



**HAL**  
open science

# Evaluating the contribution of nature to well-being: The case of ecosystem services related to fish-farming ponds in France

Helene Rey-Valette, Thierry Blayac, Jean-Michel A Salles

## ► To cite this version:

Helene Rey-Valette, Thierry Blayac, Jean-Michel A Salles. Evaluating the contribution of nature to well-being: The case of ecosystem services related to fish-farming ponds in France. *Ecological Economics*, 2022, 191, pp.107217. 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2021.107217 . hal-03355613

**HAL Id: hal-03355613**

**<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03355613>**

Submitted on 28 Oct 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1                                   **Evaluating the contribution of nature to well-being:**  
2                                   **the case of ecosystem services related to fish-farming ponds in France.**

3  
4                                   Hélène Rey-Valette, Thierry Blayac, Jean-Michel Salles  
5                                   CEE-M, Université de Montpellier, France  
6

7  
8   **Abstract**

9   Ecosystem Services (ES) can contribute to several aspects of human well-being (WB) that we  
10 understand as the subjective perception that individuals have of their quality of life, depending on a  
11 set of factors. We compare the relative weights of the WB factors resulting from ES (ES-based) and  
12 those that do not depend on ES (non-ES-based), from an online survey (N = 1006) relating to ES  
13 linked to fish-farming ponds in France. A summary variable, the “WB profile”, allows to identify  
14 individuals (38% of respondents) whose WB is strongly linked to the presence of ES (the number of  
15 ES-based WB factors is greater than the number of non-ES-based WB factors). The WB profile of  
16 these individuals is analyzed with a binary logit model showing the preponderance of variable  
17 accounting for perceptions and interactions with ecosystems (attendance, relationship and  
18 attachment to nature, efforts to preserve the environment). We observe a lower level of training and  
19 the existence of a threshold effect on the relationship between life satisfaction and the ES-  
20 dependent profile: this contribution only concerns people with a high life satisfaction index. These  
21 results attest to the importance of pro-environmental perceptions, emotions and behaviors for  
22 conservation policies.

23  
24  
25   **Key words:** Ecosystem services; Nature perceptions; Well-being, Fish-farming ponds.  
26

27   **Highlights:**

- 28  
29   Assessment of the contribution of ecosystem services to the well-being of residents  
30   Influence of connection to nature on perceptions of ecosystem services  
31   Link between life satisfaction and significance of ecosystem services on well-being  
32   Commitment to nature and life satisfaction  
33   The contribution of ecosystem services to well-being as a proxy for demand for services

## 37 **1. Introduction**

38 Environmental policies promoting ecosystem protection and biodiversity conservation increasingly  
39 focus on the evaluation of ecosystem services (ES). ES are defined as the benefits people derive,  
40 directly or indirectly, from functioning ecosystems (Costanza *et al.*, 2017). Several categories of ES  
41 are distinguished, provision, regulation and cultural (Plieninger *et al.*, 2013), the latter one being  
42 defined as “the non-material benefits that people obtain from nature, including spiritual, aesthetical,  
43 educational and recreational values” (Kosanic and Petzold, 2020, p. 2).

44  
45 When ES were institutionalized by the MA (2005), their contribution to well-being (WB) was  
46 examined using several dimensions: security, basic material for good life, health, good social  
47 relations and the strengthening of freedom of choice and action, relating to Sen’s concept of  
48 capability (1979). WB is the subjective perception that individuals have of their quality of life based  
49 on a set of internal (directly related to the psychological condition of the individuals) and external  
50 (related to the availability of services in the living environment) factors. In order to assess the  
51 contribution of ES, we aim to measure the relative importance of those related to ES (ES-based) or  
52 not (non-ES-based). For this reason, we develop an approach in line with the logic of “regional well-  
53 being” of the OECD (2014) that refers to the resources and amenities provided by their living  
54 environment. This leads to question the presence of various economic, social and cultural services  
55 and facilities, traditionally addressed in studies on the regional WB (OECD, 2014). In this study, we  
56 focus on the role of ecosystems and more generally of nature in the WB. However, the relationship  
57 between ES and WB was, until recently, less studied in detail, compared to the characterization and  
58 mapping of the supply of ES and their interaction within ES bundles (Raudsepp-Hearne *et al.*, 2010;  
59 Martin-Lopez *et al.*, 2012; Plieninger *et al.*, 2013; Turner *et al.*, 2014; Queiroz *et al.*, 2015; Renard *et al.*,  
60 2015). In particular, there is a lack of empirical measures to characterize the types of WB factors  
61 or the most significant ES. Indeed, studies on ES tend to focus on the supply and types of use and do  
62 not explicitly evaluate this contribution, except when it is linked with health (Kele, 2012; Smith *et al.*,  
63 2013; Sandifer *et al.*, 2015; Prévot and Geijzendorffer, 2016; Delgado and Marin, 2016; Bryce *et al.*,  
64 2016).

65  
66 More precisely, research on the links between ES and WB (Blythe *et al.*, 2020) has mostly been  
67 carried out during the last decade and mainly in developed countries (the EU in particular). Most  
68 often, these are holistic approaches that do not address the interactions between ES and WB and in  
69 almost half of the cases (44%) it does not provide an explicit framework for defining WB (Blythe *et al.*  
70 2020). Depending on the context, the literature focuses primarily on three aspects: human health  
71 (physical health, such as heart problems, or mental health, with the effects of the environment on  
72 stress) and landscape or recreational amenities, which are part of cultural services (Kosanic *et al.*  
73 Petzold, 2020), mostly in developed countries, and provisioning services that can be essential for  
74 livelihoods in developing countries (Polishchuk and Rauschmayer, 2012). The WB factors most often  
75 identified are: (i) a physical dimension, in particular the impact on health (Cox *et al.*, 2017; Shanahan  
76 *et al.*, 2016; Barton and Pretty, 2010), (ii) a subjective perception, and (iii) a third dimension which,  
77 according to the authors, relates to relational or mental factors (Marschke and Berkes, 2006;  
78 Coulthard *et al.*, 2011; Kamitsis and Francis, 2013; Tsunetsugu *et al.*, 2013; Chan, *et al.*, 2019).  
79 According to Blythe *et al.* (2020), the main dimensions studied are: employment, health, food  
80 security, social capital, place attachment, security, culture, and spirituality (in descending order from  
81 24% to 6%); while Chan *et al.* (2019) point out that non-material benefits are less studied. These non-  
82 material aspects, often linked to cultural ESs (CES) (Kosanic and Petzold, 2020), frequently relate to  
83 heritage and inspiration dimensions which partly come under the concept of sense of place (Lewika,  
84 2011; Raymond *et al.*, 2013; Klain *et al.*, 2014) and its influence on personal identity (Omolo and  
85 Mafongoya, 2019). These non-material aspects are also perceived as a positive factor for  
86 psychological health, for example in the case of the spiritual link with the sea (Willis, 2018). These  
87 aspects are often mentioned in studies on indigenous populations (Bark *et al.*, 2016). In developing  
88 countries, the issues relate to the impact of ES on the capacity for action and then on the WB, such as

89 their role for the availability of fish shown by Abunge *et al.* (2013) for fishermen in Kenya. In every  
90 case, emphasis is placed on the fact that interactions between ES and WB are context-dependent,  
91 with much work on the proximity of green spaces in urban areas and natural ecosystems in rural  
92 areas. It is also necessary to take into account the way in which individuals interact with these ES, in  
93 particular according to perceptions, proximity, but also the frequency and duration of visits of natural  
94 areas (Korpela *et al.*, 2014; De Vreese *et al.*, 2016; Jacobs *et al.*, 2016; Rey-Valette *et al.*, 2017; Sy *et*  
95 *al.*, 2018; Fagerholm *et al.*, 2020) and more generally the types of connection to nature (Lewicka,  
96 2011; Raymond *et al.*, 2013; Klain *et al.*, 2014). Finally, we note the need to take into account the  
97 capacity of individuals to benefit or even appropriate these processes, which raises equity and  
98 governance issues (Daw *et al.*, 2016; Kosanic and Petzold, 2020).

99

100 This overview of the types of research highlights, except for the health dimension, a recent interest  
101 in studying these interactions, including a few econometric analyses aimed at characterizing the  
102 profiles of beneficiaries globally or according to the types of ES (Blythe *et al.*, 2020; Fagerholm *et al.*,  
103 2020; Kosanic and Petzold, 2020). Thus, Fagerholm *et al.* (2020) study the contribution of landscapes  
104 and ESs to WB in 13 European rural and peri-urban regions. They characterize clusters according to  
105 the types of WB contribution freely expressed and structured by distinguishing a wide variety of WB  
106 factors (40 items). This type of analysis of perceptions and impacts on the WB helps to inform the  
107 design of conservation policies which increasingly focus on the needs (i) for knowledge and  
108 awareness of individuals regarding the roles of ES, and their direct or indirect impacts on their WB  
109 (Martín-López *et al.*, 2012; Costanza *et al.*, 2017), but also (ii) for indicators easily appropriable.  
110 Indeed, taking WB into account explicitly (Kele, 2012; Smith *et al.*, 2013; Delgado and Marin, 2016;  
111 Bryce *et al.*, 2016) is, in our view, an original way to address more precisely the demand for ES of this  
112 type and its determinants.

113 In this context, the aim of this article is to explicitly measure the weight of the contribution of ES to  
114 people's WB using surveys to rank the importance of such ES as a WB factor. The core of our analysis  
115 consists in defining a summary variable named "WB profile" based on the comparison of the number  
116 of reported ES-based WB factors versus that of the non-ES-based WB factors. Profiles with a higher  
117 ES-based factor score than that for non-ES-based factors are considered "ESs-dependent WB." From  
118 an econometric analysis (binary logit model), we can then identify which variables affect the  
119 probability of belonging to the "ESs-dependent WB" profile, with a large share of variables reflecting  
120 perceptions among the possible explanatory variables. This type of analysis associates a subjective  
121 hierarchy of the factors perceived as the most important within a set of objective factors selected  
122 according to the factors of regional WB (OECD, 2014) and the contribution of ESs. In addition, we  
123 evaluate the relationships of this variable "WB profile" with an evaluation of the respondents' life  
124 satisfaction (Frey and Stutzer, 2002; Frey *et al.*, 2009). The objective was to rank ES according to their  
125 contribution to people's WB and to identify the determining factors of this contribution, especially  
126 the types of use, people's proximity to and familiarity with ecosystems, given that sociologists and  
127 psychologists stress the role of attachment to place (Lewicka, 2011; Raymond *et al.*, 2013; Klain *et*  
128 *al.*, 2014) and familiarity with nature (Moser, 2009; Antunez *et al.*, 2016). This analysis is carried out  
129 from an online survey across France and for a particular type of ecosystem, namely the fish-farming  
130 ponds, which represent 112,000 ha in France (mainland). These are shallow stagnant water bodies,  
131 of natural origin or man-made, which are maintained by the activity of fish farming. These are  
132 extensive forms of exploitation, mainly for the purpose of restocking. They offer an original example  
133 of ES, and they contribute to wetlands, and thereby biodiversity, maintenance (Vanacker *et al.*,  
134 2015). They also make a very positive landscape contribution as they are effectively natural areas. In  
135 France, they were mostly created between the 10<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries by monasteries in order to  
136 develop fish consumption (Bernard, 2008) or to improve health in marshy areas (Billard, 2010).  
137 Consequently, fish-farming ponds constitute an important heritage resource for the territories.

138

139 Section 2 reviews the bibliography underlying our analysis and section 3 presents the survey  
140 protocol. The results are presented in section 4 which is followed by a discussion of the interest of  
141 this approach.

142

## 143 **2. Well-being assessment and impact of ecosystem services on well-being**

### 144 **21. Well-being assessments: what the literature says**

145 The issue of and methods for WB evaluation have both developed substantially during the last two  
146 decades and several approaches co-exist (Dolan *et al.*, 2011). Objective WB evaluations aim to  
147 complement standard approaches primarily based on income by displaying the diversity across  
148 external WB factors. These multidimensional analyses are based on a wide range of indicators of  
149 living conditions considered to be determining factors in WB. Initially undertaken at national level  
150 (Bigot *et al.*, 2012), they are now carried out at a local level, making it possible to define the concept  
151 of regional WB (OECD, 2014), also used to study regional inequalities. However, it appears that  
152 environmental dimensions have only been integrated marginally, if at all, into the concept of regional  
153 WB, which mainly emphasizes access to infrastructure and public goods, and mobility conditions. In  
154 France, environmental issues are only addressed through the extent of man-made development in  
155 the analysis of the quality of life (Reynard, 2016) whereas the OECD proposes four indicators: air  
156 quality, satisfaction with environmental quality, access to green spaces and a final indicator of  
157 environmental morbidity based on noise, air, water and soil pollution.

158

159 Concurrently, subjective WB evaluations have been widely accepted as a relevant measure of WB  
160 (Frey and Stutzer, 2002; Frey *et al.*, 2009). The diversity of approaches is such that a new field of  
161 research on the economics of happiness has emerged (Clark and Oswald, 2002; Clark *et al.*, 2005).  
162 According to Diener *et al.* (1999), subjective WB is related to the set of individual evaluations –  
163 negative and positive, cognitive and emotional – that we make about our life. Kahneman *et al.* (1999)  
164 showed that cognitive and emotional factors co-exist and in the same way several approaches co-  
165 exist. As a rule, evaluations promote the cognitive component. The aim is to converge broadly on an  
166 index of life satisfaction. In France, life satisfaction was rated 7.2 on a 10-point scale using a  
167 standardized protocol (Godefroy, 2011), a score which is consistent with those obtained across OECD  
168 countries (2014). At the same time, the integration of the emotional dimensions of WB gives a  
169 measure of the general sense of WB based on a range of emotions over a given period of time (Dolan  
170 *et al.*, 2011; Antoine *et al.*, 2007). The “Positive and Negative Affect Scales” of Watson *et al.* (1988) or  
171 the “Day Reconstruction Method” of the OECD (2014) may also be noted here. These approaches  
172 should be combined rather than opposed (Moser, 2009) in order to identify correlations (Antoine *et al.*  
173 *et al.*, 2007) and inconsistencies. Whilst cognitive approaches might be biased, for instance, depending  
174 on the time of the survey or the mood of the respondent (Kahneman and Krueger, 2006), studying  
175 the net result of emotions might be more accurate but is more difficult and may be biased by  
176 memory problems. These “non-welfarist” approaches emphasize the relative nature of WB  
177 perception (Frey and Stutzer, 2002) and therefore the need to include declared emotions and not  
178 only observed behaviors (Dolan *et al.*, 2011).

179

### 180 **22. Impact of ES on the WB: A few recent studies**

181 As pointed out in the introduction, the question of how to measure the impact on or contribution of  
182 ES to WB has received little attention. Beyond the systematic reviews already mentioned (Blythe *et al.*  
183 *et al.*, 2020; Kosanic and Petzold, 2020), some illustrations of published works can be noted. Nisbet *et al.*  
184 (2009) propose the “Nature Relatedness”, which evaluates individual levels of connectedness  
185 through cognitive, affective and experience dimensions, and shows the significance of time spent in  
186 natural areas. Bryce *et al.* (2016) emphasize the plurality of ES values and adopt a deliberative  
187 approach in focus groups to identify differences in representation. The feelings of participants  
188 visiting natural areas are evaluated on a Likert scale. They found six types of positive correlation  
189 between WB and ES: engagement and interaction with nature, place identity, therapeutic value,  
190 social ties, spiritual value and memory. Martinez-Suarez *et al.* (2015) recommend drawing a

191 distinction between three cases of interaction, depending on whether they are willingly sought, for  
192 example recreational activities, or they relate to consumption or to resource extraction (not limited  
193 to provisioning services) or they are a passive benefit arising from a set of amenities (aesthetic,  
194 regulating, and even cultural services).

195  
196 Regarding the WB factors studied, in addition to the health impact which is the most frequently  
197 analyzed, especially the impact on anxiety, depression, respiratory problems, asthma and infections  
198 (Browning and Lee, 2017), these analyses reveal the impact of nature relatedness: on the  
199 development of pro-social behavior (Smith *et al.*, 2013), on people's physical and mental health  
200 (Smith *et al.*, 2013; Sandifer *et al.*, 2015), on educational opportunities (Smith *et al.*, 2013), on  
201 productivity (Bryce *et al.*, 2016), on social ties (Baldwin *et al.*, 2011), and on school performance  
202 (Sandifer *et al.*, 2015). Some studies show the importance of urban or rural context, with the  
203 relationship between ES and WB strongly impacted by the urban or rural nature of the dwelling  
204 (Prévot and Geijzendorffer, 2016). Furthermore, some subjective approaches of WB point out the  
205 impact of psychological profiles on the evaluation and the perception of WB and the impact of  
206 positive emotions, of engagement in activities that are meaningful for the individual and their  
207 capacity to find a purpose in life (Seligman *et al.*, 2004). Therefore, it is important to address  
208 personality traits such as optimism, bias towards happiness, and gratitude, which promotes positive  
209 emotions and is, according to Shankland and Martin-Krumm (2012), "*one of the personality traits*  
210 *most strongly correlated with subjective WB*". Moreover, perceptions of the contribution of ES to WB  
211 depend on the familiarity, and frequency of contact, with natural areas as well as on the relationship  
212 and engagement with nature, for which different assessment metrics are proposed by different  
213 authors (Dunlap *et al.*, 2000; Davis *et al.*, 2009; Milfont and Duckitt, 2010).

214  
215 **3. Survey protocol** We undertook an online national survey with 1,006 people nationwide  
216 (mainland France). The type of ecosystem being studied related to pond-based fish farming, with  
217 supporting photos (Figure 1), but without reference to a particular pond or area.




218 Figure 1: Examples of French fish-farming ponds (Dombes and Brenne regions)

219

### 220 3.1. Questionnaire design

221 The questionnaire was designed by a multidisciplinary team of researchers specializing in ES and  
222 ponds (biologists, ecologists, economists, statisticians, zootechnicians) with the support of  
223 representatives of the profession at the national level, to convey the relative importance of the  
224 contribution of ES to the WB ecosystem of respondents. Drawing on the literature review, the  
225 questionnaire was built around several blocks to assess the importance of the contribution of ES to  
226 people's WB (Table 2), such as the impact of the relationship with the place of residence, the  
227 frequency of visits to the studied ecosystems, the psychological profiles and the relationship with  
228 nature. In order to measure the relationship with nature, we used the rating scale of Davis *et al.*  
229 (2009) which provides a set of diagrams summarizing the types of link to nature that are easily  
230 understood by respondents (Figure 2). This figure was presented to each respondent (block B) who  
231 had to choose the type of diagram that best corresponded to her/his own link to nature.  
232 Furthermore, drawing on research relating to emotions felt in contact with nature, we integrated

233 several suggestions from Bryce *et al.* (2016) into the questionnaire in order to better understand the  
 234 emotions sparked by ponds. The questionnaire consisted of a total of six blocks (Table 1).  
 235



236  
 237 Figure 2: Measurement scale of the link to nature (Davis *et al.*, 2009)  
 238

239 Table 1: Questionnaire structure (number and domain of the questions)

| Blocks  | Number of questions in the block | Domain of the questions   |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| A) Relationship with place of residence                 | 9                                | Qualifications of the living environment, Duration of residence, Size of the municipality, Type of accommodation, Distance to natural areas, Factors associated with the area of residence.   |
| B) Relationship with and use of the ponds               | 22                               | Frequency of visits of pond areas (current and in childhood), Reasons for visiting, Type of activities practiced, Vacation spot, Various questions on emotions and perceptions (beauty, tranquility, health, feeling of freedom, pleasure, conviviality, fullness, knowledge of nature...). |
| C) Ranking of WB factors                                | 2                                | Selection of the factors considered important (without restriction), Prioritization of the 8 most important factors within the list.  |
| D) Evaluation of life satisfaction                      | 2                                | Rating (on a scale from 0 to 10), current situation, Rating (on a scale from 0 to 10), if moving away from natural spaces.  |
| E) Perception of the environment, attitude and behavior | 11                               | Scale of the link to nature (Figure 2), Importance of various protective actions (from 0 to 10), Importance of environmental protection practices (from 0 to 10), Using 4 items of the NEP (Dunlap <i>et al.</i> , 2000), Types of behavior and attitude in general (socio-psychology).     |
| F) Sociodemographic profile                             | 15                               | General profile: gender, age, education, marital status, socio-professional category, income category.<br>Proxy for the environmental profile: presence of animals in the household, frequency of consumption of organic products, donations to environmental associations.                 |

240  
 241 In order to rank the impact of ES on WB, people were asked to identify first (i) the WB factors they  
 242 thought important and then (ii) to rank within this selection the relative significance of eight main  
 243 WB factors (scored 1, the most important, to 8, the least important). This approach, previously used  
 244 in the past to assess ES perceptions (Blayac *et al.*, 2014; Rey-Valette *et al.*, 2017), enables the  
 245 calculation of a citation index (number of selections) and of an average score corresponding to the  
 246 sum of the scores obtained during ranking. This selection and ranking procedure was based on a  
 247 balanced list of ten non-ES-based WB factors and ten ES-based factors. The non-ES-based factors  
 248 were chosen among the regional WB indicators selected by OECD (2014). The ten ES-based factors  
 249 were chosen according to the main ES derived from this type of ecosystem from documented  
 250 typologies (Liquete *et al.*, 2013; Haines-Young and Potschin-Young, 2018). Table 2 lists the 20  
 251 selected WB factors. In accordance with the recommendations of Smith *et al.* (2013), the elaboration


252 of these ES factors was designed to facilitate people’s interpretation of the contribution to their WB.  
 253 Thus, some regulating services were presented through their direct impact on people’s living  
 254 conditions. Of course, the types of factors were presented randomly and without referring to any  
 255 category to avoid anchoring bias.

256  
 257 Table 2: List of WB factors

| Type 1 Non-ES-Based WB factors (OECD, 2014) | Type 2 ES-based WB factors                    |  |                            |
|---|---|--|----------------------------|
|   | Wording proposed in the survey                | Type of ES (Liquette et al., 2013) CICES, V5.1; (CES = cultural ES, RES = regulating ES) |                            |
| Health                                      | Beauty of landscapes near the ponds           | CES  | Enable esthetic experience |
| Relationships with friends                  | No noise                                      | RES  | Noise attenuation          |
| Cultural and sporting activities            | Proximity of places for walks                 | CES  | Physical interactions      |
| Work/leisure balance                        | Feeling of freedom related to nature          | CES  | Spiritual or symbolic      |
| Size and quality of dwelling                | Air quality                                   | RES  | Regulation of contaminants |
| Harmony within the household                | Proximity of healthy natural spaces           | RES  | Experiential interactions  |
| Easy transport                              | Revitalizing aspect of nature                 | CES  | Experiential interactions  |
| Quality of local democracy                  | Microclimate related to pond proximity        | RES  | Micro climate regulation   |
| Income                                      | Fewer floods due to the presence of the ponds | RES  | Flood regulation           |
| Employment and professional relationship    | Social bonds related to nature                | CES  | Recreational               |

258 Life satisfaction measurement was implemented by using the norms recommended in Europe since  
 259 2003 (European quality of life survey - EQLS) and in France since 2010 (INSEE, Godefroy, 2011), for  
 260 measuring subjective WB. The following question was asked: “On a scale of 0 (not at all satisfied) to  
 261 10 (totally satisfied), rate your satisfaction with regard to the life you are currently experiencing”.

262  
 263 Figure 3 summarizes the rationale behind the selection of WB factors for the survey and displays  
 264 their integration in the general design of the research.  
 265  
 266



267  
 268 Figure 3: Selection of the WB factors and place in the research design  
 269



270 **3.2. Survey implementation**

271 Our study was carried out online using a list of addresses provided by a specialist survey  
 272 organization. The exclusion of questionnaires that were incomplete or conducted in too short a time  
 273 reduced the sample by a third (from 1,422 to 1,006 respondents). In all, 636 municipalities were  
 274 involved in the survey. On average, the questionnaire took 20 minutes to complete. About half the  
 275 respondents (46%) lived in towns of over 100,000 inhabitants whilst only 20% lived in smaller towns  
 276 or villages with fewer than 5,000 inhabitants (Table 3). Our sampling plan aims to balance the share  
 277 of municipalities with less than 100,000 inhab. and over 100,000 inhab. to take into account the  
 278 distribution of the population according to urban areas (grouping of nearby municipalities) rather  
 279 than the size of the municipalities. Indeed, given the differences observed depending on the urban or  
 280 rural context, it is important to take into account the overall urbanization rate of the area and not  
 281 only the size of the municipality of residence. In addition, we also defined a balanced proportion of  
 282 respondents according to gender and age which are determining variables for the perception of the  
 283 environment (Table 4).  
 284  
 285

Table 3: Sampling according to the size of “communes” in number of inhabitants

| Size of towns             | < 5,000 | 5,000 to 15,000 | 15,000 to 100,000 | > 100,000 | Total |
|---------------------------|---------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------|
| Number of respondents     | 200     | 122             | 223               | 461       | 1,006 |
| % of respondents          | 20%     | 12%             | 22%               | 46%       | 100%  |
| % mainland population (*) | 41%     | 20%             | 24%               | 15%       | 100%  |

286 Source: Online survey CEE-M, 2018 (\*) administrative distribution of the population according to the  
 287 municipality of residence (French Direction générale des collectivités territoriales, 2019)  
 288

289 **3.3. Statistical analysis**

290 A first descriptive phase made it possible to identify some relationships between structuring  
 291 variables, the results of which are presented in the text along with their significance level (p-value). A  
 292 logit model was used to study the extent to which ES contribute to people’s WB. The aim is to  
 293 determine which elements affect the probability of an individual selecting a higher proportion of ES-  
 294 based factors within the set of WB factors considered to be important. To do this, we first  
 295 constructed a summary variable to compare the total score of non-ES-based factors (Type 1) with  
 296 that of ES-based factors (Type 2). In order to include both the selection rate and the ranking level, for  
 297 each respondent the scores given for each factor were divided by the average selection rate of this  
 298 factor. Taking into account the selection rate amounts to reducing the importance given to the  
 299 factors chosen by a large proportion of the respondents and giving relatively more weight to the  
 300 factors that were selected less often and are therefore more specific. By comparing the total scores  
 301 of the two types of WB factors we defined a “WB profile” variable: if the total score of ES-based  
 302 factors (Type 2) is higher than the total score of the non-ES-based factors (Type 1), then the  
 303 individual belongs to the “ESs-dependent WB” profile. This WB profile is the variable to be explained  
 304 by the model. We seek therefore to identify which variables affect the probability of belonging to the  
 305 “ESs-dependent WB” profile. Therefore, the endogenous variable takes the following form:  
 306

$$307 \quad WBP_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if individual } i \text{ belongs to ESs\_dependent WB profile} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

308 A latent variable  $Z_i$  is then defined which takes the following form for a given individual  $i$ :

$$309 \quad Z_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 X_{i1} + \alpha_2 X_{i2} + \alpha_3 X_{i3} + \alpha_4 X_{i4} + \varepsilon_i \quad (2)$$


310 Where  $X_{i1}, X_{i2}, X_{i3}$  and  $X_{i4}$  are the values taken by the explanatory variables for individual  $i$ ,  $\alpha_0$  to  $\alpha_4$   
 311 are coefficients to be estimated and  $\varepsilon_i$  is a random term.  
 312  
 313

314 The  $Z_i$  function incorporates factors or variables that are likely to explain the probability that an  
 315 individual  $i$  will have a ESs\_dependent WB profile. These explanatory factors can be grouped into 4

316 main categories: (A)- those allowing to take into account the respondents' link to the nature ( $X_1$ ), (B)-  
 317 those reflecting the individuals' perceptions towards the ponds ( $X_2$ ), (C)- those expressing the socio-  
 318 demographic categories of the individuals ( $X_3$ ) and (D)- a variable measuring the subjective level of  
 319 WB ( $X_4$ ). A random term  $\varepsilon$  is also introduced in the expression of the  $Z_i$  function due to the  
 320 impossibility of observing all the explanatory factors. If the random term  $\varepsilon_i$  is assumed to be  
 321 distributed according to a Gumbel law, then a binary logit model can be used for modeling the  
 322 probability that an individual will have a ESs-dependent WB profile (i.e.  $WBP_i=1$ ). So we get:

$$323 \text{Prob}(WBP_i = 1) = \frac{\exp(Z_i)}{1+\exp(Z_i)} \quad (3)$$

324  
 325 The following figure summarizes the different statistical steps.



340  
 341 Figure 4: Steps of the econometric modeling

### 342 3.4. Surveyed sample

343 Table 4 provides the main socio-demographic characteristics of the sample.

344  
 345 Table 4: Characteristics of the surveyed sample

|  | Sample | France Mainland Population (2017) |
|--|--------|-----------------------------------|
| Women  | 50%    | 52%                               |
| Cohabiting couples   | 60%    | 72%                               |
| <45 year old   | 45%    | 36%                               |
| From 45 to 60 years old                                      | 24%    | 32%                               |
| >60 year old   | 31%    | 32%                               |
| Retired  | 27%    | 21%                               |
| Higher education diploma                                     | 56%    | 39%                               |
| Technicians, employees, workers                              | 37%    | 54%                               |
| Managers, tradesmen, shopkeepers, company directors          | 16%    | 19%                               |
| Average monthly income of the household per consumption unit | €1,812 | €1,734                            |

347  
 348 Our sample is gender balanced. The average age of respondents is 50 years, which is fully  
 349 representative of the French population above the age of 18 (the average age of the French  
 350 population was 42 years in 2017, but this includes people under the age of 18 who are not in our  
 351 sample). The same is true of co-resident couples (60% in our sample compared with 72% in the  
 352 general population). Overall, these figures match with the French data on general population.

353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363

**4. Results 4.1. Visit rates, pond perceptions and links to nature**

Only 10% of respondents declared that they “frequently” visit this type of ecosystem compared with 65% who do so “occasionally” (several times a year up to once or twice a month) and 25% who never go. The main activities are walking, and to a lesser extent, observing nature (Table 5). Figure 6 shows the average scores obtained for questions relating to perceptions and emotions linked to attendance of these sites and more generally representations and links to the environment (module B and E of the questionnaire).

Table 5: Distribution of activities related to the fish-farming ponds  
 (Respondents who frequently practice the activity)

|                                     | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Walking, hiking, jogging            | 610       | 46%     |
| Bird watching and plant observation | 282       | 21%     |
| Cycling                             | 151       | 11%     |
| Photography; painting               | 113       | 9%      |
| Picnics                             | 108       | 8%      |
| Recreational fishing                | 71        | 5%      |
| Hunting                             | 20        | 1%      |

Source: Online survey CEE-M, 2018

364  
 365  
 366  
 367

Table 6: Evaluation of links to nature experience and perception toward the ponds  
 (Average score out of 10; in bold, the statistically significant variables of the logit model)

| Concernment toward the environment  |            |
|---|------------|
| Mankind must respect nature   | 8.4        |
| Mankind must show solidarity with other species   | 7.9        |
| <b>These spaces have value for nature independently of humans</b>                             | <b>7.6</b> |
| Nature is a source of inspiration   | 7.3        |
| Emotions felt and impacts of frequenting pond areas   |            |
| Visiting these sites helps connect with nature  | 7.1        |
| The beauty of these sites creates emotions in me  | 7.0        |
| Visiting these sites is relaxing and reduces stress   | 7.0        |
| <b>Visiting these sites gives a feeling of freedom</b>  | <b>6.9</b> |
| Visiting these sites helps communicate with nature  | 6.7        |
| Visiting these sites enables learning from nature   | 6.6        |
| <b>Visiting these sites improves your physical well-being</b>                                 | <b>6.5</b> |
| Visiting these sites gives pleasure   | 6.4        |
| Visiting these sites gives a feeling of self-fulfilment                                       | 5.9        |
| In these sites I feel that I am part of something bigger than myself                          | 5.9        |
| Visiting these sites strengthens family relationships   | 5.7        |
| Commitment toward environmental conservation  |            |
| <b>I dedicate a lot of time, energy and effort to maintain the quality of the environment</b> | <b>5.9</b> |
| Compared with other people I know, I invest a lot in the environment                          | 5.7        |
| Framework for assessing the link to the nature of Davis et al., 2009                          |            |
| Importance of the link to nature (scale out of 7 see Fig. 2)                                  | <b>4.7</b> |

Source: Online survey by CEE-M, 2018

368  
 369

370 The assessments of perceptions and experiences show overall a significant concern with respect to  
 371 the protection of the environment with a rather high score for the link to nature (4.7 out of 7 or 6.77  
 372 out of 10), as well as rather positive emotions generated by frequenting pond sites, in particular for  
 373 physical or psychological WB factors.

374  
 375 **4.2. Analysis of life satisfaction and ranking of WB factors**

376 The life satisfaction of respondents (on a scale of 0 to 10) was rated at 6.7 which is lower than the  
 377 national average of 7.2 according to the INSEE (National Institute for Statistics and Economic Studies)  
 378 in 2013. As regards the contribution of pond-based ES to WB, we observe that 38% of respondents  
 379 have an ESs-dependent WBP. Most factors related to the presence of the ponds (in bold in Table 7)  
 380 were very often selected, but were less frequently ranked among the important factors.

381  
 382

Table 7: Selection and ranking of WB factors

|   | % selected | Score (*)  |           | Type of factors                          |
|---|------------|------------|-----------|--|
|   |            | Average    | Rank      |  |
| Health  | 93%        | 1.6        | 1         | Type 1 Non-ES-based                      |
| Harmony within the household                                    | 59%        | 2.7        | 2         |  |
| Income  | 58%        | 3.8        | 3         |  |
| Employment and quality of work relationships                    | 47%        | 4.2        | 4         |  |
| <b>No noise</b>   | <b>68%</b> | <b>4.5</b> | <b>5</b>  | Type 2 ES-based<br>(Regulating Services) |
| Relationships with friends                                      | 57%        | 4.8        | 6         | Type 1 Non-ES-based                      |
| Balance between work and leisure time                           | 52%        | 4.8        | 6         |  |
| Size and quality of dwelling                                    | 62%        | 4.9        | 7         |  |
| <b>Micro climate related to the proximity of the ponds</b>      | <b>13%</b> | <b>4.9</b> | <b>7</b>  | Type 2 ES-based<br>(Regulating Services) |
| <b>Air quality</b>  | <b>74%</b> | <b>5.1</b> | <b>8</b>  |  |
| <b>Proximity of healthy natural spaces</b>                      | <b>52%</b> |            |           |  |
| <b>Flood reduction effect of ponds</b>                          | <b>15%</b> |            |           |  |
| <b>Revitalizing nature of pond proximity</b>                    | <b>57%</b> | <b>5.3</b> | <b>9</b>  | Type 2 ES-based<br>(Cultural Services)   |
| <b>Feeling of freedom related to the proximity of the ponds</b> | <b>50%</b> | <b>5.4</b> | <b>10</b> |  |
| <b>Proximity of recreational sites</b>                          | <b>61%</b> | <b>5.5</b> | <b>11</b> |  |
| Cultural and sporting activities                                | 43%        | 5.7        | 12        | Type 1 Non-ES-based                      |
| <b>Beauty of landscapes near the ponds</b>                      | <b>62%</b> | <b>5.8</b> | <b>13</b> | Type 2 ES-based<br>(Cultural Services)   |
| Easy transport  | 45%        | 5.8        | 13        | Type 1 Non-ES-based                      |
| <b>Social bonds related to nature</b>                           | <b>18%</b> | <b>6.0</b> | <b>14</b> | Type 2 ES-based<br>(Cultural Services)   |
| Quality of democracy  | 22%        | 6.1        | 15        | Type 1 Non-ES-based                      |

383 Source: Online survey CEE-M, 2018

384 (\*) Ranking is in decreasing order so the lower the score the more important factor.

385

386 **4.3. Seeking correlations with the profile of individuals whose WB depends on ES**

387 The level of life satisfaction is not correlated with the WB profile but is correlated with the pond visit  
 388 rates; those people who rarely visit the ponds tend to have a lower level of life satisfaction (p-value  
 389 <0.01%). Likewise, people with a high level of life satisfaction (>8) typically have a rather strong  
 390 relationship with nature (p-value <0.03%) and a rather high level of engagement with nature (p-value  
 391 <0.01%). Finally, it is worth noting that people living in the towns or villages with fewer than 5,000  
 392 inhabitants visit the ponds quite regularly and often have a strong connection with nature.

393

394 **4.4. Econometric modelling**

395 The results of the estimation of the logit model pertaining to the variable “ESs-dependent WBP” are  
 396 presented in Table 8. The modelled probability is the probability of having such a profile. Not  
 397 surprisingly, the probability of having this profile is positively related to variables that convey (i) a  
 398 strong interest in or engagement with nature (relatedness to nature, time invested to protect the  
 399 quality of the environment, donations to environmental associations), (ii) a relatively frequent  
 400 number of visits to the ponds, (iii) a perception of these areas as having a therapeutic value as well as  
 401 to the fact of regularly consuming products from organic agriculture. On the other hand, this  
 402 probability is negatively related to the idea that ponds have some value for nature independently of  
 403 mankind (intrinsic value) and to having a higher educational level (postgraduate education). The fact  
 404 that, in the regression, the life satisfaction index and the square of its value are statistically  
 405 significant with opposite signs means that the probability of having a “ESs-dependent WB” profile is  
 406 non-monotonic, reflecting the existence of a threshold effect. Hence, the probability of having this  
 407 profile decreases with life satisfaction at a level of around 7.3 and increases thereafter, showing the  
 408 existence of a positive threshold effect with respect to the highest satisfaction levels which tend to  
 409 be more sensitive to the environment. Finally, it should be noted that the size of the town has no  
 410 impact.

411  
 412

Table 8: Estimated coefficients of the logit regression

| Variable   |                                 | Estimated Coefficient<br>(p-value) | Type and Measure  |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Intercept  |                                 | 0.3650<br>(0.7505)                 | /   |
| <b>Category A: Relatedness to nature</b>   |                                 |                                    |   |
| Intensity of the link to nature (Davis <i>et al.</i> , 2009)   |                                 | 0.1931***<br>(0.0005)              | Numeric / Scale: 1 to 7<br>(Mean: 4.74 - SD: 1.60)  |
| Personal investment in preserving the environment  |                                 | 0.1280***<br>(0.0022)              | Numeric / Scale: 0 to 10<br>(Mean: 5.88 - SD: 2.26)   |
| Donations to associations  | No                              | Ref.                               | Categorical / 3 categories<br>No donation: 54.8%; Donations to non-environmental associations: 30.5%;<br>Donations to environmental associations: 14.7% |
|  | Yes, other associations         | 0.1557<br>(0.3660)                 |   |
|  | Yes, environmental associations | 0.6578***<br>(0.0028)              |   |
| Consumption of organic goods   | From time to time               | Ref.                               | Categorical / 3 categories<br>55.5% eat organic food from time to time, 16.2% never and 28.3% regularly   |
|  | Never                           | 0.1544<br>(0.4874)                 |   |
|  | Regularly                       | 0.3311*<br>(0.0567)                |   |
| <b>Category B: Pond perception and number of visits to the ponds</b>   |                                 |                                    |   |
| Therapeutic value of the ponds (sum of health contribution and feeling of freedom according to Bryce <i>et al.</i> , 2016) |                                 | 0.0939***<br>(0.0016)              | Numeric / Scale: 0 to 20<br>(Mean: 12.84 - SD: 4.72)  |
| Intrinsic value of the ponds   |                                 | -0.1229**<br>(0.0125)              | Numeric / Scale: 0 to 10<br>(Mean: 7.56 - SD: 2.19)   |
| Number of visits to the ponds  | Several times/year              | Ref.                               | Categorical / 3 categories<br>Once a week or more: 10.4%; Several times a year (a maximum of twice a month): 64.6%; Never: 25%                          |
|  | Weekly                          | 0.5737**<br>(0.0213)               |   |
|  | Never                           | -0.1640<br>(0.4168)                |   |
| <b>Category C: Socio-demographic characteristics</b>   |                                 |                                    |   |
| Educational level  | ≤ baccalaureate                 | Ref.                               | Categorical / 3 categories<br>Secondary education: 44.3%; 2 to 4 years graduate education: 40.4%;<br>Postgraduate: 15.4%                                |
|  | 2 to 4 years graduate studies   | -0.2468<br>(0.1428)                |   |
|  | Postgraduate                    | -0.6598***<br>(0.0092)             |   |
| <b>Category D: Life satisfaction</b>   |                                 |                                    |   |

|                                   |                       |   |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Life satisfaction index           | -0.5128**<br>(0.0162) | Numeric / Scale: 0 to 10<br>(Mean: 6.75 - SD: 1.69) |
| Square of life satisfaction index | 0.0354**<br>(0.0394)  |   |

413 \*\*\* 1% significance level, \*\* 5% significance level, \* 10% significance level.

414

415 **5. Discussion**

416 Our survey aimed to explicitly measure the weight of contribution of ES to people’s WB. From the  
417 hierarchy of a list of factors contributing to the well-being of individuals, we defined a “WB profile”  
418 variable by distinguishing people whose total score of ES-based factors is higher than the total score,  
419 and those whose WB is more determined by non-ES-based WB factors. The analysis of the practices  
420 and perceptions of individuals and the use of econometric modeling make it possible to explain the  
421 specificities of people belonging to the “ESs-dependent WB” profile. Here we will discuss our results  
422 and the nature of these factors.

423

424 The first point to highlight is that, among the factors of WB (Table 7), several of the ES-based ones  
425 (Type 2) have high scores. This finding confirms the role of the factors contributing to regional WB  
426 (OECD, 2014; CGET, 2017), namely air quality, low noise, and access to green spaces, which attest to  
427 the importance of the environment to the quality of life and health as numerous authors have shown  
428 (Sandifer *et al.*, 2015; Blythe *et al.*, 2020). The regulation of local climate and of flooding are  
429 positively perceived by the residents who have a sound knowledge of the way these ecosystems  
430 function. It can be noted that regulating and maintenance ES are better ranked than cultural services  
431 among which the relational aspects are in last place. We find in part the factors most cited by  
432 Fagerholm *et al.* (2020), namely the tranquility, the social interactions, the quality of the air and the  
433 landscapes as well as the attachment to the place.

434

435 Econometric analysis (Table 8) indicates that the probability that ES contribute significantly to  
436 people’s WB is mostly related to variables (7 out of 9) accounting for perceptions and interactions  
437 with the environment. This finding is consistent with the literature (Kelé, 2012; Smith *et al.*, 2013;  
438 Martinez-Suarez *et al.*, 2015; Bryce *et al.*, 2016). First, we must point out the small number of socio-  
439 demographic variables in the determining factors of the WB profile. As is often the case, the  
440 “education” variable is important but it has the inverse relationship to that usually observed. Here,  
441 the relationship is negative, i.e. the most highly educated people have a greater probability that their  
442 WB is unaffected by the environment. However, here also, there may be a link with the context as  
443 the education level is lower in rural environments where there are more opportunities for  
444 interactions with ecosystems. We can also point out the existence of a threshold effect in regard to  
445 the relationship between life satisfaction and the ESs-dependent WBP. This relationship involves  
446 respondents with a life satisfaction index above 7.3. Given that this life satisfaction variable is linked  
447 to the level of income, age (>60) and the connection with nature, it is strongly related to all the  
448 variables conveying positive feelings towards the ponds. This echoes the results of several studies  
449 conducted on this issue. In Great Britain, MacKerron and Mourato (2013) analyzed the relationship  
450 between subjective WB at a given time and the type of surrounding environment based on a  
451 smartphone survey of 20,000 participants who used their GPS coordinates at the time of the survey.  
452 The people interviewed in a natural area tended to have a higher life satisfaction level than those in  
453 an urban environment. Vemuri and Costanza (2006) looked at 56 countries and found a strong link  
454 between Human Development Index (as a proxy of life satisfaction) and the density of ES per km<sup>2</sup>  
455 that explained 72% of the variation in life satisfaction.

456

457 Finally, several significant variables are accounting for forms of interaction and of sensitivity to the  
458 environment. The number of pond visits, and thereby the use of ecosystems that creates a proximity  
459 in terms of familiarity and contributes to improving information, is, of course, a determining factor  
460 (Meinard and Quetier, 2014; Sy *et al.*, 2020). These results suggest a relationship between  
461 knowledge of these environments and an active behavior towards the environment, which shows

462 why the typology of Martinez-Suarez *et al.* (2015) is of interest. These authors distinguish between  
463 active, passive and consumption interactions, and show the positive impact of active interactions,  
464 which mainly concern leisure activities. These results also confirm the conditions underlying  
465 experience of nature discussed by Nisbet *et al.* (2009) and the intensity of the link to nature (Davis *et*  
466 *al.*, 2011). These factors are part of a recent research program that highlights the importance of the  
467 sense of place and of psychological factors in pro-environmental behavior (Lewicka, 2011). It is also  
468 worth noting the impact of pond perception which is negatively related with the fact of attributing an  
469 intrinsic value to nature independently of mankind. This relationship may be construed as revealing  
470 an anthropocentric bias with respect to the relationship with nature, in line with most studies  
471 showing the decisive role of the impact on health and the contribution to leisure and thereby to the  
472 quality of life (López-Mosquera and Sánchez, 2011; Sandifer *et al.*, 2015; Martinez-Suarez *et al.*,  
473 2015). These groups of factors are found in the ranking of ES based on their contribution to WB  
474 (Table 7). Likewise, the surveys undertaken by Bryce *et al.* (2016) demonstrate the importance of the  
475 therapeutic value of nature with differences related to the biophysical attributes of the sites. This  
476 aspect is accounted for here by the two dimensions proposed by Bryce *et al.* (2016), namely health  
477 contribution and feeling of freedom. More generally, the typology proposed by Fagerholm *et al.*  
478 (2020) displays the diversity of WB factors, depending in particular on urbanization. Thus, although  
479 some groups rather favor urban services, but with the presence of green spaces or cultural and  
480 heritage dimensions, two of the groups emphasize the contribution of ES (air, food, hiking, etc.), with  
481 a preponderant role of the contribution of landscapes of water bodies or proximity to the sea (48%  
482 of respondents) and, for one of the groups, a strong role of attachment to place and traditions.  
483 Although the econometric approach is different, their analysis confirms the importance of the  
484 natural dimensions of the living environment and of the visit of natural sites and therefore of the  
485 experience of nature through the role of the length of residence, ES perceptions and agricultural and  
486 non-agricultural trades.

487  
488 The highlighting of the important role of these forms of interaction and of sensitivity to the  
489 environment confirms the recent emphasis on the weight of individuals' intrinsic motivations on their  
490 behavior, in connection with the importance of sociological dimensions (standards) and psychological  
491 ones (behavioral economics) on behaviors. This sheds light on the development of regulatory  
492 measures aimed at acting on perceptions, information and values to encourage individual pro-  
493 environmental behavior and promote deliberative governance mechanisms. In this area, an  
494 interesting result of our model is that we take into account personal involvement in preserving the  
495 environment which should be stressed. In fact, many studies in environmental psychology and  
496 behavioral economics (Benabou and Tirole, 2006; Moser, 2009; Croson and Treich, 2014; Sunstein  
497 and Reich, 2014; Farrow *et al.*, 2017) show the significance of engagement in attitudes towards  
498 nature and not only perceptions and values (Nisbet *et al.*, 2009; Davis *et al.*, 2011). This attitude  
499 seems logically associated with the observed stronger tendency to consume organic food, a factor  
500 which makes a positive contribution to our model.

501 Finally, we can highlight that town size, and thereby the urban or rural context, did not affect our  
502 model, although the ESs-dependent WBP was correlated with size (somewhat higher in towns or  
503 villages with fewer than 5,000 inhabitants; Chi-squared test is significant at least at 1% level). It is  
504 thus difficult to adopt a stance on the paradox raised by Douglas (2012) according to which the  
505 relationship with nature is stronger in a rural environment, while the urban need is higher, indicating  
506 different motivations according to the type of context. Nonetheless, as these contextual differences  
507 also involve socio-demographic differences, in particular age, education and income level, it is  
508 difficult to isolate the role of the context.

## 509 510 **Conclusion**

511 The literature review carried out to situate the results of our survey indicates a growing interest in  
512 the analysis of the contribution of ES and nature to the WB of individuals (particularly in terms of  
513 health) with a very broad variety of approaches. Beyond the many approaches targeting a particular

514 factor and the differences depending on the context, it is most often a question of characterizing the  
515 factors of WB by producing typologies, which are difficult to compare or to generalize due to the lack  
516 of a common framework with regard to the elements of WB taken into account. In this context of  
517 rather descriptive approaches (Blythe *et al.*, 2020; Kosanic and Petzold, 2020), our survey aimed (i) to  
518 measure the relative share of WB factors linked to ES compared to non-ES-based factors  
519 independent of relationships with the environment and (ii) to characterize, through econometric  
520 modeling, the profile of people whose WB is strongly dependent on factors linked to the ES. We have  
521 shown that these people represent a significant part of the population (38%) and that they are  
522 distinguished above all by their perceptions and behavior vis-à-vis natural spaces, rather than by  
523 their socio-demographic profiles with a single significant variable, namely a lower level of education.  
524 Thus, in accordance with the literature, we note the importance of the variables of concern and links  
525 to nature, as well as the weight of the experience resulting from regular visits to the territories  
526 considered. Finally, the relationship with life satisfaction shows an interesting threshold effect with  
527 an influence of ES for the highest levels of satisfaction (>7.3 out of 10).

528  
529 Thus, our approach enables a fuller documentation and explanation of the nature's contribution to  
530 WB, using living conditions beyond the classical socio-demographic variables, the importance of  
531 contexts and attitudes. As noted by Summers *et al.* (2016), this type of result should be of interest to  
532 public decision-makers in guiding restoration policies and more generally in arbitrating between  
533 developments that affect living conditions, where environmental issues that were previously more or  
534 less ignored are increasingly coming to the fore.

### 535 536 **Acknowledgements**

537 This work was supported by the *Observatoire Homme Milieu* (OHM) program of the French Institute  
538 for Ecology and Environment (INEE/CNRS) and by the Metaprogram EcoServ (INRA). The authors  
539 thank Nicole Lautrédou-Audouy for organizing the online survey and the database and Fériel  
540 Adjeroud for preliminary statistical analysis. They express their gratitude to the anonymous referees  
541 whose criticisms and comments have significantly improved the paper.

### 542 543 **References**

- 544  
545 Abunge, C., Coulthard, S., Daw, T.M., 2013. Connecting Marine Ecosystem Services to Human Well-  
546 being: Insights from Participatory Well-being Assessment in Kenya, *Ambio*, 42, 1010-1021.  
547  
548 Antoine, P., Poinot, R., Congard, A., 2007. Evaluer le bien-être subjectif : la place des émotions dans  
549 les psychothérapies positives. *Journal de Thérapie Comportementale et Cognitive*, 17 (4), 170-180.  
550  
551 Antunez, K., Haran, L., Roussez, V., 2016. Diagnostics de qualité de vie : prendre en compte les  
552 préférences des populations. *Revue de l'OFCE*, 145, 49-62.  
553  
554 Baldwin, R.F., Powell, R.B., Kellert, S.R., 2011. Habitat as Architecture: Integrating Conservation  
555 Planning and Human Health. *Ambio*, 40, 322-327.  
556  
557 Bark, R.H., Robinson, C.J., Flessa, K.W., 2016. Tracking cultural ecosystem services: Water chasing the  
558 Colorado River restoration pulse flow. *Ecological Economics*, 127, 165–172.  
559  
560 Barton, J., Pretty, J., 2010. What is the best dose of nature and green exercise for improving mental  
561 health? A multi-study analysis. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 44 (10), 3947-3955.  
562  
563 Benabou, R., Tirole, J., 2006. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. *Review of Economics Studies*, 70 (3),  
564 489-520.  
565



566 Bernard, C., 2008. *L'étang, l'homme et l'oiseau. Incidences des modes de gestion des étangs piscicoles*  
567 *sur les ceintures de végétation et l'avifaune nicheuse en en Sologne, Brenne, Bresse, Territoire de*  
568 *Belfort et Champagne humide*. Thèse de Géographie, ENS Lettres et Sciences Humaines, Univ. Lyon,  
569 632 p.  
570

571 Bigot, R., Croutte, P., Daudey, E., Hoibian, S., Müller J., 2012. *L'évolution du bien-être en France*  
572 *depuis 30 ans*. Credoc Cahier de Recherche N° 298, 158 p.  
573

574 Billard, R., 2010. *Derrière chez moi, il y a un étang. Les étangs, textes d'hier, regards d'aujourd'hui et*  
575 *de demain*, Quae, Paris.  
576

577 Blayac T., Mathé S., Rey-Valette H., Fontaine P., 2014. Perceptions of the services provided by pond  
578 fish farming in Lorraine (France), *Ecological Economics*, 108, 115-123  
579

580 Blythe, J., Armitage, D., Alonso, G., Campbell, D., Esteves Dias, A.C., Epstein, G., Marschke, M., Nayak,  
581 P., 2020. Frontiers in coastal well-being and ecosystem services research: A systematic review. *Ocean*  
582 *and Coastal Management* 185, 105028, 10 p.  
583

584 Browning, M., Lee, K., 2017. Within what distance does "greenness" best predict physical health? A  
585 systematic review of articles with GIS buffer analyses across the lifespan. *International journal of*  
586 *environmental research and public health*, 14 (7), 675.  
587

588 Bryce, R., Irvine, K.N., Church, A., Fish, R., Ranger, S., Kenter, J.O., 2016. Subjective well-being  
589 indicators for large-scale assessment of cultural ecosystem services. *Ecosystem Services*, 21, 258-269.  
590

591 Chan, C., Armitage, D., Alexander, S. M., Campbell, D., 2019. Examining linkages between ecosystem  
592 services and social wellbeing to improve governance for coastal conservation in Jamaica. *Ecosystem*  
593 *Services*, 39, 100997.  
594

595 Clark, A. E., Etilé, F., Postel-Vinay, F., Senik, C., Van Der Straeten, K., 2005. Heterogeneity in reported  
596 well-being: evidence from twelve european countries. *Economic Journal*, 115, 118-132.  
597

598 Clark, A. E., Oswald, A. J., 2002. A simple statistical method for measuring how life events affect  
599 happiness. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 31, 1139-1144.  
600

601 Commissariat Général à l'Égalité des Territoires (CGET), 2017. Perception des conditions de vie : des  
602 contrastes selon les territoires de résidence. *Rubrique en Bref* n°40, juin, 4 p.  
603

604 Costanza, R., De Groot, R., Braat, L., Kubiszewski, I., Fioramonti, L., Sutton, P., Farber, S., Grasso, M.,  
605 2017. Twenty years of ecosystem services: how far have we come and how far do we still need to  
606 go?. *Ecosystem services*, 28, 1-16.  
607

608 Coulthard, S., Johnson, D., McGregor, J.A., 2011. Poverty, sustainability and human well-being: a  
609 social well-being approach to the global fisheries crisis. *Global Environmental Change* 21 (2), 453-  
610 463.  
611

612 Croson, R., Treich, N., 2014. Behavioral environmental economics: promises and challenges.  
613 *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 58, 335-351.  
614

615 Cox, D.T.C., Shanahan, D.F., Hudson, H.L., Plummer, K.E., Siriwardena, G.M., Fuller, R.A., Anderson, K.,  
616 Hancock, S., Gaston, K.J., 2017. Doses of neighborhood nature: The benefits for mental health of  
617 living with nature. *Bioscience*, 67 (2), 147-155.

618  
619 Davis, J.L., Le, B., Coy, A.E., 2011. Building a model of commitment to the natural environment to  
620 predict ecological behavior and willingness to sacrifice. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 31 (3),  
621 257-265.  
622  
623 Davis, L. A. Jeffrey, D. Green, A., Reed, A., 2009. Interdependence with the environment:  
624 Commitment, interconnectedness, and environmental behavior *Journal of Environmental Psychology*,  
625 29, 173-180.  
626  
627 Daw, T.M., Hicks, C.C., Brown, K., Chaigneau, T., Januchowski-Hartley, F.A., Cheung, W.W.L.,  
628 Rosendo, S., Crona, B., Coulthard, S., Sandbrook, C., Perry, C., Bandeira, S., Muthiga, N.A., Schulte-  
629 Herbrüggen, B., Bosire, J., McClanahan, T.R., 2016. Elasticity in ecosystem services: Exploring the  
630 variable relationship between ecosystems and human well-being. *Ecology and Society*, 21(2), 11-24.  
631  
632 De Vreese, J.R., Leys, M., Fontaine, C.M., Dendonker, N., 2016. Social mapping of perceived  
633 ecosystem services supply. The role of social landscape metrics and social hotspots for integrated  
634 ecosystem services assessment landscape planning and management. *Ecological Indicators*, 66, 517-  
635 533.  
636  
637 Delgado, L.E., Marin, V.H., 2016. Well-being and the use of ecosystem services by rural households of  
638 the Rio Cruces watershed, southern Chile. *Ecosystem Services*, 21, 81-91.  
639  
640 Diener, E., Suh, E.M., Lucas, R.E., Smith, H.L., 1999. Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress,  
641 *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276-302.  
642  
643 Dolan, P., Layard, R., Metcalfe, R., 2011. *Measuring Subjective Well-being for Public Policy*. Office for  
644 National Statistics, Newport, 19 p.  
645  
646 Douglas, I., 2012. Urban ecology and urban ecosystems: understanding the links to human health and  
647 well-being. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 4(4), 385-392, 4 (4), 385-392.  
648  
649 Dunlap, R. E., Van Liere, K. D., Mertig, A., Jones, R.E., 2000. Measuring endorsement of the new  
650 ecological paradigm: a revised NEP scale. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 425-442.  
651  
652 Fagerholm, N., Martín-López, B., Torralba, M., Oteros-Rozas, E., Lechner, A.M., Bieling, C., Stahl  
653 Olafsson, A., Albert, C., Raymond, C.M., Garcia-Martin, M., Gulsrud, N., Plieninger, T., 2020.  
654 Perceived contributions of multifunctional landscapes to human well-being: Evidence from 13  
655 European sites, *People and Nature.*, 2, 217-234  
656  
657 Farrow, K., Grolleau, G., Ibanez, L., 2017. Social norms and pro-environmental behavior: A review of  
658 the evidence. *Ecological Economics*, 140, 1-13  
659  
660 Frey, B., Stutzer, A., 2002. *Happiness and Economics: How the Economy and Institutions Affect*  
661 *Human Well-Being*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.  
662  
663 Frey, B.S., Luechinger, S., Stutzer, A., 2009. *The Life Satisfaction approach (LSA) to environmental*  
664 *valuation*. IZA Discussion paper N° 4478, 29 p.  
665  
666 Godefroy, P., 2011. Satisfaction dans la vie : les personnes se donnent 7 sur 10 en moyenne. *INSEE,*  
667 *France, Portrait Social. Insee Références*, 105, 118 p  
668

669 Haines-Young, R., Potschin-Young, M., 2018. Revision of the common international classification for  
670 ecosystem services (CICES V5. 1): a policy brief. *One Ecosystem*, 3, e27108.  
671

672 Jacobs, S., Dendoncker, N., Martín-López, B., Barton, D.N., Gomez-Baggethun, E., Boeraeve, F.,  
673 McGrath, F.L., Vierikko, K., Geneletti, D., Sevecke, K.J., Pipart, N., Primmer, E., Mederly, P., Schmidt,  
674 S., Aragão, A., Baral, H., Bark, R.H., Briceno, T., Brogna, D., Cabral, P., De Vreese, R., Liqueste, C.,  
675 Mueller, H., Peh, K.S.H., Phelan, A., Rincón, A.R., Rogers, S.H., Turkelboom, F., Van Reeth, W., van  
676 Zanten, B.T., Wam, H.K., Washbourn, C.L., 2016. A new valuation school: Integrating diverse values of  
677 nature in resource and land use decisions. *Ecosystem Services*, 22, 213–220.  
678

679 Kahneman, D., Krueger, A.B., 2006. Developments in the Measurement of Subjective Well-Being.  
680 *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20 (1), 3-24.  
681

682 Kahneman, D., Diener, E., Schwartz, N., 1999. *Well-being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology*  
683 Russel Sage Foundation, New York.  
684

685 Kamitsis, I., Francis, A.J.P., 2013. Spirituality mediates the relationship between engagement with  
686 nature and psychological wellbeing. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 36, 136–143.  
687

688 Kele, R., 2012. The quality of life and the environment. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 35, 23-32.  
689

690 Klain, S. C., Satterfield, T. A., Chan, K. M. A., 2014. What matters and why? Ecosystem services and  
691 their bundled qualities. *Ecological Economics*, 107, 310-320.  
692

693 Korpela K., Borodulin K., Neuvonen M., Paronen O., TyrväinenL., 2014, Analyzing the mediators  
694 between nature-based outdoor recreation and emotional well-being, *Journal of Environmental*  
695 *Psychology* 37, 1-7  
696

697 Kosanic A., Petzold J., 2020. A systematic review of cultural ecosystem services and human wellbeing,  
698 *Ecosystem Services*, 45, 101168  
699

700 Lewicka M., 2011. Place attachment: How far have we come in the last 40 years? *Journal of*  
701 *Environmental Psychology* 31 (3), 207-230.  
702

703 Liqueste, C., Piroddi, C., Drakou, E.G., Gurney, L., Katsanevakis, S., Charef, A., Egoh, B., 2013. Current  
704 Status and Future Prospects for the Assessment of Marine and Coastal Ecosystem Services: A  
705 Systematic Review. *PLoS One* 8, e67737.  
706

707 López-Mosquera, N., Sánchez, M., 2011. The influence of personal values in the economic-use  
708 valuation of peri-urban green spaces: An application of the means-end chain theory. *Tourism*  
709 *Management* 32(4), 875-889.  
710

711 MA, 2005. *Ecosystem and Human Well-being: A framework for Assessment*. Island Press, Washington  
712 DC, 563 p.  
713

714 MacKerron, G., Mourato, S., 2013. Happiness is greater in natural environments. *Global*  
715 *Environmental Change*, 23(5), 992-1000.  
716

717 Marschke, M., Berkes, F., 2006. Exploring strategies that build livelihood resilience: a case from  
718 Cambodia. *Ecological Society*, 11 (1).  
719

720 Martín-López, B., Iniesta-Arandia, I., García-Llorente, M., Palomo, I., Casado-Arzuaga, I., Del Amo, D.  
721 G., Gomez-Baggethun, E., Oteros-Rosaz, E., Palacios-Agundez, I., Willaarts, B., González, J. A., Santos-  
722 Marti, F., Onaindia, M., Lopez-Santiago, C., Montes, C., 2012. Uncovering ecosystem service bundles  
723 through social preferences. *PLoS one*, 7 (6), e3897.

724  
725 Martinez-Suarez, P., Chiabai, A., Taylor T., Quiroga Gomez, S., 2015. The impact of ecosystems on  
726 human health and well-being: a critical review. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism* 10, 63-69.  
727

728 Meinard, Y. Quetier, F., 2014. Experiencing biodiversity as a bridge over the science–society  
729 communication gap. *Conservation Biology*, 28 (3), 705-712.

730  
731 Milfont, T.L., Duckitt, J., 2010. The environmental attitudes inventory: A valid and reliable measure to  
732 assess the structure of environmental attitudes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30 (1), 80-94.  
733

734 Moser, G., 2009. Quality of life and sustainability: Toward person–environment congruity. *Journal of*  
735 *Environmental Psychology*, 29, 351-357.

736  
737 Nisbet, E.K., Zelenski, J.M., Murphy, S.A., 2009. The nature relatedness scale: Linking individual'  
738 connection with nature to environmental concern and behavior. *Environment and Behavior*, 41 (5),  
739 715-740.

740  
741 OECD, 2014. *How's Life in Your Region? Measuring Regional and Local Well-being for Policy Making*,  
742 OECD Publishing, Paris.

743  
744 Omolo, N., Mafongoya, P.L., 2019. Gender, social capital and adaptive capacity to climate variability:  
745 A case of pastoralists in arid and semi-arid regions in Kenya. *Int. J. Clim. Change Strategies Manage.*  
746 11 (5), 744–758.

747  
748 Plieninger, T., Dijks, S., Oteros-Rozas, E., Bieling, C., 2013. Assessing, mapping, and quantifying  
749 cultural ecosystem services at community level. *Land use Policy*, 33, 118-129.

750  
751 Polishchuk, Y., Rauschmayer, F. 2012. Beyond “benefits”? Looking at ecosystem services through the  
752 capability approach. *Ecological Economics*, 81, 103–111.

753  
754 Prévot, A.C., Geijzendorffer, L., 2016. Biodiversité, services écosystémiques et bien être. In Roche P.,  
755 Geijzendorffer L., Levrel H., Maris V., *Valeurs de la biodiversité et services écosystémiques.*  
756 *Perspectives interdisciplinaires*. Quae, Paris, 89-101.

757  
758 Queiroz, C., Meacham, M., Richter, K., Norström, A. V., Andersson, E., Norberg, J., Peterson, G., 2015.  
759 Mapping bundles of ecosystem services reveals distinct types of multifunctionality within a Swedish  
760 landscape. *Ambio*, 44 (1), 89-101.

761  
762 Raudsepp-Hearne, C., Peterson, G. D., Bennett, E. M., 2010. Ecosystem service bundles for analyzing  
763 trade-offs in diverse landscapes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107 (11), 5242-  
764 5247.

765  
766 Raymond, C.M., Singh, G.G., Benessaiah, K., Bernhardt, J.R., Levine, J., Nelson, H., et al., 2013.  
767 Ecosystem services and beyond: using multiple metaphors to understand human–environment  
768 relationships. *Bioscience*, 63 (7), 536-546.

769  
770 Renard, D., Rhemtulla, J. M., Bennett, E. M., 2015. Historical dynamics in ecosystem service bundles.  
771 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences PNAS*, 112 (43), 13411-13416.

772  
773 Rey-Valette, H., Salles, J.M., Mathé, S., 2017. An assessment method of ecosystem services based on  
774 stakeholders' perceptions: The Rapid Ecosystem Services Participatory Appraisal (RESPA). *Ecosystem*  
775 *Services*, 28, 311-319.  
776  
777 Reynard, R., 2016. La qualité de vie dans les territoires français. *Revue de l'OFCE*, 145, 63-90.  
778  
779 Sandifier, P.A, Sutton-Grier, A. E., Ward, B. P., 2015. Exploring connections among nature,  
780 biodiversity, ecosystem services, and human health and well-being: Opportunities to enhance health  
781 and biodiversity conservation. *Ecosystem Services*, 12, 1-15.  
782  
783 Seligman, M. E., Parks, A. C., Steen, T., 2004. A balanced psychology and a full life. *Philosophical*  
784 *Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 359 (1449), 1379-1381  
785  
786 Sen, A., 1979. Equality of what?, *The Tanner Lectures on Human Value*, Salt Lake City, University of  
787 Utah Press.  
788  
789 Shanahan, D.F., Franco, L., Lin, B.B., Gaston, K.J., Fuller, R.A., 2016. The benefits of natural  
790 environments for physical activity. *Sports Med.*, 46 (7), 989-995.  
791  
792 Shankland, R., Martin-Krumm, C., 2012. Evaluer le fonctionnement optimal : échelles de psychologie  
793 positive validées en langue française, *Pratiques Psychologiques*, 18, 171-187.  
794  
795 Smith, L.M., Case, J.L., Smith, H. M., Harwell, L.C., Summers J.K., 2013. Relating ecosystem services to  
796 domains of human well-being: Foundation for a U.S. index. *Ecological Indicators*, 28, 79-90.  
797  
798 Summers, K., Harwell, L.C., Smith, L.M., 2016. A model for change: An approach for forecasting well-  
799 being from service-based decisions, *Ecological Indicators*, 69, 295-309.  
800  
801 Sunstein, C.R., Reich, L.A., 2014. Automatically green: Behavioral economics and environmental  
802 protection. *Harvard Environmental Law Review*, 38, 127-158.  
803  
804 Sy, M., Rey-Valette, H., Figuières, C., Simier, M., De Wit, R., 2020. *The Impact of Academic*  
805 *Information Supply and Familiarity on Ecosystem Services Perceptions. Ecological Economic*,  
806 Forthcoming, 28 p.  
807  
808 Sy, M., Rey-Valette, H., Simier, M., Pasqualini, V., Figuières, C., De Wit, R., 2018. Identifying  
809 consensus on coastal lagoons ecosystem services and conservation priorities for an effective decision  
810 making: A Q approach. *Ecological Economic*, 154, 1-13.  
811  
812 Turner, K. G., Odgaard, M. V., Bøcher, P. K., Dalgaard, T., Svenning, J. C., 2014. Bundling ecosystem  
813 services in Denmark: trade-offs and synergies in a cultural landscape. *Landscape and Urban Planning*,  
814 125, 89-104.  
815  
816 Tsunetsugu, Y., Lee, J., Park, B.-J., Tyrväinen, L., Kagawa, T., Miyazaki, Y., 2013. Physiological and  
817 psychological effects of viewing urban forest landscapes assessed by multiple measurements.  
818 *Landscape Urban Plann.* 113, 90-93.  
819  
820 Vanacker, M., Wezel, A., Payet, V., Robin, J., 2015. Determining tipping points in aquatic ecosystems:  
821 The case of biodiversity and chlorophyll  $\alpha$  relations in fish pond systems. *Ecological Indicators*. 52,  
822 184-193.  
823

- 824 Vemuri, A.W., Costanza, R., 2006. The role of human, social, built, and natural capital in explaining  
825 life satisfaction at the country level: Toward a National Well-Being Index (NWI), *Ecological Economics*,  
826 58, 119-133.  
827
- 828 Watson, D., Clark, L.A., Tellegen, A., 1988. Development and validation of brief measures of positive  
829 and negative affect: The PANAS scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.  
830
- 831 Willis, C., Papathanasopoulou, E., Russel, D., Artioli, Y., 2018. Harmful algal blooms: The impacts on  
832 cultural ecosystem services and human well-being in a case study setting, Cornwall, UK. *Marine*  
833 *Policy*, 97, 232-238.