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Abstract

As the discourses of ecological sustainability point towards the active involvement of individuals in the environmental work as an important prerequisite for targeting the sources of environmental degradation, one of the main foci for contemporary environmental policy and political theory is the need for comprehensive individual lifestyle-changes. Within political theory an Ecological Citizenship, reinterpreting the traditional state/individual relationship by straddling the private – public; national – global; and present – future divides, has been suggested a valuable approach to realising a personal responsibility for the environment. Empirical research analysing the prospects for ecological citizenship to function as a route towards individual environmental responsibility is, however, to date lacking in the literature. In this paper we elaborate on how the theory of ecological citizenship can be made empirically operational.
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1. Introduction

Quite contrary to how the first generations of green theorists argued for governmental action – i.e., the strong green state or increased public participation in political decision making - an increasing number of theorists have shifted their focus towards individual action. The argument is largely that today’s environmental problems are increasingly understood as the aggregated consequences of citizen’s unsustainable ways of life (Hobson, 2004; Beck, 1996). It is assumed that to properly amending such problems, requires that individual citizens incorporate ecological considerations in their day-to-day choices and activities. In parallel, however, calling for a more comprehensive individual involvement in the environmental work also means that policy-makers face the significant task of designing policies and policy instruments effectively addressing the citizen’s engagements, while at the same time remaining within the framework of what is considered a legitimate exercise of political authority among the general public (Jagers & Hammar 2009).

To date, this institutional dilemma has predominately been addressed via a focus on incentive-based behavioural changes. Through the use of, e.g., economic (dis)incentives, citizens are encouraged to more or less ‘voluntarily’ change their behaviour when executing a number of well-defined activities, most of which are related to the individual’s patterns of consumption. This approach of changing incitement-structures from the top and down has been demonstrated as being rather effective when it comes to governing specific changes in behaviour in a short-term perspective (Sterner, 2003); and transformed patterns of consumption are critical elements for reaching the objective of ecological sustainability (Conca et al., 2001; but see Seyfang, 2005:296-298). Yet, for a number of reasons, the ability of this ‘sustainable consumption-approach’ to reform patterns of social choice towards ecological sustainability, has been questioned. Among other things, its critics argue that minor adjustments of market mechanisms and individual responses disregard and even reduce the public motivations for other forms of individual environmental initiatives, as people are encouraged to respond to the (fiscal) incentive itself rather than to the (moral) reasons behind it (Barry, 1999; Berglund and Matti, 2006; Hobson, 2002; Jacobs, 1999; Maniates, 2001). Furthermore, by focusing solely on encouraging individuals to do their bit for the environment, by taking ethical and environmental concerns within the framework of their market-behaviour, it refrains from profoundly challenging the values and beliefs underpinning individuals’ established lifestyles, and thereby offers an “easy symbolic alternative to confronting the structural causes of ecological destruction” (Dryzek, 2005:132; also Cohen, 2005; Seyfang, 2005).
Alternative discourses of individual environmental action have therefore been suggested by political theorists, more readily adapting individual rights and responsibilities to incorporate also global and future environmental consequences of private activities. At the centre of the stage, an ecological citizenship aims at engaging citizens in a more deep-ranging and comprehensive rethinking of their daily habits, rather than mechanically changing behaviours in response to external motivations (read policy instruments) which’s mere existence are highly sensitive to the volatile workings of political will and wind.

Although the past years have seen an increasing amount of work developing the theoretical notion of such an ecological citizenship, they have largely remained theoretical and only a few have addressed the field empirically (e.g. Berglund & Matti, 2006; Carter & Huby, 2006; Horton, 2005; Jagers, 2009; Seyfang, 2006; Wolf, 2007). Yet fewer have scrutinized the strength of a values-structure conducive to ecological citizenship among the general public (as opposed to within delimited activist groups). This can be argued an evident shortcoming in the literature on ecological citizenship. The nature of the individual’s values and beliefs are well established factors underpinning both behavioural choices, formation of attitudes towards emerging social issues and also her acceptance of and response to new public policies as well as policy instruments (Converse, 1964; Rokeach, 1973; Feldman, 1988; Zaller, 1992). This function of values and beliefs is also well-researched in the environmental context, verifying their significance as causal drivers for a range of pro-environmental attitudes and behaviours (Steg et al, 2005; Stern, 2000). Stern and colleagues (e.g. 1999) even lists environmental citizenship along with private sphere activities as outputs from the value-belief-norm chain of pro-environmental behaviour. Nevertheless, few comprehensive attempts have been made to conceptualise the theory of ecological citizenship in terms of values and beliefs, subject it to empirical scrutinising, and thereby evaluate its usefulness as a theoretical model for broad public engagement. From a policy centred perspective, knowledge of how the values and beliefs implied by the theory of ecological citizenship resonances with mass belief-systems might further be perceived as a requirement for balancing policy effectiveness with legitimacy when promoting a transition to more comprehensive environmental responsibilities for the individual.

In this paper we aim at conceptualizing the political-theoretical literature on ecological citizenship into an empirically testable model enabling us to make the theory of ecological citizenship operational. This is done by asking: *How can the theoretical values-construct of the ecological citizen be conceptualised and made operational?*
2. Theoretical conceptualisations of the ecological citizen

In contrast to the framing of individual environmental action as *sustainable consumption* (SC) currently dominating environmental policy discourses and political/sociological/psychological studies (e.g. Hobson, 2002 & 2004; Martens and Spaargaren, 2005; Seyfang, 2005), suggestions has been made for an individual environmental responsibility that are both broader in scope, targeting lifestyles rather than single activities and motivating behavioural change by moral considerations rather than by external incentives. Framing individual environmental responsibilities as based in interpersonal political relationships, and as aiming towards the fundamental reshaping of social-environmental relations, an increasing number of scholars have proposed the notion of an *ecological citizenship* (EC) guiding the individual’s role in the environmental work (van Steenbergen, 1994; Dobson, 2003). In particular, four aspects relating to personal environmental obligations function as the distinguishing characteristics of the ecological citizen.

1. *Social Justice/sense of fairness.* In contrast to the remits of traditional political citizenship, some of the EC proponents typically use the metaphor of the ecological footprint (e.g. Wackernagel and Rees, 1996) as a starting-point from which the balance of civic rights and duties emanates. As such, the ecological footprint, and in particular the acknowledgement that individuals in certain parts of the world let their activities expand way what would be possible had the resources been evenly distributed, underpins ecological citizenship’s holding of *social justice* as its core value or virtue (Dobson and Valencia, 2005). Although SC may very well be interpreted as an important tool for individuals aspiring to reduce their ecological footprint and thereby practise EC (Micheletti, 2003; Seyfang, 2005), sustainable consumers are not by necessity also ecological citizens, neither judging by the full range of their actions nor by the values or motivations underpinning these actions. Only when pro-environmental activities are guided by an intrinsic moral motivation, rather than a financial incentive, it should be considered an act of ecological citizenship. Thus, it is not just a matter of doing green things; it is a matter of being green in doing them too (Dryzek 2005). Following this, in contrast to changes in market-behaviour, which is the principle aim within a policy for sustainable consumption, which aims at changing market-behaviours, the crucial idea behind the notion of an ecological citizenship is the need for a comprehensive rethinking of those values and beliefs dominating the contemporary notion of the proper state/individual as well as human beings/nature relationships (Bell, 2005:182). EC therefore also implies a political responsibility for citizens to promote structural changes;
for instance through active participation in deliberations on the values that ought to guide both society in general and policy-making especially (Achterberg, 1993; Barry, 1999).

2. **Dismantling the distinction between public and private.** Inspired by feminist political theory, EC incorporates activities traditionally being regarded as the *private sphere* and excluded from the public sphere (Dobson, 2003). This is first and foremost due to the shift from framing citizenship as being a political state/individual relationship, to incorporate the non-contractual relations between the citizens themselves on account of the claim that also private relations and acts have an (environmentally degrading) effect in the public arena and thus give rise to citizenship obligations. This feature also indicates a shift in focus from the motivational domains constituting the main demarcation line in the state/individual relations of traditional citizenship theory (e.g. individualism vs. collectivism), and towards values in the range between other-regarding values, and values promoting more of a self-regarding behaviour. This dimension corresponds well to the, within environmental psychology often referred to, distinction between the Dominant Social Paradigm (DSP) and the New Ecological Paradigm (NEP) (e.g. Dunlap et al, 2000), where the values and attitudes characterising ecological citizenship are located within the latter.

3. **Unbounded responsibility.** The centrality of interpersonal relations indicates that responsibilities, rather than rights, are core principles for the ecological citizen. EC, furthermore, expands the territorial scope of these civic duties. From being confined within a nation-state, citizenship is now thought of as being global or universal in character. The space of ecological citizenship is synonymous with the spread of negative effects that our actions have for others, i.e. the scope of citizen duties can be extended both across generations and territorial borders. Pollution does not stop at national boundaries and, consequently, neither should the duties of the ecological citizen (Dobson, 2003).

4. **Non-reciprocal responsibility.** As a consequence of the primacy of social justice, the duties of the ecological citizen are non-reciprocal in character. Individuals should thus not be asked to take on new duties with the motivation that they will personally gain from them and be able to claim some right or benefit in return. Rather, the duties of ecological citizenship are described as responsibilities for all personal actions that ‘always already’ affect others (Dobson, 2003:49). The civic duties therefore lie in making these impacts as sustainable as possible and not make use of an unequal amount of *environmental services, capital or space*, compared to others. As implied earlier, within an ecological citizenship the main (or only) motivation for taking on environmental obligations is founded in a

---

**Kommentar [JM1]:** Är uttrycket hämtat från någon annan fasean? "environmental capital"?? Vad fasean är det? Services? Terminologin känns främmande för en amatör som jag.
sense of social justice; an acknowledgement that it is not right to compromise others ability to lead a full life by upholding an unequal distribution of resources (Connelly and Smith, 2003).

Possibly a model illustrating the assumed causality between values, beliefs, norms (social and personal), attitudes and (estimated) behaviour, about here.

3. Making the ecological citizen operational

In this section we discuss how the four characteristics introduced above can be made operational and possible to investigate empirically at the level of individual citizens. Before doing that, however, it should be pointed out that to be able to investigate not only to what degree there are individuals in Sweden carrying the normative ideals emphasised in EC, but also to what degree these ideals affect things such as individual behaviour, additional characteristics will also have to be measured (though these are not discussed in this paper). Let us explain. As said, following the political-theoretical propositions primarily elaborated by Dobson (2003; 2005), the ecological citizen’s predisposition to form pro-environmental norms of behaviour are expected to originate in her priority among motivational values. Furthermore, general value-priorities translate into environmental attitudes and therefore both directly and indirectly underpin positive responses to policies corresponding with the environmentally protective agenda of ecological citizenship. Thus, through an analysis of personal values, beliefs, and norms held by Swedish citizens, we attempt to highlight the presence of those elements which conforms to the characterisation of the ecological citizen. However, it is also important to see what effects these motivational values have for things such as behaviour and different aspects of ‘willingness’ (…to adjust certain behaviours, … to accept or support certain policies and so on). Thus, responsibilities for; and perceived solutions to the environmental problem have to be considered too, as do the respondents self-reported behaviour. More specifically, following the outline of ecological citizenship, the analysis aims at elucidating how the respondents position themselves in questions regarding their willingness to take on environmental responsibilities in the private-sphere, the acceptance of making a personal (economic or other) sacrifice in pursuit of a better environment for all, the application of social justice as a guide for attitudinal and behavioural decisions as well as the use of motivations which go beyond the borders of the nation-state and draw

Kommentar [JM2]: Detta är ju en jäkligt bra idé, men vi har ju ingen nu, så varför nämna det här i pappret? Kan du inte bara nämna det på din presentation istället?
on a universalistic care for others. To be able to do this, the four core characteristics of EC need to be specified, which is what will now be elaborated.

In what follows, we account for how the cornerstones of EC have been made operational and employed in a comprehensive mail questionnaire that was sent out to a random sample of the Swedish population in the spring 2009. The sample consisted of 3000 individuals in the age of 18-80 years. The response rate was moderate (just above 36%). However, rigorous comparisons have been made with an annual survey carried out by the SOM-institute at the University of Gothenburg, which has an overall high response rate (close to 60% in 2008) and a reputation for good quality fieldwork and representative samples. The intention with these comparisons is to examine if the moderate response rate has severely affected the representativeness of our respondents or not. However, the correspondence when it comes to aggregate distributions of both a set of general political and attitudinal variables and a set of socio-economic variables are striking. The most important deviation of our respondents probably is that young people are under-represented and older people over-represented among the respondents. However, this pattern is similar also in surveys with much higher response rates such as the SOM surveys. Below we present how the four EC characteristics were operationalised in the survey.

**Social justice**

As said, an important aspect of social justice is typically captured by the metaphor of the ecological footprint. This is a popular way to display that individuals in certain parts of the world let their activities expand way beyond what would be possible had the resources been evenly distributed. A fact from which a need to balance civic rights and duties emanates. Furthermore, it is first when pro-environmental activities are guided by an intrinsic moral motivation that it should be considered an act of ecological citizenship. In addition, EC also implies a political responsibility for citizens to promote structural changes; for instance through active participation in deliberations on the values that ought to guide both society in general and policy-making especially. The core aspect of social justice are measured via three sub-components: general sense of fairness, awareness of ecological footprints, reasons for pro-environmental behaviour are other-regarding. The following survey questions were used to capture social justice and its three components:
**General sense of fairness**

Här följer några blandade påståenden. I vilken utsträckning instämmer du i dessa påståenden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Var och en bör inte förbruka mer av jordens resurser än att de räcker till allas grundläggande behov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Många menar att vissa av jordens resurser är begränsade, till exempel odlingsbar mark, olja och fisk. Det finns olika idéer om hur dessa begränsade resurser bör fördelas. I vilken utsträckning instämmer du i följande påståenden om hur de bör fördelas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resurserna bör fördelas <em>lika</em> mellan alla världens människor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurserna bör fördelas så att de tillfaller de människor som har <em>störst behov</em> av dem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurserna bör fördelas så att de tillfaller de människor som <em>förtjänar</em> dem mest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Awareness of ecological footprints**

Här följer några påståenden om konsumtion, i vilken utsträckning instämmer du i dessa påståenden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Många varor vi konsumerar i Sverige leder till negativa konsekvenser för miljön i andra länder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>När vi konsumerar varor i Sverige så förbrukar vi många gånger naturresurser i andra länder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oron för att svenskars konsumtion skadar miljön i andra länder är överdriven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycket av det farliga avfall som uppkommer i Sverige hamnar till sist i fattiga länder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons for pro-environmental behaviour are other-regarding

När du köper ekologiskt märkta varor, hur viktiga är då nedanstående skäl för dig? (procent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Köper aldrig ekologiskt märkta varor</th>
<th>Inte alls viktigt</th>
<th>Mycket viktigt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekologiska varor har generellt sett bättre kvalitet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekologiska varor är bättre för min hälsa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekologiska varor skadar miljön i mindre utsträckning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekologiska varor är bättre för de människor som tillverkar varorna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att köpa ekologiska varor lättar mitt dåliga samvete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det påverkar samhällsutvecklingen i miljövänlig riktning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dismantling the distinction between public and private.

To dismantling the public-provate distinction means a shift from the traditional way of framing citizenship as being a political state/individual relationship, to incorporate the non-contractual relations between the citizens and this based upon the claim that also private relations and acts have negative environmental impact effect in the public arena and thus give rise to citizenship obligations. This logic is highly difficult to measure in a relevant way in the Swedish context. Our attempt is with the following items:

Här följer några blandade påståenden. I vilken utsträckning instämmer du i följande påståenden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
<th>Instämmer helt och hållet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Politiker och myndigheter ska inte lägga sig i om människor är miljövänliga eller inte |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
Det är bra att politiker och myndigheter försöker få människor att bete sig mer miljövänligt |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
Om jag väljer att köra bil är det min privatsak |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
Om jag väljer att äta kött är det min privatsak |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
I vilken utsträckning instämmer du i följande påståenden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var och en har rätt att fritt konsumera utan att andra ska lägga sig i</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer inte alls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer helt och hållet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unbounded responsibility.

As was indicated earlier, the space or sphere of ecological citizenship is not politically or geographically determined but coincide with the spread of negative effects that my actions have for others. The implication of this is that the scope of citizen duties should be extended both across generations and territorial borders. In total, we divide the aspect of unbounded responsibility into three sub-components when operationalising ecological citizenship: temporal extension of justice, spatial extension of justice, large scope of obligations. These components were translated into empirically usable survey questions by asking:

Temporal extension of justice

Vår konsumtion och resursanvändning idag har konsekvenser för framtida generationers livsvillkor. Vad tycker du är viktigast att ta hänsyn till när det gäller vår konsumtion och resursanvändning idag?

Nu levande människors livskvalitet är viktigast | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
**Spatial extension of justice**

Här följer några blandade påståenden. I vilken utsträckning instämmer du i dessa påståenden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Påståenden</th>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
<th>Instämmer helt och hållet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Det är orättvist att svensknarnas konsumtion förbrukar naturresurser i andra länder</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Så länge lagar och regler följs är det inte svenska konsumenters problem om miljön i andra länder skadas</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det är orättvist att svenskarnas sätt att leva skadar livsmiljön för människor i andra länder</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Large scope of obligations

**Non-reciprocal responsibility**

In consistence with the morality of social justice, the duties of the ecological citizen ought to be non-reciprocal. This means, the duties of ecological citizenship are described as responsibilities for all personal actions that affect others because it is not right to compromise others ability to lead a full life by upholding an unequal distribution of resources. This also means that acts of balancing may be needed, i.e., that some individuals may have to lower their negative environmental contributions while others may have the right to increase their negative environmental impact up to a certain level.

Our attempt to capture this aspect of ecological citizenship consists of the following items:
Enligt FNs klimatexperter kan alla människor på jorden släppa ut 0,5 ton koldioxid per år utan att jordens klimat förändras. Idag släpper somliga ut mer än 0,5 ton medan andra släpper ut mindre än 0,5 ton. I vilken utsträckning instämmer du i följande påståenden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De människor som släpper ut mer än 0,5 ton koldioxid per år har en skyldighet att minska sina utsläpp ned till 0,5 ton per år</th>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
<th>Instämmer helt och hållet</th>
<th>Ingen uppfattning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De människor som släpper ut mindre än 0,5 ton koldioxid per år har en rättighet att öka sina utsläpp till 0,5 ton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De människor som släpper ut mer än 0,5 ton koldioxid per år ska kunna fortsätta att göra detta om de kompenserar för sina höga utsläpp genom andra miljöförbättrande åtgärder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De människor som släpper ut mindre än 0,5 ton koldioxid per år ska kunna sälja rätten att släppa ut sin överskjutande del till andra människor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Concluding remarks

In this paper we have introduced a discussion on how the theoretical ideas and assumptions can be connected to the empirical literature on issues such as environmental values, norms, attitudes and behaviour. We believe we have come further than all earlier attempts. That is not to say we have reached all the way! In a next step, we would like to send this questionnaire to several countries, enabling comparative studies, something we believe is important since it would allow us to elucidate and illuminate cultural differences in terms of citizenship and the relation between individuals and the state, which are inevitably there. It should also be noted that apart from the EC-specific questions accounted for in this paper, we also have a variety of socio-psychological questions (e.g., values (Schwartz), attitudes (NEP) and social and personal norms) as well as a range of questions regarding issues such as willingness to pay, attitudes towards policy instruments (mainly climate change related) as well as questions concerning the individuals (self-reported) environmentally significant behaviour.
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