MEHMET KORKUT

2078194

FACTORS THAT AFFECT PRO-ENVIRONMENTAL BEHAVIOR OF GREEK CYPRIOTS

Supervised by Assoc. Prof. Dr. Maria Fernanda Rivas

April 2019

Abstract

The main objective of this paper is to find the factors that affect the pro-environmental behavior of Greek Cypriots by using the Eurobarometer Survey 88.1. Logit regressions are used to test 6 hypotheses created based on previous studies. Results indicate that education level and age increases the probability of behaving pro-environmentally. Also, residents of small towns and cities are likely to behave more pro-environmentally than rural residents. Higher income classes also have a likelihood to behave more for some pro-environmentall behavior compared to lower middle income classes. For cities, respondents in Larnaca, Paphos and Famagusta show high probability on different types of pro-environmental behavior than respondents in Nicosia. On the other hand, respondents who are married or living with a partner behave more pro-environmentally than single respondents. Lastly, respondents who are not very satisfied with their lives and never using internet in a day tend to show different types of pro-environmental behavior.

Acknowledgment

Firstly, I want to thank my supervisor Maria Fernanda Rivas who help and guide me throughout the semester. I could not be able to do this kind of a graduation project without her.

Secondly, I acknowledge my whole family, especially my great-grandmother who passed away 2 months ago. She is the one makes me who I am. Also, I want to thank specially to my uncle, Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özhan Öztuğ for being a role model for me.

Thirdly, I would like to thank my friends, İrfan Esendağlı, Beyit Yiğit, Onat Serin, Mehmet Dalgıç, Seval Avkan and Yasemin Mertdağ for their love and support during my university life.

Finally, I want to thank all of my instructors who helped me to love Economics and gain a different perspective.

Table of Contents

1.Introduction

Over the last few decades, the exploitation of planet Earth and the degradation of the environment on the planet have gone up at an alarming rate and therefore the number of environmental problems has gone up as well. The solution to the environmental problems is based on individuals' attitudes and behaviors. An attitude is " a relatively enduring organization of beliefs, feelings, and behavioral tendencies towards socially significant objects, groups, events or symbols " (Hogg & Vaughan 2005, p. 150). Therefore, anaylzing the effect of socially significant objects, groups etc. on persons' environmental beliefs, feelings or behavior is important in order to find a solution for the environmental problems. In other words, the change of people's actions towards the environment is not possible without the change of stereotype in their minds.

Cyprus is the third biggest island in the Mediterranean Sea and located between Turkey and Egypt. It has mediteranean climate which consists of dry-hot summers and warm-slightly rainy winters. However, the climate change is started to felt on the island. According to the report of The Cyprus Institute, an increase in extremely hot summer days and 10-15% reduction in rainfalls are expected between 2020 and 2050. Cypriots have to behave pro-environmentally otherwise Cyprus is going to be uninhabitable because of the extreme climatic conditions. The aim of this paper is to analyze the pro-environmental decision making of Cypriots or, to measure the effect of personal and social factors on pro-environmental decision making. There are several papers which studied this topic with different perspectives. However, there is no study done on Cyprus so that this research is going to be an addition to the literature.

Eurobarometer 88.1 (2017) by the European Comission is going to be used as a data source. The findings of the model indicates that increasing education level has a strong positive effect whereas age has a weak positive effect on the likelihood of different kinds of pro-environmental behavior. Also, an increase in income class increases the probability of behavior of different types of environmental behavior. Respondents who are married or living with a partner are likely to have a probability of behaving more pro-environmentally compared to single respondents. For residents, there is a strong probability that small town and urban citizens behave more pro-environmentally compared to rural citizens. In addition, citizens in touristical places such as Famagusta, Paphos and Larnaca are likely to show more pro-environmental behavior than citizens in Nicosia. In addition, there is a low probability that respondents who are not very satisfied with their lives and never using internet in a day tend to show different types of pro-environmental behavior compared to respondents who are satisfied with their lves and using internet eveyday.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows ; the results of the previous studies on pro-environmental behavior and the hypotheses are presented in section 2. Then, the explanation of the data and variables is included in section 3. Descriptive statistics of the variables are also presented in this section. In section 4, the model used in the analysis and solutions to possible problems are explained followed by the presentation of results of the model and their interpretation. Lastly, section 5 presents a general overview of the study and policy recommendations.

2.Literature Review

Pro-environmental purchasing behavior has been a popular topic in the last decade and many studies have been conducted by scholars. The studies on this topic have a wide range of approaches because there are many personal and social factors which affect people's behavior. Consequently, individual-level data that was collected by the Eurobarometer or other surveys from different years are used on the studies in order to analyze tpeople's attitudes and behaviors regarding the environment. In this section of the paper, different studies about pro-environmental behavior and attitude are presented. Firstly, papers studying the effect of education on pro-environmental behavior (PER) are presented. Secondly, papers analyzing the effect of gender on pro-environmental behavior are mentioned, followed by, studies related to the effect of age. Fourthly, studies regarding how living in urban or rural areas affects PER are mentioned. In the final part of the section, papers examining the relationship between marital status, the presence of children in the household and PER are mentioned.

Education and PER

Many papers found that education is positively correlated with PER. Meyer (2015) examined the effect of the twentieth century's educational reforms in Europe on environmental friendly behavior by using pooled data which consists of a two-wave Eurobarometer survey conducted in 2007 and 2011. Pro-environmental behaviors such as recycling waste, cutting down energy and water consumption, buying environmentally friendly products or environmental friendly traveling are used as the dependent variable. Two-stage least squares (2SLS) regression results showed that education has a large direct impact on PER : one additional year of education increases the number of pro-environmental behaviors by 8.3%. People who are more educated are more aware and more concerned about environmental problems. Similarly, Gifford &

Nilsson (2014) indicated that "making informed pro-environmental choices is difficult if one has incorrect or no knowledge" suggesting that the education type is also important, i.e, environmental attitudes also depend on which programs people are studying or have studied. For example, business and technology students are less concerned about the environment than students in other diciplines. In addition, Chankrajang & Muttarrak (2016) tried to answer the question, "Does schooling contribute to Pro-Environmental behaviors in Thailand?" According to their results, an increase in 1 year of schooling increases the probability of use of cloth bags by 5%, energy-saving light bulbs by 2.1% and energy efficient appliances by 7.7% in Thailand. Also, it decreases the probability of never using cloth bags by 6.7%, light-bulbs by 1.6% and energy-efficient appliances by 6.3%. Another study by Varoglu et al. (2017) investigated the environmental knowledge of 145 eighth grade students in North Cyprus and tries to find a correlation between environmental knowledge, attitudes, and behavior. Statistics showed that there is a significantly positive correlation between them but the correlation coefficient is not high. It can be said that environmental attitude has a stronger relationship with environmental knowledge than with environmental behavior. Therefore, Varoglu et al. (2017) claimed that improving the curriculum at secondary education will lead to higher environmental behavior and attitudes among students. On the other hand, Grenstdad & Wollebaek in 1998, found that education did not lead to PER behavior in Norway. This result can be supported by Rhead's (2015) research. Higher educated people with higher incomes cannot assimilate environmental information. Since the majority of the studies find a positive effect, I also expected to find a positive effect in Cyprus.

The first hypothesis is as follows :

H1 : Education has a positive effect on pro-environmental behavior.

Gender and PER

Even though some studies found that there are no clear gender differences in environmental attitudes and behaviors, in their review paper, Gifford & Nilsson (2014) stated from recently emerged researches that women have stronger environmental attitudes, behavior and concern than men. It can be explained by personality effect on genders' behaviors. For instance, being agreeable, which is more conspicuous of women's personal traits, affects pro-environmental behavior in a positive way. Many patterns of personality were used to explain the gender differences in this issue. Moreover, Paço & Rodrigues (2016)'s findings supported this idea. Regression results showed that women exhibit a significantly higher environmental responsibility than men among Portugueses who are 18 years old or older in 2014. Similarly, findings of Casalo & Escario (2017) showed that Spanish women behave more pro-environmentally than Spanish men. On the other hand, Marie-Line & Maja (2008) conducted two survey studies in France and Great Britain in order to analyze the adherence and knowledge of pro-ecological norms. In the first study, gender differences in France cannot be observed. In contrast, in the other one, they found that although both of the genders are aware of the social desirability, women have a stronger normative adherence than men to pro-environmental ideas. Therefore, it should be noted from this study that gender differences are not always found in studies. Because most of the studies found a positive relationship between education and PER, it is also expected to find a positive relationship in Cyprus.

The second hypothesis is as follows :

H2 : Women behave more pro-environmentally than men.

Age and PER

It is difficult to draw a general conclusion about the effect of age on pro-environmental behavior from the past studies because some papers found that old people care about the environment wheras other papers suggest the opposite. Gifford & Nilsson (2014) review different studies on the relationship between age and pro-environmental behavior. One study suggested that older people show more pro-environmental behavior than younger people. This is explained by the effect of historical events or "cohort effect" in the article. The Great Depression in the 1930s and Second World War in 1940s had a great impact on older people. Limited resources and the attitude of protection on those times have increased people's concerns about the environment. In addition, according to a study by Casaló & Escario (2017), there exists a positive relationship between age and pro-environmental behavior. This results can be explained by trust on technology : Young people may think that technological developments will take care of environmental problems so that there is no need to be concerned about it. However, most studies found that younger people are more environmentally concerned than older people. The findings can be explained by the "true age effect" and the "era effect". True age effect is the possibility that people become less concerned about the environment when they get older. The reason for that can be the change in attitudes when people are getting close to death. Mostly religious old people think that if they harm the environment, god will punish them after death. On the other hand, era effect arises from the change in social-political climate over the years. Changing situations may make people less concerned about the environment. Thus, they may behave less pro-environmentally. For example, people behave less pro-environmentally in economic recession or war times. Since there was a war in 1974, it is expected older Cypriots to behave more pro-environmentally than younger ones because of the cohort effect.

The fourth hypothesis is as follows :

H3 : Older people behave more pro-environmentally than young people.

Region (Urban-rural) and PER

Despite the fact that some people think that people who live in rural areas behave more pro-environmentally than people live in urban cities, Chen et al. (2011) indicated that urbanized people are more likely to engage in pro-environmental behaviors in China, especially highly educated young people. Similarly, Gifford & Nilson (2014) mentioned a study that reported the urbanized German people's commitement to the environmental issues. They are more commited to the environmental issues than people who live in rural areas of Germany. Another study stated that although Norwegian farmers want to protect the environment, they put their interests ahead of nature's interest. On the other hand, Hinds & Sparks (2008) mentioned that British people with rural backgrounds show a more positive attitude towards the environment than people with urban backgrounds. As the Republic of Cyprus mostly consists of rural areas, most people have a direct relationships with nature. Therefore, it is expected that rural residents behave more pro-environmentally than urban residents.

The fourth hypothesis is as follows :

H4 : Rural residents behave more pro-environmentally than urban residents.

Marital Status, presence of children in the household and PER

Chen et al. (2011) found that single respondents behave more pro-environmentally than married respondents in China. When it can be considered that single respondents are generally younger than married ones, the authors noted that the effect of marital status over age may be because of time constraints on pro-enviornmental behavior which is forced by family responsibilities. Furthermore, Garcia-Valinas et al. (2011) 's results showed that the "never married" status has

significantly positive effect on environmental engagement in both Western and Eastern Europe. On the other hand, Ergun & Rivas (2019) mentioned in Turkey that people with a child worry more about climate change. Beckmann (1993) 's findings supported this idea. Parents with larger families are likely to have children in school where environmental issues are discussed so that they feel pressure to meet their children's socially conscious behavior. Therefore, they behave more pro-environmentally. Besides, married females who are home-makers show more concern about climate change. However, despite the two opposite results mentioned above, Diamontopoulos et al. (2003) found no difference between married and single people in terms of environmental knowledge. Since most of the studies found that single people and people with children behave more pro-environmentally, I also expected to find the same results for the Cyprus case.

The sixth and seventh hypothesises are as follows :

H5 : Single people behave more pro-environmentally than married people.

H6 : People with children behave more pro-environmentally than others.

3. Data and Variables

3.1 Data

The dataset used in this paper is the EUROBAROMETER 88.1 which was retrieved from GESIS Data Catalogue. It was collected through face-to-face or face-to-face computer-assisted personal interview by CYMAR at the request of the Directorate-General for Communication "Media monitoring and analysis" Unit between 23 September and 2 October 2017. It covers 28 countries and includes categories which are international institutions, relations and conditions, political issues, political attitudes and behavior, society and culture, natural environment and nature. The minimum age of the respondents is 15 years old. The number of

interviews is around 1000 for the most of the countries. However, it is 501 for the Republic Of Cyprus.

3.2 Dependent Variable

The dependent variable differs for each logit model. It is an index which is created by adding the respondents' multiple answers to the question : "Have you done any of the followings in the past six months ?". The answers takes value 1 if respondent did the action, and 0 otherwise it is 0. The selectional answers are : 1) "chosen a more environmentally-friendly way of travelling (walk, bicycle, public transport, electric car)" , 2) " avoided buying over-packaged products" , 3) " avoided single-use plastic goods other than plastic bags (e.g. plastic cutlery, cups, plates, etc.) or bought resuable plastic goods , 4) " seperated most of your waste for recyling" , 5) "cut down your water consumption" , 6) " cut down your energy consumption (e.g. by turning down air conditioning or heating, not leaving appliances on stand-by, buying energy efficient appliances) , 7) " bought products marked with environmental label" , 8) " bought local products" , 9) " used your car less by avoiding unnecessary trips, working from home (teleworking), etc. ". In addition to the nine selectional answers above, "none" and " don't know" are also selectional. Respondents who chose "none" are included as zero in the index . One respondent who chose " don't know" was eliminated from the dataset.

Firstly, an index which consists of the addition of all answers is used as a dependent variable in ordered logit model. Secondly, an index named **eco_travel** which contains answers of question 1 and 9 is used for logit model 1. Thirdly, an index named **eco_purchase products** which includes answers of question 2, 3, 7 and 8 is used for logit model 2. Fourthly, an index

named **recycling** contains the answer of question 4 is used for logit model 3. Finally, an index named **w_e_consumption** includes answers of question 5 and 6 is used for logit model 4.

The distribution of the dependent variable is shown in **Table-1**.

Table 1 : Distribution of the dependent variable

Index	Frequency	Percentage
0	67	13.4
1	94	18.9
2	107	21.4
3	106	21.2
4	66	13.1
5	34	6.9
6	14	2.9
7	5	1.1
8	5	0.9
9	1	0.2
Total	500	100.00

3.2 Explanatory Variables

Sociodemographic variables such as age, education level, marital status, having children, income class, gender, district, type of community and other variables such as internet use and

life satisfaction are used as explanatory variables. All independent variables are qualitative variables except age which is a quantitative variable. Dummy variables are created for qualitative variables. In addition, respondents who chose “do not know” or “ refusal” in the questions were eliminated from the dataset.

Firstly, education is measured by the age which respondents stopped full-time education in the main dataset. Therefore, “Age of stopping full-time education – 6 “ is used in order to calculate the education years of respondents. Four dummy variables are created for the education. Respondents’ whose educational years are between 0 and 9 are counted as primary/secondary school. In addition, respondents whose educational years are between 9 and 13 are counted as high-school. Then, respondents whose educational years are above 13 are counted as university/master/phd.

Secondly, lower-middle, middle and upper-middle income classes are created in order to observe the environmental behavior of different income classes. While doing this, working class and lower-middle class are combined due to their low frequencies. Also, upper-middle class and high class are combined due to the same reason.

Thirdly, marital status and having children or not are included to the data by asking the current situation of respondents. The possible answers to the question consist of 4 categories which are married, single but living with a partner, single and widow/divorced. Therefore, married and single but living with a partner are combined and three dummy variables are created for the marital status. Also, there are answers including having children or not in these categories. Combaining the answers, I noted a dummy variable that shows if the respondent has a child or not.

Fourthly, the district where the respondent lives is included. The districts are Nicosia, Larnaka, Famagusta, Limassol and Paphos.

Fifthly, urban, rural and small town dummy variables are created to see if rural residents behave more pro-environmentally than urban residents. Sixthly, gender variable men is created in order to find which of the genders are behaving pro-environmentally. Seventhly, the age varibale is used to check the relationship between the age of the respondents and his/her pro-environmental behavior. Apart from socio-demographic variables, life satisfaction and internet usage are used even though any paper regarding the relationship between PER and them was not found. Life satisfaction of respondents is measured as ; satisfied, not very satisfied, and not at all satisfied. Lastly, internet use of the respondents is measured as ; using everyday, using often and using never. The description of the explanatory variables is shown in **Table-2a.**

Table 2a : Descriptions of explanatory variables

Age	Age of the respondents
Men	Takes value 1 if the respondent is coded as 1
Lowermiddle income class	Takes value 1 if the respondent answered as working class or lower-middle class of the society when asked : " do you see yourself and your household belonging to …? "
Middle income class	Takes value 1 if the respondent answered as middle-class of the society when asked : " do you see yourself and your household belonging to …? "
Uppermiddle income class	Takes value 1 if the respondent answered as upper-middle or high class of the society when asked : " do you see yourself and your household belonging to …? "
Primary_secondary school	Takes value 1 if the respondent studied less than 9 years
High school	Takes value 1 if the respondent studied between 9 and 13 years

University_master_phd	Takes value 1 if the respondent studied more than 13 years
Household_with_child	Takes value 1 if the respondent answered as single or multiple household with children
Household_without_child	Takes value 1 if the respondent answered as single or multiple household without children
Single	Takes value 1 if the respondent is single
Married_partner	Takes value 1 if the respondent is married or is single but living with a partner
Divorced	Takes value 1 if the respondent is divorced or widow
Nicosia	Takes value 1 if the district is coded as 1
Limassol	Takes value 1 if the district is coded as 2
Larnaca	Takes value 1 if the district is coded as 3
Paphos	Takes value 1 if the district is coded as 4
Famagusta	Takes value 1 if the district is coded as 5
Rural	Takes value 1 if the type of community is coded as 1
Small_town	Takes value 1 if the type of community is coded as 2
Urban	Takes value 1 if the type of community is coded as 3
Internet_usage_everyday	Take value 1 if the respondent is using internet everyday
Internet_usage_often	Takes value 1 if the respondent is using internet often
Int_usage_never	Takes value 1 if the respondent is not using internet
Life_very_satisfied	Takes value 1 if the respondent is very satisfied with his/her life
Life_not_very_satisfied	Takes value 1 if the respondent is not very satisfied with his/her life
Life_not_all_satisfied	Takes value 1 if the respondent is not all satisfied with his/her life

Table 2b : Descriptive statistics of variables

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
index_dependent	500	0	9	2,46	1,744
age	500	15	90	45,01	18,762
men	500	0	1	,48	,500
women	500	0	1	,52	,500
Lowermiddle income class	488	0	1	,42	,494
Middle income class	488	0	1	,54	,499
Uppermiddle income class	488	0	1	,04	,200
primary_secondary school	449	0	1	,20	,397
High school	449	0	1	,45	,498
university_master_phd	449	0	1	,31	,465
Household_with_child	500	0	1	,35	,478
Household_without_child	500	0	1	,54	,499
Nicosia	500	0	1	,39	,489
Limassol	500	0	1	,32	,466
Larnaca	500	0	1	,13	,336
Paphos	500	0	1	,12	,319
Famagusta	500	0	1	,04	,206
single	500	0	1	,14	,345
married_partner	500	0	1	,75	,434
divorced	500	0	1	,11	,318
rural	500	0	1	,37	,484
small_town	500	0	1	,30	,457
urban	500	0	1	,33	,471
Internet_usage_everyday	500	0	1	,67	,472
Internet_usage_often	500	0	1	,10	,295
Internet_usage_never	500	0	1	,15	,362

life_very_satisfied	500	0	1	,90	,305
life_not_very_satisfed	500	0	1	,09	,279
life_not_all_satisfied	500	0	1	,02	,123
Valid N (listwise)	441				

4. Results

1 ordered and 4 different logit models are used for the estimation. All variables used in the regression are adjusted by using the weight from Eurobarometer 88.1 to correct the sample.

Results of 4 different logit models are presented in **Table-3**. Robust logit regression is used in order to deal with heteroskedasticity. Also, there is no multicollinearity between the explanatory variables because none of the VIF values is above 5 (see appendix 1b).

Reference categories are **: women, lowermiddle-income class, primary_secondary school, household_with_child, Nicosia, single, rural, internet_usage everyday and life_very_satisfied**

Before the interpretation of 4 logit models, extreme results of the ordered logit model will be interpreted. Based on results of ordered logit model (**Appendix 1a**), it can be said that age decreases the probability of behaving pro-environmentally by *0.01 %* for the respondents who do not behave pro-environmentally in general (index number 0 and 1). On the other hand, age increases the probability of behaving pro-environmentally for the higher groups (index number 4 and 5) by *0.05-0.07 %*. Therefore, it has a ineffectual effect. In addition, the highest probability that upper-middle and high income classes behave more pro-environmentally than lower-middle income class is *0.048* . In a same way, the probability that upper-middle and high

income classes behave less pro-environmentally than lower-middle income class is *0.074*. For education, the probability of pro-environmental behavior of university-master-phd graduates more than primary-secondary school graduates is *0.084* at most. Inversly, the probability of the opposite situation can be at most *0.013*. Furthermore, highest probabilities that respondents are Larnaca, Paphos and Famagusta behave more pro-environmentally than respondents in Nicosia are 0.0*69, 0.047* and *0.0117*. Inversly, probabilities that respondents in Larnaca, Paphos and Famagusta behave less pro-environmentally than respondents in Nicosia are increased by *10.6%, 7.2%* and *2.4%*. On the other hand, the likelihood of respondents who are married or living with a partner behaving more pro-environmentally than single respondents is increased by *5 %* at most. Also, the likelihood of opposite situation can be increased by *7.8%* at most. Meanwhile, the probability of the environmental behavior of small town and uran residents more than rural residents can be increased by *6.11 %* at most. However, the probability of the environmental behavior of small town and uran residents less than rural residents can be increased by *9.4%* at most. Lastly, the probability that respondents who are not very satisfied with their lives behave more pro-environmentlly than respondents who are very satisfied with their lives is *0.038*.

Table 3 : Regression results of logit models

Dependent variable	**Model 1 eco_travel**		**Model 2 eco_purchase products**		**Model 3 recycling**		**Model 4 w_e_consumption**	
Independent variable	p-value	Marginal Effect	p-value	Marginal Effect	p-value	Marginal Effect	p-value	Marginal Effect
age	**0.006**	**0.003**	0.557	-0.0009	**0.088**	**0.002**	0.327	0.001
men	0.530	-0.209	0.567	0.025	0.115	-0.065	0.694	-0.018
middle	**0.008**	**-0.100**	0.410	0.041	0.689	0.018	0.944	-0.003
uppermiddle	0.298	-0.068	**0.050**	**0.259**	0.396	0.106	0.951	0.07
high	**0.000**	**0.174**	**0.033**	**0.121**	**0.005**	**0.149**	0.599	0.032
uni_master_phd	**0.000**	**0.302**	**0.005**	**0.200**	**0.000**	**0.288**	0.660	0.033
hh_child	0.33	-0.351	0.740	-0.017	0.631	-0.0241	0.679	0.022
Limassol	0.838	0.008	0.397	-0.043	**0.032**	**0.112**	0.479	-0.04
Larnaca	**0.018**	**0.124**	**0.001**	**0.233**	0.123	0.102	0.402	0.062
Paphos	**0.036**	**0.143**	**0.001**	**0.332**	0.787	0.0211	0.153	-0.127
Famagusta	0.112	0.143	**0.003**	**0.357**	**0.001**	**0.341**	**0.001**	**0.512**
married_partner	**0.068**	**0.188**	**0.037**	**0.205**	0.683	0.043	0.253	0.126
divorced	0.195	0.150	**0.095**	**0.182**	0.946	-0.008	0.829	0.027
small_town	**0.026**	**0.099**	0.755	0.018	**0.000**	**0.293**	**0.021**	**0.138**
urban	**0.000**	**0.175**	0.993	0.0005	**0.000**	**0.192**	**0.066**	**0.112**
Int_often	0.804	0.013	0.305	0.079	0.573	-0.03	0.641	-0.036
Int_never	0.241	0.049	**0.058**	**0.102**	0.677	-0.02	0.753	-0.018
L_not_very_satisfied	0.688	0.023	**0.048**	**0.142**	0.755	-0.02	0.746	-0.025
L_not_all_satisfied	0.350	0.121	0.770	0.061	0.710	-0.07	0.974	-0.005

Firstly, based on the results of **Model 1** (environmentally way of travelling), age increases the probability of using environmentally way of travelling by 0.3 %, holding else constant. Being a middle-income class decreased the probability of using environmentally way of travelling by 10% compared to being lower middle income class. Moreover, being a high school and

university-master-phd graduate increased the probability of environmentally travelling by 17.4 and 30.2 %, compared to being primary-secondary school graduate. In addition, living in Larnaca and Paphos increases the probability of choosing environmentally way of travelling by 12.4% and 14.3% respectively, compared to living in Nicosia. For marital status, being married or living with a partner increases the likelihood of choosing environmentally way of travelling by 18.8%. Also, living in a small town and urban increases the probability of choosing environmentally way of travelling by 9.9% and 17.5% respectively, compared to living in rural areas.

Secondly,based on the results of **Model 2** (showing environmental purchasing behavior), being an upper-middle income class increases the probability of showing environmental purchasing behavior by 25.9%, compared to being a lower-middle income class. For education, , being a high school and university-master-phd graduate increased the probability of showing environmental purchasing behavior by 12.1% and 20% respectively, compared to being primary-secondary school graduate. In addition to that, living in Larnaca, Paphos and Famagusta increases the likelihood of showing environmental purchasing behavior by 23.3%, 33.2% and 35.7%, compared to living in Nicosia. On the other hand, being a married or living with a partner and divorced increases the probability of showing environmental purchasing behavior by 20.5% and 18.2%, compared to being single. For internet usage, never using internet increases the probability of showing environmental purchasing behavior by 10.2% ,compared to using internet everyday. Being not very satisfied with life also increases the likelihood of showing environmental purchasing behavior by 14.2% compared to being fully satisfied with life.

Thirdly, based on the results of **Model 3** (recycling), age increases the probability of recycling by 0.2% at the 8.8% significance level, holding else constant. On the other hand, being a high school and university-master-phd graduate increases the likelihood of recycling by 14.9% and

28.8% respectively compared to being a primary-secondary school graduate. If we look at the districts of Cyprus, it can be seen that living in Limassol and Famagusta increases the probability of recycling by 11.2% and 34.1% severally compared to living in Nicosia. Also, being a resident in small towns and urban cities increases the likeliness of recycling by 29.3% and 19.2 % compared to being a resident in rural areas.

Lastly, based on the results of **Model 4** (cutting down water and energy consumption), living in Famagusta increases the likelihood of cutting down water and energy consumption by 51.2% compared to living in Nicosia. In addition to that, being a resident in small towns increases the probability of cutting down water and energy consumption by 13.8% whereas being a resident in urban cities increases the likelihood by 11.2% , compared to being a resident in rural areas.

It is clearly seen that when education level increases the probability of behaving pro-environmentally in terms of travelling, purchasing and recycling increases. Thus, *Hypothesis 1* is supported due to evidence from **Model 1,2** and **3**. However, an evidence cannot be found to support or reject *Hypothesis 2* due to statistical insignificance of the coefficients in all models. In addition, *Hypothesis 3* is supported by the findings of **Model 1** and **3**. Therefoe, age has a small effect on the likelihood of behaving pro-environmentally on travelling and recycling. *Hypothesis 4* is rejected due to findings of **Model 1,3** and **4**. It can be said that urban residents behave more pro-environmentally in terms of travelling, recycling and water-energy consumption than rural residents. *Hypothesis 5* is also rejected by the findings of **Model 1** and **2**. The probability that married people behave more pro-environmentally than single people in terms of pro-environmentally travelling and purchasing behavior is almost 10%. Lastly, there is no statistically significant evidence found to neither support nor reject the *Hypothesis 6*.

5. Conclusion

This study measures the pro-environmental behavior of the Greek Cypriots by using the Eurobarometer 88.1 which is collected in 2017. Logit regressions are used to measure the level of pro-environmental behavior of respondents.

Evidence from different logit models is found to support *Hypothesis 1* (Education has a positive effect on pro-environmental behavior). It was expected to find such a connection between education and pro-environmental behavior and the result is in line with Meyer(2015), Chankrajang & Mutarrak (2016) and Varoglu et al. (2017). On the other hand, no statistical evidence is found to neither support *Hypothesis 2* (Women behave more pro-environmentally than men) nor reject it. *Hypothesis 3* (Older people behave more pro-environmentally than young people) is supported due to findings of Model 1 and 3 which includes age variable at 8.8 percent significance level. The result is in line with the cohort effect in the paper of Gifford & Nilson (2014). In addition, the evidence is against *Hypothesis 4* (Rural residents behave more pro-environmentally than urban residents). This result is in line with Chen et al. (2011) and Gifford & Nilson (2014). Moreover, *Hypothesis 5* (Single people behave more pro-environmentally than married people) is not supported since the results show the opposite, i.e that Cypriots who are married or living with a partner behave more pro-environmentally than single ones. Thus, it can be said that this result clashes with most of the findings of the literature. Unfortunately, *Hypothesis* 6 (People with children behave more pro-environmentally than others) is also not rejected or supported due to statistical insignificance of coefficients. In addition, other results of the models indicate that there is a high probability that respondents in Larnaca , Paphos and Famagusta behave more pro-environmentally than respondents in Nicosia. Also, there is a low probability on the facts that internet usage and life satisfaction level decreases the pro-environmental purchasing behavior.

Since the effects of environmental problems have been increasing in a strong way, there should be some policies done by the government to reduce the effect of these problems. Based on my findings, as a policy recommendation, the concept of "environmental issues" should occupy a more important place in the education system and people should be encouraged to complete at least high school. Also, I think there should be more environmental indicators and supervision around the Nicosia area because touristic cities like Larnaca are better at pro-environmental behavior. On the other hand, I think there should be more supervision in farming sector around the villages because the results of the model indicate that rural residents behave less pro-environmentally than other residents. This might be because of the harmful substances used by farmers which damage the ecolocigal balance of the environment.

REFERENCE LIST

Autio, Minna & Heiskanen, Eva & Heinonen, Visa. (2009). Narratives of 'green' consumers - The antihero, the environmental hero and the anarchist. Journal of Consumer Behaviour. 8. 40 - 53. 10.1002/cb.272.

Casaló, L. V., & Escario, J. J. (2018). Heterogeneity in the association between environmental attitudes and pro-environmental behavior: A multilevel regression approach. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *175*, 155–163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.11.237

Chankrajang, Thanyaporn & Muttarak, Raya. (2017). Green Returns to Education: Does Schooling Contribute to Pro-Environmental Behaviours? Evidence from Thailand. Ecological Economics. 131. 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2016.09.015.

Chen, X., Peterson, M., Hull, V., Lu, C., Lee, G., Hong, D., & Lıu, J. (2011). Effects of attitudinal and sociodemographic factors on pro-environmental behaviour in urban China. *Environmental Conservation*, 38(1), 45-52.

Diamantopoulos, A., Schlegelmilch, B. B., Sinkovics, R. R., & Bohlen, G. M. (2003). Can socio-demographics still play a role in profiling green consumers? A review of the evidence and an empirical investigation. *Journal of Business research*, 56(6), 465-480.

Ergun, SJ, Rivas, MF. The effect of social roles, religiosity, and values on climate change concern: An empirical analysis for Turkey. *Sustainable Development*. 2019; 1– 12.

García-Valiñas, M. A., Macintyre, A., & Torgler, B. (2012). Volunteering, pro-environmental attitudes and norms. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 41(4), 455-467.

Gifford, R., & Nilsson, A. (2014). Personal and social factors that influence pro-environmental concern and behavior: A review. *International Journal of Psychology*, *49*(3), 141–157. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12034

Hinds, J., & Sparks, P. (2008). Engaging with the natural environment: The role of affective connection and identity. *Journal of environmental psychology*, 28(2), 109-120.

Marie-Line, F., & Maja, B. (2008). Pro-environmental attitudes and behavior: Revealing perceived social desirability. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale*, *21*(4), 25–53. Retrieved from www.cairn.info/revue-internationale-de-psychologie-sociale-2008-4-page-25.htm

McLeod, S. A. (2018, May 21). Attitudes and behavior. Retrieved from https://www.simplypsychology.org/attitudes.html

Meyer, Andrew, (2015), Does education increase pro-environmental behavior? Evidence from Europe, Ecological Economics, 116, issue C, p. 108-121,

Paço, A. and Gouveia Rodrigues, R. (2016), Environmental activism and consumers' perceived responsibility. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 40: 466-474. doi:10.1111/ijcs.12272

Rhead, R. (2015). Concern for the natural environment and its effect on pro-environmental behaviour amongst the British Public, 1–439.

Varoglu, L., Temel, S., Yılmaz, A. (2018). Knowledge, Attitudes and Behaviours towards the Environmental Issues: Case of Northern Cyprus. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 14(3), 997-1004.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1a-Results of the Ordered logit and 4 logit models (Stata Output)

```
Iteration 0:   log pseudolikelihood = -914.97874
Iteration 1:   log pseudolikelihood = -866.70229
Iteration 2:   log pseudolikelihood = -865.93877
Iteration 3:   log pseudolikelihood = -865.93787
Iteration 4:   log pseudolikelihood = -865.93787

Ordered logistic regression                     Number of obs     =        471
                                                Wald chi2(19)     =     121.05
                                                Prob > chi2       =     0.0000
Log pseudolikelihood = -865.93787               Pseudo R2         =     0.0536

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |               Robust
     index_dependent |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |      .0105   .0062581     1.68   0.093    -.0017656    .0227655
                 men |  -.1327885   .1771923    -0.75   0.454     -.480079     .214502
              middle |    .021467   .2108367     0.10   0.919    -.3917654    .4346994
         uppermiddle |   .7065665   .4090412     1.73   0.084    -.0951396    1.508273
                high |   .7064694   .2312101     3.06   0.002     .2533059    1.159633
      uni_master_phd |   1.242945   .2790307     4.45   0.000     .6960549    1.789835
            hh_child |  -.1090427   .2262382    -0.48   0.630    -.5524613     .334376
            Limassol |   .0315058    .208626     0.15   0.880    -.3773935    .4404052
             Larnaca |   1.017662   .2918216     3.49   0.000     .4457021    1.589622
              Paphos |    .691063   .3852851     1.79   0.073    -.0640819    1.446208
           Famagusta |   2.290325   .3254409     7.04   0.000     1.652472    2.928177
     married_partner |   .7434624   .3250439     2.29   0.022      .106388    1.380537
            divorced |   .3669752   .3757602     0.98   0.329    -.3695011    1.103452
          small_town |   .9493643   .2285266     4.15   0.000     .5014603    1.397268
               urban |   .8972497   .2252314     3.98   0.000     .4558042    1.338695
           int_often |   .1306036   .2821182     0.46   0.643     -.422338    .6835452
           int_never |  -.0290556    .229802    -0.13   0.899    -.4794591     .421348
l_not_very_satisfied |   .5682681   .2937644     1.93   0.053    -.0074995    1.144036
 l_not_all_satisfied |   .1741234   .4655303     0.37   0.708    -.7382991    1.086546
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------------
               /cut1 |    .667653   .4310921                     -.177272    1.512578
               /cut2 |   1.832655   .4298578                     .9901492    2.675161
               /cut3 |   2.830661   .4420562                     1.964247    3.697075
               /cut4 |   3.906889    .460514                     3.004298     4.80948
               /cut5 |   4.885788   .4683775                     3.967785    5.803791
               /cut6 |   5.793967   .4924765                     4.828731    6.759203
               /cut7 |   6.538269   .5065684                     5.545414    7.531125
               /cut8 |   7.330048   .5791641                     6.194907    8.465188
               /cut9 |   8.607098   .7860059                     7.066555    10.14764
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

.
. *marginal effects.
.
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(0))

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(index_dependent==0), predict(outcome(0))
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

```
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+------------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |  -.0011038   .0006509    -1.70   0.090    -.0023796     .000172
                 men |   .0139594    .018583     0.75   0.453    -.0224626    .0503813
              middle |  -.0022567   .0221727    -0.10   0.919    -.0457144     .041201
         uppermiddle |  -.0742776   .0443383    -1.68   0.094    -.1611792    .0126239
                high |  -.0742674   .0248464    -2.99   0.003    -.1229655   -.0255694
      uni_master_phd |  -.1306643   .0311349    -4.20   0.000    -.1916875    -.069641
            hh child |   .0114631   .0237355     0.48   0.629    -.0350576    .0579838
            Limassol |   -.003312     .02197    -0.15   0.880    -.0463725    .0397484
             Larnaca |  -.1069814   .0313022    -3.42   0.001    -.1683326   -.0456303
              Paphos |  -.0726478   .0407885    -1.78   0.075    -.1525917    .0072961
           Famagusta |  -.2407698   .0417818    -5.76   0.000    -.3226606   -.1588789
     married_partner |  -.0781563   .0337434    -2.32   0.021     -.144292   -.0120205
            divorced |  -.0385782   .0392015    -0.98   0.325    -.1154118    .0382554
          small_town |  -.0998017   .0262842    -3.80   0.000    -.1513177   -.0482856
               urban |  -.0943231   .0247073    -3.82   0.000    -.1427486   -.0458977
           int_often |  -.0137297    .029598    -0.46   0.643    -.0717406    .0442813
           int_never |   .0030545   .0241275     0.13   0.899    -.0442345    .0503435
l_not_very_satisfied |   -.059739   .0311043    -1.92   0.055    -.1207024    .0012243
 l_not_all_satisfied |  -.0183047   .0489954    -0.37   0.709    -.1143339    .0777245
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(1))

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(index_dependent==1), predict(outcome(1))
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+------------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |  -.0008547   .0005181    -1.65   0.099    -.0018702    .0001609
                 men |    .010809   .0144316     0.75   0.454    -.0174764    .0390944
              middle |  -.0017474   .0171614    -0.10   0.919    -.0353831    .0318883
         uppermiddle |  -.0575145    .033733    -1.70   0.088    -.1236299     .008601
                high |  -.0575066   .0186699    -3.08   0.002     -.094099   -.0209142
      uni_master_phd |  -.1011756   .0227587    -4.45   0.000    -.1457819   -.0565694
            hh_child |   .0088761   .0184036     0.48   0.630    -.0271943    .0449464
            Limassol |  -.0025646   .0169809    -0.15   0.880    -.0358465    .0307174
             Larnaca |  -.0828376    .025038    -3.31   0.001    -.1319113    -.033764
              Paphos |  -.0562525   .0313554    -1.79   0.073    -.1177079     .005203
           Famagusta |  -.1864323   .0301515    -6.18   0.000    -.2455281   -.1273365
     married_partner |  -.0605178   .0270789    -2.23   0.025    -.1135914   -.0074441
            divorced |  -.0298718   .0308254    -0.97   0.333    -.0902883    .0305448
          small_town |  -.0772782   .0191503    -4.04   0.000    -.1148121   -.0397443
               urban |  -.0730361   .0185565    -3.94   0.000    -.1094061   -.0366661
           int_often |  -.0106311   .0230453    -0.46   0.645    -.0557991    .0345369
           int_never |   .0023651   .0187366     0.13   0.900    -.0343579    .0390881
l_not_very_satisfied |   -.046257    .024166    -1.91   0.056    -.0936215    .0011075
 l_not_all_satisfied |  -.0141736    .037879    -0.37   0.708    -.0884151    .0600678
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(2))

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(index dependent==2), predict(outcome(2))
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+------------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |   -.000324    .000215    -1.51   0.132    -.0007453    .0000973
                 men |   .0040972   .0056678     0.72   0.470    -.0070115    .0152059
```

```
              middle |  -.0006624   .0064971    -0.10   0.919    -.0133964    .0120717
        uppermiddle |  -.0218013   .0124409    -1.75   0.080    -.0461851    .0025825
                high |  -.0217983   .0092023    -2.37   0.018    -.0398344   -.0037622
      uni master phd |  -.0383514   .0125911    -3.05   0.002    -.0630296   -.0136732
            hh_child |   .0033645    .007076     0.48   0.634    -.0105041    .0172332
            Limassol |  -.0009721   .0064097    -0.15   0.879     -.013535    .0115907
             Larnaca |  -.0314002   .0118424    -2.65   0.008    -.0546109   -.0081896
              Paphos |  -.0213229   .0130095    -1.64   0.101    -.0468211    .0041752
           Famagusta |  -.0706686   .0174009    -4.06   0.000    -.1047738   -.0365635
     married partner |  -.0229397    .012093    -1.90   0.058    -.0466416    .0007621
            divorced |  -.0113231   .0123132    -0.92   0.358    -.0354565    .0128103
          small_town |  -.0292929   .0092091    -3.18   0.001    -.0473425   -.0112434
               urban |  -.0276849   .0097908    -2.83   0.005    -.0468744   -.0084954
           int_often |  -.0040298   .0087793    -0.46   0.646    -.0212369    .0131773
           int_never |   .0008965   .0071054     0.13   0.900    -.0130298    .0148229
l not very satisfied |  -.0175341   .0095347    -1.84   0.066    -.0362218    .0011536
 l_not_all_satisfied |  -.0053726   .0143297    -0.37   0.708    -.0334584    .0227131
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(3))

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(index_dependent==3), predict(outcome(3))
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |   .0004381   .0002725     1.61   0.108     -.000096    .0009722
                 men |  -.0055405   .0073599    -0.75   0.452    -.0199657    .0088846
              middle |   .0008957   .0088032     0.10   0.919    -.0163583    .0181497
        uppermiddle |   .0294812   .0186398     1.58   0.114    -.0070522    .0660146
                high |   .0294772   .0098516     2.99   0.003     .0101683     .048786
      uni_master_phd |   .0518614   .0134168     3.87   0.000     .0255649    .0781579
            hh_child |  -.0045498   .0093763    -0.49   0.628     -.022927    .0138275
            Limassol |   .0013146   .0087628     0.15   0.881    -.0158602    .0184893
             Larnaca |   .0424615   .0145516     2.92   0.004      .013941    .0709821
              Paphos |   .0288343   .0166132     1.74   0.083    -.0037269    .0613956
           Famagusta |   .0955629   .0221814     4.31   0.000     .0520882    .1390376
     married_partner |   .0310207   .0136951     2.27   0.024     .0041787    .0578627
            divorced |   .0153119   .0156312     0.98   0.327    -.0153246    .0459484
          small_town |   .0396118   .0111126     3.56   0.000     .0178316    .0613921
               urban |   .0374374   .0098407     3.80   0.000     .0181501    .0567247
           int_often |   .0054494   .0118613     0.46   0.646    -.0177983    .0286971
           int_never |  -.0012123   .0096076    -0.13   0.900    -.0200429    .0176182
l_not_very_satisfied |   .0237108   .0128601     1.84   0.065    -.0014945     .048916
 l_not_all_satisfied |   .0072652   .0194336     0.37   0.709    -.0308238    .0453543
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(4))

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(index_dependent==4), predict(outcome(4))
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |   .0007159   .0004287     1.67   0.095    -.0001243    .0015561
                 men |  -.0090537   .0122105    -0.74   0.458    -.0329858    .0148785
              middle |   .0014636   .0143821     0.10   0.919    -.0267247     .029652
        uppermiddle |   .0481745   .0283152     1.70   0.089    -.0073223    .1036712
                high |   .0481678   .0159404     3.02   0.003     .0169253    .0794104
      uni_master_phd |   .0847453   .0192438     4.40   0.000     .0470281    .1224625
            hh_child |  -.0074346   .0153649    -0.48   0.628    -.0375494    .0226801
```

```
            Limassol |   .0021481     .01423     0.15   0.880    -.0257422    .0300384
             Larnaca |   .0693853   .0212356     3.27   0.001     .0277642    .1110063
              Paphos |   .0471174   .0266957     1.76   0.078    -.0052053    .0994401
           Famagusta |   .1561568    .026806     5.83   0.000     .1036179    .2086956
     married_partner |   .0506901   .0222845     2.27   0.023     .0070131     .094367
            divorced |   .0250208    .025684     0.97   0.330    -.0253189    .0753604
          small_town |   .0647287   .0169111     3.83   0.000     .0315836    .0978738
               urban |   .0611754   .0165004     3.71   0.000     .0288352    .0935157
           int_often |   .0089047   .0193102     0.46   0.645    -.0289427    .0467521
           int never |   -.001981   .0156695    -0.13   0.899    -.0326926    .0287305
l_not_very_satisfied |   .0387451   .0199649     1.94   0.052    -.0003854    .0778757
 l_not_all_satisfied |   .0118719   .0317484     0.37   0.708    -.0503537    .0740976
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(5))

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(index_dependent==5), predict(outcome(5))
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |   .0005374   .0003273     1.64   0.101    -.0001042     .001179
                 men |  -.0067965   .0091214    -0.75   0.456    -.0246742    .0110811
              middle |   .0010988    .010771     0.10   0.919     -.020012    .0222095
         uppermiddle |   .0361644   .0212915     1.70   0.089    -.0055662     .077895
                high |   .0361594   .0130523     2.77   0.006     .0105773    .0617415
      uni_master_phd |    .063618   .0176329     3.61   0.000     .0290581    .0981778
            hh_child |  -.0055812   .0116427    -0.48   0.632    -.0284004    .0172381
            Limassol |   .0016126   .0106817     0.15   0.880    -.0193232    .0225484
             Larnaca |   .0520873    .016587     3.14   0.002     .0195774    .0845971
              Paphos |   .0353709   .0210558     1.68   0.093    -.0058977    .0766394
           Famagusta |   .1172263   .0230743     5.08   0.000     .0720015    .1624511
     married_partner |   .0380528   .0178875     2.13   0.033     .0029939    .0731118
            divorced |    .018783   .0195788     0.96   0.337    -.0195907    .0571566
          small_town |   .0485916   .0137568     3.53   0.000     .0216288    .0755543
               urban |   .0459242    .013445     3.42   0.001     .0195725    .0722758
           int_often |   .0066847   .0145279     0.46   0.645    -.0217894    .0351588
           int_never |  -.0014872   .0117377    -0.13   0.899    -.0244926    .0215182
l_not_very_satisfied |   .0290858   .0152429     1.91   0.056    -.0007898    .0589614
 l_not_all_satisfied |   .0089122   .0237922     0.37   0.708    -.0377197    .0555441
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(6))

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(index_dependent==6), predict(outcome(6))
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |   .0002747   .0001736     1.58   0.114    -.0000656     .000615
                 men |  -.0034738   .0047626    -0.73   0.466    -.0128084    .0058608
              middle |   .0005616   .0055088     0.10   0.919    -.0102355    .0113587
         uppermiddle |   .0184842   .0111611     1.66   0.098    -.0033912    .0403596
                high |   .0184817   .0075679     2.44   0.015     .0036488    .0333146
      uni_master_phd |   .0325162   .0107646     3.02   0.003      .011418    .0536145
            hh child |  -.0028526   .0059923    -0.48   0.634    -.0145973    .0088921
            Limassol |   .0008242   .0054351     0.15   0.879    -.0098283    .0114768
             Larnaca |   .0266227   .0098317     2.71   0.007     .0073529    .0458925
              Paphos |   .0180786   .0107001     1.69   0.091    -.0028932    .0390505
           Famagusta |   .0599164   .0156508     3.83   0.000     .0292413    .0905914
     married_partner |   .0194494   .0101688     1.91   0.056     -.000481    .0393798
```

```
           divorced |   .0096003   .0102321     0.94   0.348    -.0104543    .0296549
         small_town |    .024836   .0085606     2.90   0.004     .0080575    .0416145
              urban |   .0234726   .0084166     2.79   0.005     .0069764    .0399689
           int often |   .0034167   .0073887     0.46   0.644    -.0110649    .0178983
           int_never |  -.0007601   .0060271    -0.13   0.900     -.012573    .0110527
l_not_very_satisfied |   .0148663   .0081542     1.82   0.068    -.0011157    .0308482
 l_not_all_satisfied |   .0045552   .0122222     0.37   0.709    -.0193999    .0285103
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(7))

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(index_dependent==7), predict(outcome(7))
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni master phd hh child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+-----------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |   .0001629   .0001149     1.42   0.156    -.0000622    .0003881
                 men |  -.0020607   .0027916    -0.74   0.460    -.0075322    .0034107
              middle |   .0003331   .0032824     0.10   0.919    -.0061002    .0067665
         uppermiddle |   .0109651   .0069748     1.57   0.116    -.0027052    .0246354
                high |   .0109636   .0056543     1.94   0.053    -.0001187    .0220459
      uni_master_phd |   .0192891   .0080683     2.39   0.017     .0034754    .0351027
            hh_child |  -.0016922   .0035935    -0.47   0.638    -.0087354    .0053509
            Limassol |   .0004889   .0032162     0.15   0.879    -.0058147    .0067926
             Larnaca |   .0157929   .0066776     2.37   0.018     .0027051    .0288808
              Paphos |   .0107245   .0065899     1.63   0.104    -.0021915    .0236405
           Famagusta |   .0355432   .0127321     2.79   0.005     .0105888    .0604976
     married_partner |   .0115377   .0065369     1.77   0.078    -.0012745    .0243498
            divorced |    .005695    .006226     0.91   0.360    -.0065077    .0178978
          small_town |    .014733   .0063564     2.32   0.020     .0022748    .0271913
               urban |   .0139243   .0061273     2.27   0.023     .0019149    .0259336
            int_often |   .0020268   .0043798     0.46   0.644    -.0065574    .0106111
            int_never |  -.0004509   .0035556    -0.13   0.899    -.0074197    .0065179
l_not_very_satisfied |   .0088189   .0057896     1.52   0.128    -.0025285    .0201663
 l_not_all_satisfied |   .0027022   .0073164     0.37   0.712    -.0116377     .017042
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(8))

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(index_dependent==8), predict(outcome(8))
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+-----------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |   .0001087   .0000784     1.39   0.166     -.000045    .0002623
                 men |  -.0013745   .0019412    -0.71   0.479    -.0051792    .0024302
              middle |   .0002222   .0021865     0.10   0.919    -.0040632    .0045076
         uppermiddle |   .0073138   .0053987     1.35   0.175    -.0032674     .017895
                high |   .0073128   .0040379     1.81   0.070    -.0006014    .0152269
      uni master phd |   .0128659   .0063498     2.03   0.043     .0004206    .0253113
            hh_child |  -.0011287   .0024276    -0.46   0.642    -.0058867    .0036293
            Limassol |   .0003261   .0021502     0.15   0.879    -.0038882    .0045404
             Larnaca |    .010534   .0055834     1.89   0.059    -.0004093    .0214773
              Paphos |   .0071533   .0049518     1.44   0.149     -.002552    .0168586
           Famagusta |   .0237075   .0106816     2.22   0.026      .002772    .0446431
     married partner |   .0076957   .0049306     1.56   0.119     -.001968    .0173594
            divorced |   .0037986   .0043661     0.87   0.384    -.0047588    .0123561
          small_town |    .009827   .0047607     2.06   0.039     .0004962    .0191579
               urban |   .0092876   .0047739     1.95   0.052    -.0000691    .0186443
            int_often |   .0013519   .0029337     0.46   0.645    -.0043981    .0071019
            int_never |  -.0003008   .0023943    -0.13   0.900    -.0049935     .004392
```

```
l_not_very_satisfied |   .0058822   .0040839     1.44   0.150     -.002122    .0138865
 l_not_all_satisfied |   .0018024   .0048818     0.37   0.712    -.0077658    .0113705
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(9))

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(index dependent==9), predict(outcome(9))
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |   .0000447   .0000449     1.00   0.319    -.0000432    .0001327
                 men |  -.0005657   .0008523    -0.66   0.507    -.0022363    .0011048
              middle |   .0000915   .0009052     0.10   0.920    -.0016826    .0018656
         uppermiddle |   .0030102   .0027005     1.11   0.265    -.0022826    .0083031
                high |   .0030098   .0024098     1.25   0.212    -.0017133     .007733
      uni_master_phd |   .0052954   .0039931     1.33   0.185    -.0025309    .0131217
            hh_child |  -.0004646   .0010072    -0.46   0.645    -.0024386    .0015095
            Limassol |   .0001342   .0009018     0.15   0.882    -.0016334    .0019018
             Larnaca |   .0043356   .0032885     1.32   0.187    -.0021097    .0107809
              Paphos |   .0029442   .0026336     1.12   0.264    -.0022176     .008106
           Famagusta |   .0097576   .0073251     1.33   0.183    -.0045994    .0241147
     married_partner |   .0031674   .0025767     1.23   0.219    -.0018829    .0082177
            divorced |   .0015635   .0018848     0.83   0.407    -.0021306    .0052575
          small_town |   .0040446   .0029242     1.38   0.167    -.0016867     .009776
               urban |   .0038226   .0028368     1.35   0.178    -.0017373    .0093826
           int_often |   .0005564   .0012422     0.45   0.654    -.0018783    .0029911
           int_never |  -.0001238   .0009912    -0.12   0.901    -.0020665    .0018189
l_not_very_satisfied |    .002421   .0021012     1.15   0.249    -.0016973    .0065394
 l_not_all_satisfied |   .0007418    .002047     0.36   0.717    -.0032701    .0047538
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

.
.
.
. * logits.
.
. logit eco_travel age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol ///
> Larnaca Paphos Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often
int_never l_not_very_sati
> sfied ///
> l_not_all_satisfied, robust

Iteration 0:   log pseudolikelihood = -203.12672
Iteration 1:   log pseudolikelihood =  -176.9439
Iteration 2:   log pseudolikelihood = -173.49427
Iteration 3:   log pseudolikelihood = -173.43625
Iteration 4:   log pseudolikelihood = -173.43598
Iteration 5:   log pseudolikelihood = -173.43598

Logistic regression                             Number of obs     =        471
                                                Wald chi2(19)     =      56.13
                                                Prob > chi2       =     0.0000
Log pseudolikelihood = -173.43598               Pseudo R2         =     0.1462

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |               Robust
          eco travel |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |   .0306179   .0112164     2.73   0.006     .0086341    .0526016
                 men |  -.1847439   .2944053    -0.63   0.530    -.7617677    .3922799
              middle |  -.8850398   .3447912    -2.57   0.010    -1.560818   -.2092615
         uppermiddle |  -.6037522   .5812996    -1.04   0.299    -1.743078    .5355741
                high |    1.54398   .4557254     3.39   0.001     .6507746    2.437185
      uni_master_phd |   2.669719   .5289239     5.05   0.000     1.633047     3.70639
            hh_child |  -.3100259   .3204925    -0.97   0.333    -.9381796    .3181278
            Limassol |   .0748101   .3655483     0.20   0.838    -.6416515    .7912717
             Larnaca |   1.101015   .4660969     2.36   0.018     .1874816    2.014548
              Paphos |   1.270008   .6100494     2.08   0.037      .074333    2.465683
```

```
           Famagusta |   1.267147   .7974186     1.59   0.112    -.2957643    2.830059
     married_partner |   1.664449   .9059219     1.84   0.066    -.1111254    3.440023
            divorced |   1.327636   1.015487     1.31   0.191    -.6626825    3.317955
          small town |   .8812206   .3936503     2.24   0.025     .1096801    1.652761
               urban |   1.549275   .3862423     4.01   0.000     .7922535    2.306296
           int_often |   .1180858   .4756577     0.25   0.804    -.8141861    1.050358
           int_never |   .4377568   .3777432     1.16   0.247    -.3026064     1.17812
l_not_very_satisfied |   .2075111    .516378     0.40   0.688    -.8045712    1.219593
 l_not_all_satisfied |   1.075808   1.153351     0.93   0.351    -1.184718    3.336334
                cons |   -7.36122   1.073721    -6.86   0.000    -9.465674   -5.256765
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

.
. margins, dydx(*)

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(eco_travel), predict()
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |   .0034694   .0012523     2.77   0.006     .0010149     .005924
                 men |  -.0209341   .0333189    -0.63   0.530    -.0862379    .0443697
              middle |  -.1002875   .0380308    -2.64   0.008    -.1748264   -.0257486
        uppermiddle |  -.0684136   .0657682    -1.04   0.298     -.197317    .0604898
                high |   .1749547   .0498115     3.51   0.000      .077326    .2725833
      uni_master_phd |   .3025167   .0551497     5.49   0.000     .1944253    .4106081
            hh_child |  -.0351303   .0361365    -0.97   0.331    -.1059565    .0356959
            Limassol |    .008477   .0414385     0.20   0.838    -.0727409    .0896949
             Larnaca |   .1247605   .0526433     2.37   0.018     .0215815    .2279395
              Paphos |   .1439098   .0686846     2.10   0.036     .0092904    .2785291
           Famagusta |   .1435856   .0903864     1.59   0.112    -.0335684    .3207397
     married_partner |   .1886055   .1033724     1.82   0.068    -.0140006    .3912116
            divorced |   .1504399   .1160176     1.30   0.195    -.0769505    .3778302
          small_town |   .0998547   .0448177     2.23   0.026     .0120136    .1876958
               urban |   .1755546   .0431425     4.07   0.000     .0909969    .2601123
           int_often |   .0133808   .0538128     0.25   0.804    -.0920903    .1188518
           int_never |    .049604   .0423344     1.17   0.241    -.0333698    .1325778
l_not_very_satisfied |   .0235139   .0586476     0.40   0.688    -.0914332     .138461
 l_not_all_satisfied |   .1219042   .1305275     0.93   0.350     -.133925    .3777334
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

.
.
.
. logit eco_purchase_products age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd
hh_child Limassol ///
> Larnaca Paphos Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often
int_never l_not_very_sati
> sfied ///
> l_not_all_satisfied, robust

Iteration 0:   log pseudolikelihood = -315.11859
Iteration 1:   log pseudolikelihood = -279.22906
Iteration 2:   log pseudolikelihood = -278.64374
Iteration 3:   log pseudolikelihood = -278.64137
Iteration 4:   log pseudolikelihood = -278.64137

Logistic regression                             Number of obs     =        471
                                                Wald chi2(19)     =      64.02
                                                Prob > chi2       =     0.0000
Log pseudolikelihood = -278.64137               Pseudo R2         =     0.1158

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |               Robust
eco_purchase_products |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |  -.0046671   .0079517    -0.59   0.557    -.0202521     .010918
                 men |   .1249416    .218708     0.57   0.568    -.3037183    .5536014
              middle |   .2035038   .2476728     0.82   0.411    -.2819261    .6889336
```

```
          uppermiddle |   1.275695    .656276     1.94   0.052    -.0105822    2.561973
                 high |   .5941043   .2841293     2.09   0.037     .0372211    1.150987
       uni_master_phd |   .9856155   .3614588     2.73   0.006     .2771693    1.694062
             hh child |  -.0848417   .2557072    -0.33   0.740    -.5860185    .4163352
             Limassol |  -.2158336   .2558513    -0.84   0.399    -.7172929    .2856257
              Larnaca |   1.146757   .3501987     3.27   0.001     .4603807    1.833134
               Paphos |   1.632711   .5305739     3.08   0.002     .5928051    2.672616
            Famagusta |   1.757386   .6099375     2.88   0.004     .5619301    2.952841
      married_partner |   1.010722   .4916717     2.06   0.040     .0470633    1.974381
             divorced |   .8947595   .5415436     1.65   0.098    -.1666465    1.956165
           small_town |    .089879     .28822     0.31   0.755    -.4750219    .6547798
                urban |   .0024801   .2851793     0.01   0.993    -.5564611    .5614212
            int_often |   .3894073   .3813801     1.02   0.307     -.358084    1.136899
            int_never |   .5041012   .2682798     1.88   0.060    -.0217175     1.02992
l_not_very_satisfied |     .69939   .3571781     1.96   0.050    -.0006663    1.399446
 l not all satisfied |   .3016816   1.034105     0.29   0.770    -1.725128    2.328491
               _cons |  -1.492769   .6454352    -2.31   0.021    -2.757798   -.2277388
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

.
. margins, dydx(*)

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(eco_purchase_products), predict()
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |  -.0009506   .0016203    -0.59   0.557    -.0041263    .0022251
                 men |    .025449   .0444563     0.57   0.567    -.0616837    .1125816
              middle |   .0414511   .0503565     0.82   0.410    -.0572459    .1401481
        uppermiddle |   .2598425   .1325003     1.96   0.050     .0001467    .5195383
                high |   .1210113   .0567867     2.13   0.033     .0097114    .2323113
      uni_master_phd |    .200757    .070889     2.83   0.005     .0618172    .3396969
            hh_child |  -.0172811   .0520716    -0.33   0.740    -.1193397    .0847774
            Limassol |  -.0439625   .0519586    -0.85   0.397    -.1457995    .0578745
             Larnaca |   .2335796    .069207     3.38   0.001     .0979364    .3692227
              Paphos |   .3325619   .1037243     3.21   0.001      .129266    .5358578
           Famagusta |   .3579566   .1207533     2.96   0.003     .1212845    .5946287
     married_partner |   .2058709   .0984935     2.09   0.037     .0128271    .3989147
            divorced |   .1822509   .1091659     1.67   0.095    -.0317103     .396212
          small_town |   .0183072   .0587501     0.31   0.755     -.096841    .1334553
               urban |   .0005052   .0580879     0.01   0.993    -.1133451    .1143554
           int_often |   .0793172   .0773612     1.03   0.305    -.0723079    .2309423
           int_never |   .1026789    .054189     1.89   0.058    -.0035297    .2088874
l_not_very_satisfied |   .1424566   .0720803     1.98   0.048     .0011818    .2837315
 l_not_all_satisfied |   .0614486   .2104356     0.29   0.770    -.3509976    .4738948
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

.
.
.
.
. logit recycling age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol ///
> Larnaca Paphos Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often
int_never l_not_very_sati
> sfied ///
> l_not_all_satisfied, robust

Iteration 0:   log pseudolikelihood = -305.04012
Iteration 1:   log pseudolikelihood =  -264.4327
Iteration 2:   log pseudolikelihood = -263.54383
Iteration 3:   log pseudolikelihood = -263.54097
Iteration 4:   log pseudolikelihood = -263.54097

Logistic regression                             Number of obs     =        471
                                                Wald chi2(19)     =      63.33
                                                Prob > chi2       =     0.0000
Log pseudolikelihood = -263.54097               Pseudo R2         =     0.1360
```

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             |               Robust
   recycling |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
         age |   .0143775   .0084385     1.70   0.088    -.0021616    .0309166
         men |  -.3479791   .2234951    -1.56   0.119    -.7860214    .0900632
      middle |   .0974283   .2441104     0.40   0.690    -.3810192    .5758758
uppermiddle |    .563921   .6645398     0.85   0.396    -.7385531    1.866395
        high |   .7916439   .2890519     2.74   0.006     .2251125    1.358175
uni master phd |   1.527047   .3942535     3.87   0.000     .7543247     2.29977
    hh_child |  -.1278533   .2669439    -0.48   0.632    -.6510537    .3953471
    Limassol |   .5939566   .2834372     2.10   0.036     .0384299    1.149483
     Larnaca |   .5422526   .3547205     1.53   0.126    -.1529869    1.237492
      Paphos |    .111525   .4114866     0.27   0.786    -.6949738    .9180239
  Famagusta |   1.805687   .5464732     3.30   0.001     .7346192    2.876755
married partner |   .2308583   .5663253     0.41   0.684    -.8791189    1.340835
    divorced |  -.0429313   .6331496    -0.07   0.946    -1.283882    1.198019
 small_town |   1.553308   .3066974     5.06   0.000     .9521925    2.154424
      urban |   1.015352   .2838677     3.58   0.000      .458982    1.571723
   int_often |  -.2018627   .3593222    -0.56   0.574    -.9061212    .5023959
   int_never |  -.1181549   .2830728    -0.42   0.676    -.6729675    .4366577
l_not_very_satisfied |  -.1247779   .4004238    -0.31   0.755    -.9095942    .6600383
 l_not_all_satisfied |  -.4180049    1.12462    -0.37   0.710     -2.62222     1.78621
       _cons |  -1.919471   .7090317    -2.71   0.007    -3.309148   -.5297943
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

.
. margins, dydx(*)

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(recycling), predict()
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             |            Delta-method
             |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
         age |   .0027202   .0015945     1.71   0.088     -.000405    .0058454
         men |  -.0658369   .0418186    -1.57   0.115    -.1477999    .0161261
      middle |   .0184332    .046046     0.40   0.689    -.0718152    .1086816
uppermiddle |   .1066927   .1255865     0.85   0.396    -.1394524    .3528377
        high |   .1497773    .053104     2.82   0.005     .0456953    .2538593
uni_master_phd |   .2889141   .0705276     4.10   0.000     .1506827    .4271456
    hh_child |  -.0241896   .0504103    -0.48   0.631     -.122992    .0746129
    Limassol |   .1123753   .0522929     2.15   0.032      .009883    .2148676
     Larnaca |    .102593   .0664974     1.54   0.123    -.0277395    .2329256
      Paphos |   .0211003   .0779245     0.27   0.787     -.131629    .1738296
  Famagusta |   .3416321   .0987643     3.46   0.001     .1480578    .5352065
married_partner |   .0436779   .1069342     0.41   0.683    -.1659093     .253265
    divorced |  -.0081225   .1198129    -0.07   0.946    -.2429515    .2267065
 small_town |   .2938827   .0521229     5.64   0.000     .1917237    .3960416
      urban |   .1921025   .0509772     3.77   0.000     .0921891    .2920159
   int_often |   -.038192   .0678366    -0.56   0.573    -.1711493    .0947653
   int_never |  -.0223546   .0536492    -0.42   0.677    -.1275052    .0827959
l_not_very_satisfied |  -.0236077   .0757303    -0.31   0.755    -.1720365     .124821
 l_not_all_satisfied |  -.0790856   .2127513    -0.37   0.710    -.4960706    .3378993
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

.
.
.
. logit w_e_consumption age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child
Limassol ///
> Larnaca Paphos Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often
int_never l_not_very_sati
> sfied ///
> l not all satisfied, robust

Iteration 0:   log pseudolikelihood =  -324.1234
Iteration 1:   log pseudolikelihood = -308.34665
Iteration 2:   log pseudolikelihood = -308.13649
Iteration 3:   log pseudolikelihood = -308.13516
```

```
Iteration 4:   log pseudolikelihood = -308.13516

Logistic regression                             Number of obs     =        471
                                                Wald chi2(19)     =      25.92
                                                Prob > chi2       =     0.1325
Log pseudolikelihood = -308.13516               Pseudo R2         =     0.0493

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |               Robust
     w e consumption |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |    .007198   .0073667     0.98   0.329    -.0072404    .0216363
                 men |  -.0808434   .2054057    -0.39   0.694    -.4834312    .3217445
              middle |    -.01674   .2364893    -0.07   0.944    -.4802506    .4467706
        uppermiddle |   .0315949   .5113566     0.06   0.951    -.9706456    1.033835
                high |   .1397937   .2660133     0.53   0.599    -.3815828    .6611702
      uni_master_phd |    .144581   .3287007     0.44   0.660    -.4996606    .7888225
           hh_child |   .0976943   .2358671     0.41   0.679    -.3645968    .5599854
            Limassol |  -.1767186   .2500213    -0.71   0.480    -.6667513    .3133142
             Larnaca |   .2679823   .3209737     0.83   0.404    -.3611146    .8970792
              Paphos |  -.5496687   .3871435    -1.42   0.156    -1.308456    .2091186
           Famagusta |   2.209557   .6770342     3.26   0.001     .8825941    3.536519
     married_partner |   .5470514   .4814037     1.14   0.256    -.3964824    1.490585
            divorced |   .1166212   .5392069     0.22   0.829    -.9402048    1.173447
          small_town |   .5966879   .2633994     2.27   0.023     .0804345    1.112941
               urban |    .485546    .267016     1.82   0.069    -.0377958    1.008888
           int_often |   -.158726   .3404564    -0.47   0.641    -.8260083    .5085563
           int_never |  -.0815584   .2598482    -0.31   0.754    -.5908515    .4277348
l_not_very_satisfied |  -.1120532   .3461151    -0.32   0.746    -.7904263      .56632
 l_not_all_satisfied |  -.0245832   .7446665    -0.03   0.974    -1.484103    1.434936
               _cons |   -1.04968    .598472    -1.75   0.079    -2.222664    .1233031
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

.
. margins, dydx(*)

Average marginal effects                        Number of obs     =        471
Model VCE    : Robust

Expression   : Pr(w_e_consumption), predict()
dy/dx w.r.t. : age men middle uppermiddle high uni_master_phd hh_child Limassol
Larnaca Paphos
               Famagusta married_partner divorced small_town urban int_often int_never
               l_not_very_satisfied l_not_all_satisfied

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     |            Delta-method
                     |      dy/dx   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
                 age |   .0016683   .0017005     0.98   0.327    -.0016646    .0050011
                 men |   -.018737   .0475581    -0.39   0.694    -.1119491    .0744752
              middle |  -.0038798   .0548156    -0.07   0.944    -.1113163    .1035567
        uppermiddle |   .0073227   .1185021     0.06   0.951    -.2249371    .2395825
                high |   .0323998   .0615671     0.53   0.599    -.0882696    .1530692
      uni_master_phd |   .0335094   .0760826     0.44   0.660    -.1156097    .1826285
           hh_child |   .0226425   .0546448     0.41   0.679    -.0844594    .1297444
            Limassol |  -.0409579   .0578194    -0.71   0.479    -.1542819    .0723662
             Larnaca |   .0621099   .0741356     0.84   0.402    -.0831931     .207413
              Paphos |  -.1273961   .0890441    -1.43   0.153    -.3019192    .0471271
           Famagusta |   .5121064   .1504229     3.40   0.001     .2172829    .8069299
     married_partner |   .1267895   .1109356     1.14   0.253    -.0906403    .3442192
            divorced |   .0270292   .1249404     0.22   0.829    -.2178494    .2719078
          small_town |   .1382937   .0598093     2.31   0.021     .0210696    .2555177
               urban |   .1125344   .0611048     1.84   0.066    -.0072288    .2322977
           int_often |  -.0367877   .0788512    -0.47   0.641    -.1913332    .1177578
           int never |  -.0189027   .0601889    -0.31   0.753    -.1368708    .0990655
l_not_very_satisfied |  -.0259704   .0801704    -0.32   0.746    -.1831016    .1311607
 l_not_all_satisfied |  -.0056976   .1725853    -0.03   0.974    -.3439585    .3325633
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

Appendix 1b – VIF values of the variables

Variable	VIF	1/VIF
divorced	4.37	0.229021
married_pa~r	4.37	0.229044
uni_master~d	2.47	0.404200
high	1.92	0.521557
age	1.85	0.540992
urban	1.83	0.547861
Larnaca	1.53	0.652881
middle	1.51	0.661129
hh_child	1.48	0.674205
Paphos	1.44	0.693234
Limassol	1.44	0.694224
small_town	1.40	0.711787
int_never	1.34	0.746050
Famagusta	1.27	0.786013
uppermiddle	1.24	0.803880
men	1.12	0.889279
l_not_very~d	1.11	0.902132
int_often	1.09	0.917932
l_not_all_~d	1.09	0.918114
Mean VIF	1.78	