3%) expressed a WTCF. We found
2 that perceived quantity of urban green spaces in the city (QGA) could explain this result; more men
3 (22%) perceived a low quantity of urban green spaces than women (8%). Finally, WTCF increases
4 considerably with the frequency of use of the green spaces (Fig 1); 59% of respondents who
5 expressed a WTCF claimed that they used the green spaces frequently (every day or every week),
6 whereas 60% of respondents who did not express a WTCF claimed that they never or infrequently
7 used the green spaces.

8 Of the 131 respondents (61.3%) who voiced a protest bid, the main reasons were: “the local
9 government should pay for these spaces” (60%), “my household income means I can not afford it”
10 (18%), and “taxes are already very high” (15%). The others reasons (“I will not use these spaces”,
11 “I do not agree to create new spaces” and “There are already enough parks”) accounted for less
12 than 5%.

13

14 *Variables influencing quantity to pay*

15

16 The multiple linear regression analyses for the amount to pay for a natural project (Table 3)
17 showed that the possibility of enjoying wild animals (WFAU), age (AGE) and the presence of
18 children at home (CHILDREN) influenced this dependent variable. We found that those who gave
19 greater importance to the conservation of wild fauna in the city and people with children were more
20 inclined to pay a high amount for the natural project. Although older people have similar or higher
21 incomes than younger people, the QTP for natural projects diminished with age. We found that
22 72% of older people had a QTP of 12 EUR/year, whereas only 55% of younger people had the
23 same QTP. While 12% of younger people declared a QTP of 300 EUR/year, no older people
24 declared a similar QTP. People with children had a greater preference for the natural project and
25 agreed to pay more for it than those without children. The average QTP bracket for natural projects
26 was 0.18-0.28% of the monthly household income.

1 The multiple linear regression analyses (Table 4) showed that the variables for gender
2 (SEX) and the perceived quantity of urban green spaces in the city (QCG) influenced the QTP for
3 ornamental projects. A higher percentage of women preferred the natural project. Therefore, the
4 percentage of women willing to contribute financially for the ornamental project was lower than for
5 the natural project. The average QTP bracket for ornamental projects was 0.08-0.12% of the
6 monthly household income.

7

8 *The influence of bird information*

9

10 The provision of bird information did not have a significant effect on the dependent
11 variables PROJECT, WTCF, and QTP in the multiple regressions. We then categorised the
12 respondents in terms of their importance placed on urban wild fauna (WFAU) (Fig. 2). In the
13 experimental group (i.e. when information was given about possible negative effects of losing
14 urban green spaces on avifauna) the proportion of people who preferred the natural project was
15 higher among those who said urban wild fauna was important than among those who said it was not
16 important. In the control group (i.e. when information on birds was not provided), this proportion
17 was not significantly higher. However, preference for the natural project is significantly higher in
18 the experimental group ($\chi^2 = 20.525$, $df = 6$, $p < 0.05$) only for those who consider enjoying urban
19 wild fauna as “important”. We could not find an analogous result with the QCA, CHILDREN and
20 SEX variables influencing green spaces types preferred.

21 In the same way, we categorised the respondents according to their frequency of use of
22 green spaces (FUSE) (Fig. 3). In the category “monthly” of FUSE, we found a significant higher
23 proportion of people willing to contribute financially in the experimental group than in the control
24 group ($\chi^2 = 11.988$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.05$). The other variables that affected WTCF, gender and
25 profession, do not show a similar response.

26 The results of the survey are summarized in Fig. 4: the preference for “natural” green areas
27 is linked to attitudinal variables (perception of the quantity of green areas and interest for wild

1 animals) as well as socio-economic variables (gender and number of children in the household).
2 WTCF is positively linked to frequency of use but depends on income (income being itself related
3 to gender and profession). Quantity to pay for natural projects is linked to the interest in wild
4 animals but also to two socio-economic variables (age and presence of children in the household).
5 Others variables driving the quantity of WTCF for ornamental projects included perception of the
6 quantity of green areas and gender. Finally, giving information about the importance of green areas
7 for avifauna only has a limited effect. It has an influence on: 1) the preference for natural project
8 but only for a category of respondents, and 2) WTCF but only through one modality of frequency
9 of use.

10

11 **Discussion**

12

13 We found a few differences between our sample and the population of Montpellier. The
14 proportion of women was higher in our sample; a possible explanation is that the cultural centers
15 offer activities for children of school age, thus attracting more mothers with children. The
16 difference between the sampled average monthly income and the INSEE data could be linked to the
17 fact that cultural centers are visited less frequently by people with very low income than those with
18 higher incomes. Apart from these differences, which imply caution in interpreting data, our results
19 provide a valuable insight into citizens' opinions. However, it is possible these populations may
20 differ according to other unmeasured variables.

21 Although the CVM was designed to assess the economic value of public environmental
22 goods (Davis, 1963; Carson, 2000), our results show that a method adapted from CVM can be used
23 as a tool for revealing social preferences regarding green spaces. One way of finding out about the
24 public's appreciation of green spaces is to ask about WTCF and to refer to the quantities of money
25 as an indicator of the importance given to the type of green spaces considered.

26 Our first objective was to find out how people value two different projects for urban green
27 spaces. Consistent with previous studies in other geographical contexts, our results found that most

1 people (93%) want more green spaces in their city. Similarly, in Finland, approximately half of the
2 respondents in a CVM study expressed a willingness to pay to prevent construction in urban forests
3 (Tyrväinen, 2001). In the same cities, a one km increase in the distance to the nearest forested area
4 led to an average 5.9% decrease in the market price of the dwelling; residences with a view onto
5 forests were, on average, 4.9% more expensive than dwellings with otherwise similar
6 characteristics (Tyrväinen and Miettinen, 2000). Citizens in Bari city, Italy see the public and
7 private green areas as a single beneficial system and perceive green areas as enhancing their quality
8 of life (Sanesi and Chiarello 2006). In Stockholm, Bolund and Hunhammar (1999) concluded that
9 the urban natural green areas services have a substantial impact on quality of life in urban areas and
10 should be addressed in land-use planning. In a Venezuelan study, 99% of respondents indicated that
11 urban green areas are important or very important for improved quality of life (Caula and
12 DeNóbrega, 2005)

13 Most people (over 70%) preferred the natural over ornamental types of green spaces. Many
14 people who declared that the benefit from enjoying wild animals in the city was important preferred
15 the natural project. This is consistent with numerous studies of public attitudes toward natural
16 resources demonstrating the positive social value of native urban biodiversity. For example, in a
17 survey for the UK Forestry Commission in 1989, most people preferred forests that were diverse,
18 looked natural, and fit into the landscape (Millard, 2000). In urban woodland in Reading, UK, a
19 large majority of people valued the ‘naturalness’ of the woodland. Regarding possible reasons for
20 this type of preference, Rohde and Kendle (1994) suggested that the attractiveness of urban wildlife
21 for people originates from some properties of naturalness. Moreover, urban sites with tree and
22 shrub communities probably come closest to providing people with wilderness qualities in an urban
23 area. This can contribute to what Millard (2000) refers to as people’s sense of place. This means a
24 perception of what distinguishes a person’s own place from other urban localities. It also raises
25 people’s awareness of how they value the place in which they live.

26 Our second objective was to find out the extent to which people’s attitudinal and socio-
27 economic characteristics affected their valuation of green spaces. In early CVM surveys, some

1 influential attitudinal and socio-economic variables recurred across studies and countries (Bateman
2 and Langford, 1997 - national park in the United Kingdom; Hadker et al., 1997 - national park in
3 Bombay, India; Tyrväinen and Väänänen, 1998 - urban forest in Finland; Oguz, 2000 – urban parks
4 in Ankara, Ethiopia; Coles and Bussey, 2000 - urban forest in UK; Blaine et al. 2003 - urban green
5 spaces in USA; Caula and DeNóbrega, 2005 - urban botanical garden in Venezuela; Raybould,
6 2005 - erosion beach in Australia; Jim and Chen, 2006 - urban environments in China). These
7 variables include the respondent's income, frequency of use of the study site, age, gender, level of
8 education, presence of children at home, preferences for environment-related activities, attitudes,
9 and the existence of substitutes for environmental goods. In our study, the preference for natural
10 green spaces was significantly linked to people's positive attitude towards wildlife conservation
11 and the desire to increase the amount of green spaces in the city. The preference for natural green
12 spaces was also influenced by gender and the presence of children at home. People with children at
13 home had a greater preference for natural spaces. However, this was more apparent among women
14 than among men and it is linked to a more general gender issue (Blunt and Wills, 2000). In France,
15 the average salary for women is 15% lower than for men doing the same job; unemployment is
16 higher among women, and women do two-thirds of domestic chores (Gailliard, 2002).
17 Consequently, women spend more time tending children than men, which involves participating in
18 leisure activities such as going to children's parks and playgrounds. Thus, women may be more
19 aware of the importance of green spaces for day-to-day well-being, which could explain why they
20 expressed a stronger WTCF.

21 WTCF tends to be influenced by profession, the frequency of use of green spaces, and
22 gender. In our study, as in many others, profession was correlated with income level. Our results
23 show that people with well-paid jobs had a higher WTCF for green spaces than those with lower-
24 paying jobs, consistent with the economic theory that household income and WTCF are positively
25 correlated (Jakobsson and Dragun, 2001). The WTCF was affected by the same variables that
26 characterize the acquisition of a market good (i.e., demand and available budget). We did not find a
27 correlation between gender and monthly household income.

1 People’s attitudes toward wildlife conservation and the presence of children at home
2 influenced the preference for the natural project, and thus had a positive and significant correlation
3 with the QTP for the natural project. As in other studies (Loomis and Ekstrand, 1998; Pate and
4 Loomis, 1997), we found a significant negative correlation between age and QTP.

5 The percentage of people expressing a WTCF was smaller and the percentage of protest
6 bids was greater than was found in other studies (Mitchell and Carlson, 1989; Hadker et al., 1997;
7 Tyrväinen and Väänänen, 1998; Oguz, 2000; Caula and DeNóbrega, 2005). Additionally, the
8 average QTP in proportion to the monthly household income (0.165%) was lower than the value
9 found by Hadker et al. (1997; 0.24-0.27% in India) and Caula and DeNóbrega (2005; 0.46% in
10 Venezuela). Two points may provide some explanation. First, Montpellier, like many other French
11 Mediterranean cities, has a landscape pattern with a dense ancient downtown district and a large
12 area of new low-density areas with individual houses and gardens. As a result, local inhabitants
13 may be under the impression that they live in a very green city compared to other cities. Second,
14 despite the fact that Montpellier has one of the most rapid annual urban growth rates (8-11%; INSEE,
15 2002), it has very few new boroughs with many high buildings. Its urban growth is largely due to
16 the development of new sectors with individual houses and gardens, which immediately surround
17 the urban core of the old villages on the town’s periphery. This could explain why local people do
18 not feel that urban growth makes the environment too artificial.

19 Our last objective was to determine whether the information on the importance of green
20 spaces for bird conservation could change the WTCF for green spaces. The information about birds
21 increased preference for the natural project and WTCF only for a certain category of people (people
22 with a “favourable” attitude for urban fauna and people who use green spaces monthly). Similarly,
23 Jensen (2000) found that providing information and explanations (especially those that emphasize
24 the positive aspects) to forest recreationists about management practices increased support for those
25 practices. We did not find a correlation between the provision of bird information and QTP.

26 Even though giving information on the importance of birds in urban habitats can be
27 perceived as a key factor to increase citizens’ environmental awareness, our results show that

1 people yet aware of environment are positively influenced by this information and show a higher
2 willingness to contribute financially. This suggests that giving information on wildlife and natural
3 habitats in the city is not enough for increasing the interest for natural green spaces for the public.
4 The challenge for public bodies and nongovernmental organizations dealing with urban nature
5 conservation is to convince those citizens unaware of environmental issues. Sustainable
6 management of urban areas must take into account both the necessity to maintain and enhance
7 ecosystem services in the city and citizens' well-being. Urban green spaces can play an important
8 role from that point of view. As a network of ecological habitats, they can provide resources for
9 urban wildlife and can provide a variety of desired services to urban residents. Our results confirm
10 the interest of citizens for maintaining urban ecosystem services, particularly through the existence
11 of natural green spaces in the city.

12 Decision makers and managers should take advantage of this positive attitude. In terms of
13 sustainable urban management, our results show that municipalities could, in their green spaces
14 policies, put more emphasis on natural urban habitats in a very broad sense. Instead of designing
15 ornamental new landscaped parks, one option could be to take advantage of the remnants of the
16 previous non urban landscape (e.g., vineyards, orchards, overgrown fields or gardens) and their
17 existing vegetation. Those green spaces would provide recreational and biodiversity services and
18 could be managed at lower costs if compared to ornamental parks where flowering, watering,
19 weeding (sometimes with chemicals), pruning, and trimming are time, money and energy
20 consuming.

21 Designing new green spaces following those principles could also be part of municipalities'
22 strategies to increase environmental awareness. Our results showed that only giving basic
23 information on the relationships between green spaces and bird habitats requirements did not
24 change attitudes toward public green spaces for all citizens. Public campaigns that explain, based
25 on actual examples, the advantages of maintaining a network of green spaces in the city could help
26 increase the public's environmental awareness and in doing so, could lead people to think as

1 sustainable urban development, not as a top-down injunction, but as a real way to increase quality
2 of life in the city.

3

4 **Acknowledgements**

5

6 We thank FUNDAYACUCHO, Venezuela (Contract N° E-211-87-2001-1) for funding this study.

7 We appreciate logistical support from the Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive in

8 Montpellier, France and the University of Alberta's Augustana Campus. We also thank two

9 anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

10

1 **References**

2

3 Alberti, M., Marzluff, J.M., Shulenberger, E., Bradley, G., Ryan, C., Zumbrunnen, C. 2003.

4 Integrating humans into ecology: opportunities, challenges for studying urban ecosystems.

5 *Bioscience* 53, 1169-1179.

6 Attwell, K. 2000. Urban land resources and urban planting - case studies from Denmark. *Landscape*

7 *and Urban Planning* 52, 145-163.

8 Azqueta, D. 1994. *Valoración Económica de la Calidad Ambiental*. McGraw-Hill, Mexico City. pp.

9 229.

10 Bateman, I.J., Langford, I.H. 1997. Non-user' willingness to pay for a National park: an application

11 and critique of the contingent valuation method. *Regional Studies* 31, 571-582.

12 Blamey, R.K. 1998. Decisiveness, attitude expression and symbolic responses in contingent

13 valuation surveys. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 34, 577-601.

14 Blaine, T.W., Lichtkoppler, F.R. Stanbro, R. 2003. An assessment of residents' willingness to pay

15 for Green Space and Farmland Preservation Conservation Easements using the Contingent

16 Valuation Method (CVM). *Journal of Extension* 41(4). Available from: <

17 <http://www.joe.org/joe/2003august/a3.shtml>> (accessed November 2008).

18 Blunt, A., Wills, J. 2000. *Dissident Geographies: An Introduction to Radical Ideas and Practice*,

19 Pearson Education, Harlow, UK. pp. 90-127.

20 Bolund, P., Hunhammar, S. 1999. Ecosystem services in urban areas. *Ecological Economics* 29,

21 293-301.

22 Bourgery, C. 1996. *La charte de l'arbre pour Montpellier*. Direction Paysage et Nature, Ville de

23 Montpellier et le centre de formation professionnelle forestière de Chateauneuf du Rhône.

24 Carson, R.T. 2000. Contingent valuation: a user's guide. *Environmental Science and Technology*

25 34, 1413-1418.

26 Caula, S. 2007. L'usage de l'avifaune comme indicateur écologique et socio-économique dans

- 1 l'espace urbain. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Montpellier II, France. Available from:
2 <http://www.cefe.cnrs.fr/ecopop/anciens/Sabina_Caula.htm> (accessed November 2008).
- 3 Caula, S., DeNóbrega, R. 2005. The contingent valuation of two projects for the development of
4 the botanical garden of Valencia: effects of bird diversity and of socioeconomic and
5 behavioral factors. *Revista Faces de la Facultad de Ciencias económicas y Sociales*. Año 16
6 - Número 27.
- 7 Caula, S; DeNóbrega, R., Giner, S.. 2003. Bird diversity as an element of a conservation strategy
8 for the botanical garden of the city of Valencia, Venezuela. *Acta Biológica Venezuelica*
9 Vol. 23, Nro. 1.
- 10 Caula, S., Marty, P., Martin, J.L. 2008. Seasonal variation in species composition of an urban bird
11 community in Mediterranean France. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 87, 1–9.
- 12 Chace, J.F., Walsh, J.J. 2006. Urban effects on native avifauna: a review. *Landscape and Urban*
13 *Planning* 74, 46-69.
- 14 Chiesura, A. 2004. The role of urban parks for the sustainable city. *Landscape and Urban Planning*
15 68, 129-138.
- 16 Clergeau, P, Mennechez, G; Sauvage, A., Lemoine, A., 2001. Human perception and appreciation
17 of birds: a motivation for wildlife conservation in urban environments of France in:
18 Marzluff, J.M., Bowman, R., Donnelly, R. (Eds.), *Avian Ecology and Conservation in an*
19 *Urbanizing World*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, Massachusetts, pp. 69-88.
- 20 Coles, R.W., Bussey, S.C. 2000. Urban forest landscape in the UK. *Landscape and Urban Planning*
21 52, 181-188.
- 22 Davis, R.K. 1963. The value of outdoor recreation: an economic study of the Maine Woods. PhD
23 Thesis, Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 24 Eliasson, I. 2000. The use of climate knowledge in urban planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*
25 48, 31-44.

- 1 European Environment Agency. 2006. Urban Sprawl in Europe – The Ignored Challenge. EEA
2 Report N°10/2006, European Environment Agency, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- 3 Europa. 2007. Treaty of Lisbon: The treaty at a Glance. Available from:
4 <http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/glance/index_en.htm> (accessed November 2008).
- 5 Europa. 2008. Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment. Available from:
6 <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/urban/thematic_strategy.htm> (accessed November 2008).
- 7 Fernandez-Juricic, E., Jokimäki, J. 2001. A habitat island approach to conserving birds in urban
8 landscape: case studies from southern and northern Europe. Biodiversity and Conservation
9 10, 2023-2043.
- 10 Gailliard, F. 2002. Égalité hommes-femmes en France: où en-est on ? France Diplomatie. Ministère
11 des affaires étrangères. Available from: <[http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/fr/article-](http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/fr/article-imprim.php3?id_article=21388)
12 [imprim.php3?id_article=21388](http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/fr/article-imprim.php3?id_article=21388)> (accessed November 2008).
- 13 Gómez, F., Tamarit, N., Jabaloyes, J. 2001. Green zones, bioclimatic studies and human comfort in
14 the future development of urban planning. Landscape and Urban Planning 55, 151-161.
- 15 Groupement de la Statistique Publique. 2003. Prospective Démographique et Economique en
16 Languedoc-Roussillon. Préfecture de Région Languedoc-Roussillon, Groupement de la
17 Statistique Publique. Available from: < [http://www.languedoc-](http://www.languedoc-roussillon.pref.gouv.fr/grandsdossiers/prospective/pdf/prospective_1.pdf)
18 [roussillon.pref.gouv.fr/grandsdossiers/prospective/pdf/prospective_1.pdf](http://www.languedoc-roussillon.pref.gouv.fr/grandsdossiers/prospective/pdf/prospective_1.pdf) > (accessed
19 November 2008).
- 20 Hadker, N., Sharma, S., David, A., Muraleedharan, T.R. 1997. Willingness-to-pay for Borivli
21 National Park: evidence from a Contingent Valuation. Ecological Economics 21, 105-122.
- 22 Huang, S.-L., Wong, J-H., Chen, T.-Ch. 1998. A framework for an indicator system for measuring
23 Taipei's urban sustainability. Landscape and Urban Planning 42, 15-27.
- 24 Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques (INSEE). 2002. Éditeur, Paris cedex
25 14, France.

- 1 Jakobsson, K.M., Dragun, A.K. 2001. The worth of a Possum: valuing species with the Contingent
2 Valuation Method. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 19, 211-227.
- 3 Jensen, F.S. 2000. The effects of information on Danish forest visitors' acceptance of various
4 management actions. *Forestry* 73, 165-1721
- 5 Jim, C.Y., Chen, W.Y. 2006. Impacts of urban environmental elements on residential housing
6 prices in Guangzhou (China). *Landscape and Urban Planning* 78, 422-434.
- 7 Kelcey, J.G., Rheinwald, G., 2000. *Birds in European cities*. Ginster Verlag, St Katharinen,
8 Germany.
- 9 Kotchen, M.J., Reiling, S.D. 2000. Environmental attitudes, motivations, and contingent valuation
10 of nonuse values: a case study involving endangered species. *Ecological Economics* 32, 93-
11 107.
- 12 Loomis, J., Ekstrand, E. 1998. Alternative approaches for incorporating respondent's uncertainty
13 when estimating willingness to pay: the case of the Mexican spotted owl. *Ecological*
14 *Economics* 27, 29-41.
- 15 Marzluff, J. M., 2001. World wide urbanization and its effects on birds in: Marzluff, J.M.,
16 Bowman, R., Donnelly, R. (Eds.), *Avian ecology and conservation in an urbanizing world*.
17 Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, Massachusetts, pp. 19-38.
- 18 Millard, A. 2000. The potential role of natural colonisation as a design tool for urban forestry – a
19 pilot study. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 52, 173-179.
- 20 Mitchell, R.C., Carlson, R.T. 1989. Using surveys to value public goods: the contingent valuation
21 method. *Resources for the Future*. Washington, D.C.
- 22 Myers, N., Mittermeier, R.A., Mittermeier, C.G., da Fonseca, G.A.B., Kent, J. 2000. Biodiversity
23 hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* 403, 853-858
- 24 Oguz, D. 2000. User surveys of Ankara's urban parks. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 52, 165-171.
- 25 Pate, J., Loomis, J. 1997. The effect of distance on willingness to pay values: a case of study of
26 wetlands and salmon in California. *Ecological Economics* 20, 199-207.

- 1 Raybould, M. 2005. Attitudes and information effects in contingent valuation of natural resources.
2 PhD Thesis, Griffith University, Australia.
- 3 Rohde, C.L.E., Kendle, A.D. 1994. Human Well-being, Natural Landscapes and Wildlife in Urban
4 Areas: A Review. Research Report No. 22. University of Reading, Department of
5 Horticulture and Landscape and the Research Institute for the Care of the Elderly, Bath,
6 England.
- 7 Sanesi, G., Chiarello, F. 2006. Residents and urban green spaces: the case of Bari. *Urban Forestry
8 and Urban Greening* 4(3-4), 125-134.
- 9 Savard, J.P.L., Clergeau, P., Mennechez, G. 2000. Biodiversity concepts and urban ecosystems.
10 *Landscape and Urban Planning* 48, 131-142.
- 11 Schauman, S., Salisbury, S. 1998. Restoring nature in the city: Puget Sound experiences.
12 *Landscape and Urban Planning* 42, 287:295.
- 13 Scottish Greenspace. 2008. What is Greenspace? <<http://www.greenspacescotland.org.uk>>
14 (accessed November 2008).
- 15 Spash, C., Urama, K., Burton, R., Kenyon, W., Shannon, P., Hill, G. 2006. Motives behind
16 willingness to pay for improving biodiversity in a water ecosystem: Economics, ethics and
17 social psychology. *Ecological Economics* doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2006.09.013.
- 18 Staners, D., Bordeaux, P. (Eds.), 1995. Europe's Environment - The Dobris assessment. European
19 Environment Agency. Copenhagen, Denmark. 676 pp.
- 20 Tyrväinen, L. 1997. The amenity value of the urban forest: an application of hedonic pricing
21 method. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 37, 211-222.
- 22 Tyrväinen, L. 2001. Economic valuation of urban forest benefits in Finland. *Journal of
23 Environmental Management* 62, 75-92.
- 24 Tyrväinen, L., Miettinen, A. 2000. Property prices and urban forest amenities. *Journal of
25 Environmental Economics and Management* 39, 205-223.

- 1 Tyrväinen, L., Väänänen, H. 1998. The economic value of urban forest amenities: an application of
2 the contingent valuation method. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 43, 105-118.
- 3 United Nations Population Division. 2001. *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision*.
4 <http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/wup2001/WUP2001_CH1.pdf> (accessed
5 November 2008).
- 6 Venkatachalam, L. 2004. The contingent valuation method: a review. *Environmental Impact*
7 *Assessment Review* 24, 89-124.
- 8 Vuorisalo, T., Latinen, R., Laaksonen, H. 2001. Urban biodiversity in local newspapers: a
9 historical perspective. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 10, 1739-1756.
- 10 Zar, J. 1999. *Bio-Statistical Analysis*. 4th Ed. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey. pp.
11 123.

1 **FIGURES**

2

3 Figure 1. Variation in the WTFC with the frequency of use of the green spaces (FUSE). WTFCF
4 increases by over 20% as frequency of use of the green spaces increases.

5

6 Figure 2. Variation in the preference for a project type (50% natural, 75% natural or 100% natural)
7 in the control (without bird information) and the experimental questionnaire (with bird
8 information). Groups categorized according to the possibility of enjoying wild animals in the city.

9 Pearson Chi-square analysis control group $\chi^2 = 20.52533$, $df = 6$, $P < 0.05$; experimental group $\chi^2 =$
10 8.101851 , $df = 8$, $P > 0.05$.

11

12 Figure 3. Variation in the WTFC (No-Yes) in control (without bird information) and experimental
13 questionnaire (with bird information). Groups categorized in terms of frequency of use of urban
14 green spaces. Pearson Chi-square analysis control group $\chi^2 = 11.98784$, $df = 3$, $P < 0.05$.

15 Experimental group $\chi^2 = 5.207731$, $df = 5$, $P > 0.05$

16

17 Figure 4. This graph shows the attitudinal and socio-economic variables that affect the dependents
18 variables: type of project, WTFC and QTP. Perceived quantity of urban green areas in the city
19 (QGA), possibility of enjoying wild animals (WFAU), Frequency of use of green areas (FUSE),
20 gender (SEX), presence of children at home (CHILDREN), Profession (PROF), monthly household
21 income (INCOME), age (AGE) as explanatory variables.