Convergences and divergences in understanding the word biodiversity among citizens: A French case study

Marine Levé, Agathe Colléony, Pauline Conversy, Ana-Cristina Torres, Minh-Xuan Truong, Carole Vuillot, Anne-Caroline Prévot

1 Convergences and divergences in understanding the word biodiversity
2 among citizens: a French case study

3 ***Running head:*** How do French citizens define biodiversity?

4 **Levé Marine**[1,2], Colléony Agathe[1,3*], Conversy Pauline[1,4*], Torres Ana-Cristina[1*], Truong Minh-
5 Xuan[1,5*], Vuillot Carole[1*], Prévot Anne-Caroline[1,6]

6

7 [*]These authors contributed equally to this work.

8 [1]Centre d'Écologie et des Sciences de la Conservation (CESCO UMR7204), MNHN, CNRS,
9 Sorbonne Université, BP 135, 57 rue Cuvier, 75005, Paris, France

10 [2]Écologie Systématique Évolution, Univ. Paris-Sud, CNRS, AgroParisTech, Université Paris-
11 Saclay, 362 rue du Doyen André Guinier, 91400, Orsay, France

12 [34]Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning, Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, 32000
13 Israel

14 [4]Réserve de biosphère de Fontainebleau et du Gâtinais, Centre d'écotourisme de Franchard, Route
15 de l'Ermitage, 77300 Fontainebleau, France

16 [5]Albert Vieille SAS, 629 route de Grasse, BP 217, 06227 Vallauris Cedex, France

17 [6]Laboratoire Parisien de Psychologie Sociale (LAPPS, EA4386), Université Paris Ouest, Dpt
18 psychologie, 200 avenue de la République, 92000 Nanterre, France

19

20 *Authors email adresses*

21 Marine Levé : marine.leve@cri-paris.org ; Agathe Colléony : agathe.colleony@gmail.com; Pauline
22 Conversy : pauline.conversy@gmail.com; Ana-Cristina Torres : actorresv@outlook.com ; Minh-
23 Xuan Truong : mxuan.truong@gmail.com; Carole Vuillot : carole@vuillot.info; Anne-Caroline
24 Prévot : anne-caroline.prevot@mnhn.fr

25 *Corresponding author*
26 Levé Marine : marine.leve@cri-paris.org ; +336 45 50 82 03; Écologie Systématique Évolution,
27 Univ. Paris-Sud, CNRS, AgroParisTech, Université Paris-Saclay, 362 rue du Doyen André Guinier,
28 91400, Orsay, France

1

1 **Abstract**

2 Biodiversity is undergoing a major crisis. Institutions, while launching initiatives tackling the issue,

3 are using and diffusing the term biodiversity and related expert knowledge. However, to collectively

4 address the biodiversity crisis, it is important that actors are able to communicate with each other.

5 This is particularly true in the three-part set including science, public institutions, and citizens. In

6 this paper, we explored this mutual understanding with a focus on laypeople: we assessed the

7 understanding of biodiversity in a sample of 1209 French adult citizens and explored the

8 convergences and divergences with institutional and academic definitions. With a classical

9 hypothetical-deductive approach, we first showed an overall congruence between laypeople and

10 institutions : 80% of respondents provided a descriptive definition of plant and animal species as

11 well as their diversity, which are main ideas diffused by institutions. However, based on the high

12 diversity of the collected definitions, with 57% of provided words in definitions mentioned only

13 once, we complemented this study with an inductive approach. We showed a discrepancy in the

14 definitions from lay people and from conservation science (based on evolutionary and dynamic

15 processes). We also highlighted that 18,5% of definitions are not descriptive and are referring to

16 specific actions for biodiversity conservation. We discuss these results in the context of social-

17 ecological transitions, and encourage conservation communities to acknowledge the range of

18 biodiversity definitions used by laypeople, and to form closer relationships with laypeople to anchor

19 conservation research and action with a bottom-up dynamic process of knowledge sharing.

20

21 **Keywords**: biodiversity understanding; questionnaire study; conservation; experience of nature

1. Introduction

Biodiversity is currently experiencing a major crisis, which also affects humanity. The conservation science community has been mobilized for a long time in addressing this crisis, notably through conservation biology (Soulé, 1985; Bennett et al., 2017). More than 15 000 scientists co-signed a call to humanity for protecting biodiversity in December 2017 (Ripple et al., 2017). Scientific or academic environmental bodies are producing information and definitions related to biodiversity (e.g. Sarrazin and Lecomte, 2016; Primack, 2014) (Table 1). Despite their diversity, these academic definitions consider biodiversity as a dynamic process, both at the long-term scale (through evolutionary processes) and short-term scale (ecological dynamics).

International initiatives have also been trying for a long time to address this crisis, from the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 to the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (2011-2020) designed by the United Nations' Convention for Biological Diversity (CBD). This strategic plan has been available at regional (e.g., Europe) and national levels (e.g., France). At more local levels, initiatives are also increasingly flourishing, such as the differential management programme adopted by several European cities (e.g., Amsterdam, Hamburg, Brussels, Paris) to enhance biodiversity in green spaces. These institutional texts and declarations all refer to "biodiversity", although providing slightly different definitions. For instance, the CBD, European Commission and French government institutional definitions (Table 1) include many similar terms (i.e., diversity, species, animals and plants, ecosystem and life). These institutional definitions are grounded in the scientific and academic definitions but usually lack the dynamic aspects.

The term "biodiversity" has also spread to society. For instance, the number of articles referring to biodiversity in the French national mass media source "Le Monde" dramatically increased in 2010 and remained at a high level afterwards (unpublished data). At the European level, the number of people aware of this notion increased by 9% from 2007 to 2013 (European Commission 2007, European Commission 2013), and in 2015, at least eight out of ten Europeans were worried about biodiversity loss (European Commission 2015).

In addition to this general increase in knowledge about biodiversity and awareness of related issues, individual variations on these topics remain high (see, for instance Buijs et al., 2008 or Moss et al., 2016). For instance, at the European level in 2013, the declarative level of knowledge of biodiversity varied according to gender and education level: men and more educated Europeans were more likely to say that they know about biodiversity (European Commission, 2013). More precisely, in a Swiss study, Lindemann-Matthies and Bose (2008) found that the probability to never come across the term biodiversity significantly decreases with age (from 10 to 70 years old). Children's discourses about biodiversity are different according to their gender, with girls

56 mentioning more ornamental plants and boys mentioning more wild plants in a study conducted in

57 Argentina (Campos et al., 2012). Also in Argentina, students' understanding of biodiversity was

58 largely centred on species diversity, underestimating other ecologically meaningful characteristics

59 such as functional traits or species evenness (Bermundez and Lindemann-Mathies, 2018). In

60 addition to socio-demographic influences, individual life experience towards nature has also been

61 shown to impact people's knowledge of biodiversity: in England, Cox and Gaston (2015) showed

62 that knowledge on birds was related to connectedness with nature. Pilgrim et al. (2007) showed that

63 British people who walk in nature more often know more local species than people who do so less

64 often. Awareness of conservation issues is also highly variable, depending on individual and social

65 factors. Prévot et al. (2018) recently showed that French adults who are involved in local activities

66 in relation to biodiversity in their daily life know more about biodiversity than people who are not.

67 An understanding of biodiversity thus appears to vary according to gender, age, education, and

68 connectedness to nature and experiences of nature.

69 Despite these variations in understanding, the concept of biodiversity is a prominent point of

70 discussion between political spheres (at international and national levels), scientific communities

71 and the rest of society (see also Bermundez and Lindemann-Mathies, 2018). Recent works

72 addressed potential problems regarding information sharing between these communities: Moore et

73 al. (2019) showed that American citizens progressively lower their perception of temperature

74 abnormalities, which could explain the lack of support of public policies regarding climate change.

75 Meinard and Quetier (2014) showed that the term "biodiversity" remains vague and is anchored on

76 differing implicit knowledge between communities, notably scientists and conservation

77 practitioners. To collectively address the biodiversity crisis, it is important that all these spheres

78 understand each other. Citizens understanding of up-to-date biodiversity concepts should favour

79 their empowerment to make decisions on socioscientific issues, such as biodiversity management,

80 conservation or sustainable development (Bermundez and Lindemann-Matthies, 2018).

81 Mutual understanding among different individuals or social groups is encouraged when these

82 persons or groups share mental models or social representations (Buijs, 2009). Mental models are

83 cognitive frameworks that people use to understand and interpret the world (Biggs et al., 2011);

84 social representations are socially elaborated and shared knowledge that participates in the

85 construction of social groups (Moscovici, 1961). To address the issue of a mutual understanding

86 regarding biodiversity, it is therefore important to assess the convergences and divergences in the

87 definitions of biodiversity between the different spheres. In other words, do citizens understand

88 biodiversity the same way that institutions do? What about the scientific definitions? And if citizens

89 do not understand biodiversity in the way that scientists or institutions describe biodiversity, then
90 how do they describe it?

91 A recent work by Moss et al. (2015) focused on assessing the understanding of one definition of
92 biodiversity for people visiting at zoos. In their study, they provided a definition of biodiversity that
93 includes diversity, animal and plant species (see Table 2). Then, they ranked the level of
94 understanding of biodiversity for each person asked and compared it to the reference definition.
95 Overall, 75% of the 5661 definitions collected in this survey were somehow close to this reference
96 definition (Moss et al., 2015).

97 In this study, we focused on the understanding of biodiversity by citizens and on how this concept
98 was shared between citizens, institutions and academia. Using the proposed definition framed by
99 Moss et al. (2015), we explored French citizens' definitions of biodiversity. We hypothesized that
100 people provide definitions of biodiversity that are closer to institutional definitions than to scientific
101 definitions for several combined reasons: knowledge transfer towards the public is mainly based on
102 media communication; scientists have difficulties transferring their knowledge both to practitioners
103 (e.g., Francis and Goodman, 2010) and to journalists (Nisbet and Scheufele, 2009, Besley and
104 Tanner, 2011); public institutions are more directly involved than scientists in diffusing
105 conservation messages to the public. We therefore assessed the convergence between definitions
106 given by the citizens and institutional definitions, i.e., referring to diversity, animal and plant
107 species. Based on the literature (see above), we hypothesized that people who have experienced
108 nature regularly defined biodiversity in a more detailed manner than people who have not. To test
109 this hypothesis, we compared the definitions of biodiversity of people who grew up in the
110 countryside or sub-urban areas, to those of people who grew up as city-dwellers. Moreover, based
111 on the published results on the effects of gender, age and educational path on biodiversity
112 knowledge, we hypothesized that women, young people and students were more likely to provide
113 definitions closer to institutional ones than other people.

114 Our quantitative assessment of the alignment of citizens' definitions with institutional ones allowed
115 us to test these hypotheses. However, a reductive approach was used regarding the actual variety of
116 definitions given by citizens and it thus did not allow us to address this variety for all of the existing
117 understandings of biodiversity. Thus, we paired this hypothetical-deductive approach with an
118 inductive approach, using an analysis of the content of the definitions. This approach revealed high
119 potential for sharing and co-constructing knowledge of biodiversity conservation among scientists,
120 institutions and citizens.

2. Method

2.1. Survey design

We collected biodiversity definitions from 1260 French citizens across 6 years, by pooling data from ten different questionnaire surveys. These surveys were all conducted by the same research team working at the French National Museum of Natural History and explored components of the human relationship to nature from different perspectives. They all included the same specific questions regarding the respondent's definition of biodiversity, the respondents' age, gender, current and childhood living places as well as their individual life experience with nature. Details of each survey can be found in Table 2. Because 51 out of 1260 respondents did not give any definition of biodiversity, we based our analysis on 1209 different definitions. All surveys were administered in France to French-speaking respondents. Participants remained anonymous, and no personal information allowing for identification was recorded. Participants were informed that the data were collected only for research purposes. Respondents did not receive any compensation for their participation. The process followed the ethical standards required by the French National Commission of Computing and Liberties (CNIL, 2018). Questionnaires corresponding to the subsets detailed in Table 2 are available as supplementary files.

2.2. Questionnaire design

2.2.1. Definition of biodiversity

All surveys asked respondents to give their definition of biodiversity with an open-ended question, using the formulation "How would you define biodiversity?"

2.2.2. Individual life experience with nature

We assessed individual life experience with nature by using two proxies as follows. First, we assessed the declared level of rurality of the childhood living place on a 5-point scale with the following categories labelled from 1 to 5: big city, medium city, small city, village, and hamlet, i.e., a small settlement in a rural place usually set around a farm building. We used this information as a proxy for individual life experiences with nature, as we considered that people who grew up in rural places were more likely to be in contact with nature than people who grew up in urban environments.

Second, we used a derived version of the Inclusion of Nature in Self (INS, Schultz, 2001) on a 5-point scale. This scale provides a set of five overlapping circles labelled "nature" and "self". People were asked to choose the assemblage that best defined their relationship to nature. Data were coded from 1 for the less overlapping circles to 5 for the completely overlapping circles (Supplementary Figure A.1). The INS scale has been widely used in research (Liefhänder et al., 2013) and phas

154 rovided an easy and quick way to measure individual life experiences with nature in sometimes
155 long questionnaires.

2.2.3. Socio-demographic variables

157 We also recorded age and gender (feminine/masculine). Depending on the surveys, age was
158 assessed by year of birth or by age categories. We therefore homogenized the data using seven age
159 categories (18-25; 26-30; 31-40; 41-50; 51-60; 61-70; over 70 years old). Because our surveys were
160 biased towards students, we distinguished students from non-students when the information was
161 available. We refer to this as the variable "student/non-student" hereafter.

2.3. Hypothetical-deductive analyses

2.3.1. Convergences of citizens' definitions with the institutional definition

164 We evaluated the extent to which people's definitions of biodiversity were close to the institutional
165 definition by using the same reference and the same scoring system as Moss et al. (2015). As such,
166 we assessed a score on a 5-point scale that we called the "Institutional proximity index" (IPI, see
167 Table 3). To check the consistency of this categorization process, three of the authors coded the
168 same random sample of 80 definitions. Inter-reliability was over 0.75 (0.89) and was considered
169 excellent (Cicchetti, 1994). One author coded all of the remaining datasets.

2.3.2. Statistical analyses

171 We used ordinal models (package ordinal for R, Christensen, 2015) to test the relationship between
172 the IPI and the following individual factors: INS, rurality of childhood living place, gender, age and
173 student/non-student. We included the data subset as a fixed effect, with subset C (French citizens 1)
174 being the reference factor. We also included an interaction term between age and the survey subset,
175 as well as between the student variable and the survey subset. We accounted for this because of a
176 partial knowledge of sampled respondents in each subset, one having been targeted more towards
177 students than others and a great proportion of these students were ecology/biology students.

178 More specifically, we first checked for the influence of the student variable compared to the age
179 variable, the student variable being not equally distributed across age groups (chi-square=595.06,
180 df=6, p<0.001). We first used the portion of the dataset in which the student variable was available
181 to fit the model with both age and student variables, along with the other variables. If the student
182 variable had no significant effect, we fitted the model without it and used the full dataset.

2.4. Inductive analyses

2.4.1. Content analyses of the definitions

We changed conjugated verbs to infinitives, and plural nouns to their singular forms. We identified articles, conjunctions and other grammatical operative words, and excluded them from our final set of words (see example in Fig. 1). We therefore obtained a set of nouns, proper nouns, infinitive verbs, adverbs and adjectives.

We then calculated the number of definitions in which each term of this set appeared. Among these terms, we highlighted those that also belonged to institutional definitions, as well as terms that specifically referred to academic definitions, i.e., biodiversity dynamics and evolution.

2.4.2. Inductive categorization of definitions and statistical modelling

Reading the citizens' definitions led us eventually to propose a categorization of three groups. Groups were assessed and discussed by all authors for relevance. They are defined as follows:

- Group 1: definitions that referred to the ecological description of biodiversity and to perceptions, with terms such as "habitat", "territory", "harmony","beauty", e.g. "Diversity of living organisms, of habitats, genes"; "All nature"

- Group 2: definitions that referred to actions related to biodiversity; actions could be general, with terms such as "conservation", "preservation", or specific, such as buying local and organic food, e.g. "Preserving species"; "To favour fauna and flora diversity in order to achieve natural equilibrium, without synthetic additions"

- Group 3: definitions that did not refer to biodiversity, e.g. "no idea"

To check for consistency within the categorization process, three authors coded the same random sample of 50 definitions. Inter-reliability was over 0.75 (0.83) and was considered excellent (Cicchetti, 1994). One author coded all of the remaining datasets.

We used generalized linear models (package lme4 for R, Bates et al., 2015) with logit link (binomial family) to test the relationship between the respective proportions of the first two groups of definitions and the following individual factors: INS, rurality of childhood living place, gender, age and student/non-student. We included the data subset as a fixed effect, with subset C (French citizens 1) being the reference factor.

All statistical analyses were performed using R 3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2017).

3. Results

3.1. Dataset description

The overall dataset included 1209 respondents. It included 61.4% of women and the most represented age class included 18-25 year old (34.0%). We did not find any significant difference between the different surveys for the declared rurality of the childhood living place or for gender (chi-squared=25.25, df=20, p-value=0.19, and chi-squared=7.684, df=5, p-value=0.17, respectively). However, age distributions differed between the surveys (chi-squared=587.19, df=30, p-value<0.001), as did as the student/non student distributions, when that information was available (chi-squared=272.88, df=3, p-value<0.001).

3.2. Degree of convergence of citizens' definitions with the institutional definition

The institutional proximity index (IPI) mostly commonly obtained was 3 (34.8% of the dataset definitions, see also Table 3). The IPI was significantly related to the age of respondents, with older respondents providing definitions that were less convergent with the institutional definition (Table 4). The IPI was not significantly related to gender or individual history of experiences with nature (INS, rurality of childhood living places).

3.3. Core definition, diversity of definitions and appearance of academic biological terms

Definitions given by respondents included 13.5 words on average. The full set of definitions provided 1065 different words, i.e., nouns, proper nouns, adjectives, adverbs or infinitive verbs. Out of this total, 57% were only mentioned by a single respondent, and 1% (i.e., 11 terms) were used by more than 100 respondents. Most of these 11 terms echoed the institutional definition with terms such as "species", "living", "diversity" or "ecosystem". Others belong to the scientific vocabulary, such as "fauna" and "flora". The term "species" was the most reported, with more than 50% of the respondents using it in their definition (Table 5).

Among the 1209 definitions, only 7 included the term "dynamics" and only 19 included the terms "evolution" or "evolutionary". More specifically, 4 out of the 7 definitions with "dynamics" referred to both dynamics and evolution. Only 1 referred to selective processes, and it was one of the 7 abovementioned definitions (see Supplementary material Table A.2). We noticed that definitions sometimes referred to terms linked to ecological processes: 24 definitions mentioned the term "balance" and 85 mentioned "interactions". We found six definitions referring to ecosystem services: 4 explicitly mentioned "services", and 2 mentioned the "beauty" of biodiversity (which could refer to a cultural service).

3.4. Definitions categorization and relationship to individual factors

We found that 965 (80%) of the definitions provided were descriptive (846 definitions) or related to perceptions about biodiversity (119 definitions) (group 1), e.g., "Diversity of living organisms, of habitats, genes"; "All nature". Action-related definitions (group 2) accounted for 224 definitions (18.5%), e.g., "Preserving species"; "To favour fauna and flora diversity in order to achieve a natural equilibrium, without synthetic additions". Overall, 29 out of these 224 action-related definitions mentioned precise actions: 14 referred to agricultural changes, 6 referred to individual connection with nature and 9 mentioned a behaviour of consumption. The other 1.5% of the definitions (n=20) were categorized in the third group, e.g., "no idea".

We found that non-students were significantly more prone to giving definitions related to conservation actions (Table 6). We did not find any other correlations between the respective proportions of descriptive/action-related definitions and the following individual factors: gender, age, INS, rurality of childhood living places.

4. Discussion

In this study, we explored the convergence between definitions of biodiversity provided by institutions, academics and the rest of society. We combined two approaches: through the IPI, we assessed the diffusion of expert institutional knowledge towards society; through inductive categorization, we assessed local knowledge of lay people. Indeed, expert institutional knowledge and local knowledge coexist within society, interact with each other and take part in conceptual definitions.

4.1. Citizens collectively define biodiversity similarly to institutions

Our study revealed that 11 words were employed by more than 100 respondents each, for a total of 1065 different words. This points towards a common basis for the representation of biodiversity among respondents. Concepts such as species, ecosystems, and diversity are part of this common representation. The notion of interactions between elements of biodiversity is also present (even if less abundant), with 85 definitions including words referring to these interactions. These commonly shared terms indicated that the collected definitions were quite close to the definitions used by institutions (e.g., the CBD, European Union regulations and the French government, see Table 1). They indeed underlined the diversity of individuals, species, and ecosystems, together with interactions and ecological networks. Diversity was also the most important component of biodiversity understanding in the Bermudez and Lindemann-Matthies (2018) study in Argentina with students, as well as in the Fiebelkorn and Menzel (2012) study in Costa-Rica and Germany with student biology teachers and in the Kilinc et al. (2013) study in Turkey with students. Buijs

277   and Elands (2013) explored the social representations of nature in a group of 364 Dutch lay people,

278   whom they asked to associate up to 5 words to the term "nature". Similar to our results, some of the

279   terms most often associated with the concept of nature for people interviewed were general terms

280   such as "animals" (50% of their respondents), plants (22%) and everything living (10%). Most often

281   mentioned terms were also tree/forest (37%) and meadows (10%). In Chile, Cerda and Bidegain

282   (2018) explored the representations of biodiversity by 45 people from different social groups in a

283   Biosphere Reserve; they found that "all the groups of respondents thought that biodiversity had

284   something to do with the diversity of animals and plants" (p. 206), which corresponds to the general

285   finding of our study. Similarly, in a study with focus-groups in Scotland, Fischer and Young (2007)

286   found that both experts and non-experts in natural history "perceived and appreciated the diversity

287   in their surrounding" (p.274).

288   Eighty percent of the collected definitions corresponded to a description or a perception of

289   biodiversity (Group 1 in the results section). This high proportion is encouraging, regarding the

290   fulfilment of the current Strategic Plan for Biodiversity of the CBD and the associated Aichi targets.

291   In particular, the first target states that "by 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of

292   biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably", values here being

293   "interpreted in the broadest sense, including environmental, cultural, economic and intrinsic values"

294   (https://www.cbd.int/doc/strategic-plan/targets/T1-quick-guide-en.pdf). However, gathered

295   definitions seldom mentioned these values specifically, and when they did, the mentioned values

296   were mostly environmental and intrinsic values of biodiversity. While the first Aichi target also

297   encompasses ecosystem services, economic or social values, those were mentioned by a negligible

298   proportion of respondents. The big picture of biodiversity does not seem to be fully recognized by

299   citizens so far.

300   We found that young people defined biodiversity according to the institutional definitions more

301   often than older ones, and that students gave relatively more descriptive definitions than non-

302   students. We did not find any other correlation, notably regarding gender and individual life

303   experience with nature. The fact that students gave more descriptive definitions than other people

304   was expected in our study because the students surveyed were predominantly studying ecology.

305   However, the absence of correlations with the other individual factors was first surprising, because

306   the knowledge and awareness of biodiversity do vary between individuals (e.g., European

307   Commission, 2014), notably according to one's individual life experience with nature (e.g., Chawla,

308   1998). However, the apparent discrepancy of our results with the literature can be explained by at

309   least two reasons: first, our index of institutional proximity did not embrace biodiversity knowledge

310   as a whole. Indeed, following Frick et al. (2004), environmental knowledge is composed of at least

three components: declarative or factual knowledge (what is it), action-related knowledge (what can I do) and effectiveness knowledge (how are my actions efficient?). Our index only partly encompassed the first level of knowledge. Second, the way we assessed individual life experience with nature was also very restrictive: the declared rurality of childhood living place may not have reflected the varying lifestyles among respondents. Furthermore, although the Inclusion of Nature in Self (INS) is one of the existing scales to assess the individual level of connection with nature, it is mostly dedicated to the cognitive relationship and does not embrace wider connections (Tam, 2013).

4.2. Contrary to conservation scientists, citizens do not embrace any dynamic component in their understanding of biodiversity

The collected definitions seldom mention the dynamics or evolution of biodiversity, even if they are of importance in ecological and conservation biology science (Sarrazin and Lecomte, 2016). Thus, the biodiversity they refer to is not fully consistent with the current academic definition usually used in ecology.

The fact that the definitions of biodiversity used by most people converge with the static definition provided by institutions rather than with a dynamic one shared by the scientific community (which relies on the dynamics and evolution of biodiversity) indirectly reveals a side issue for conservation scientists: the concepts of equilibrium or balance of nature are still present in institutional visions, even if they are no longer the single vision within the scientific community (e.g., Couix and Hazard, 2013, Robert et al., 2017, Mace, 2014). These links with dynamic and evolutionary processes are now essential in biodiversity conservation (Sarrazin and Lecomte, 2016) and seemed to be lacking in this study dataset. However, some published elements suggest that the dynamic vision of biodiversity is present in professionals such as foresters (Buijs et al., 2008) and that farmers recognize the complexity of biodiversity (Kelemen et al., 2013). We therefore encourage the ecological scientific community to communicate more widely what is relevant now in this current and very fast changing period, i.e., on the dynamic processes underlying biodiversity functioning and interactions with humans (see also Mace, 2013).

4.3. In addition, what else ?

The third main result of our study is that it revealed great diversity in the understanding of biodiversity by lay people around the common representation. Indeed, in addition to the 11 most cited words, the collected definitions included more than 1000 other words, with 57% of the total number of words being mentioned only once and thus giving an idea of the variety of citizen interpretations of biodiversity. Similarly, in their study asking for association with the term "nature", Buijs and Elands (2013) collected 670 different terms, of which only 22 were mentioned

345   by more than 4 people. A very large proportion of the terms appeared thus to be mentioned by less

346   than 4 people, revealing a very high diversity in the perception of nature by those interviewed. This

347   result confirms that citizens commonly link biodiversity to other concepts: in Fischer and Young

348   study (2007), Scottish people who were interviewed rooted biodiversity in specific places,

349   biodiversity contributing to specific spatial patterns, as well as to concepts such as natural flows

350   (e.g. food chains). Buijs et al. (2008) found that people interviewed in the Netherlands, Scotland

351   and Germany "used broad definitions, often including diversity of landscapes and cultural diversity

352   in, for example, land use or even cuisine" (p.70). This last example echoes the definitions in our

353   sample that defined biodiversity as a whole assemblage of interacting elements, including humans.

354   Notably, some respondents mentioned the need for more appropriate interactions between humans

355   and other species, using terms such as "live together". These definitions may reflect a diversity of

356   worldviews about nature or relationships to biodiversity (e.g. van den Born, 2008), notably the

357   proposed "relational value" for human-nature relationships (Chan et al., 2016).

358   This diversity also appeared when considering a small group of definitions, which were related to

359   actions. The existence of this group may be partly due to the national context when the study was

360   conducted. First, all but one survey took place in 2015 or early 2016, and France hosted COP21 at

361   the end of 2015. Thus, 2015 was a year of preparation and popularization of the associated issues,

362   with biodiversity being among them: on this occasion, environmental issues were very present in

363   media communications (e.g., a public book gathered "30 questions to understand the Paris

364   conference", Canfin and Staime, 2015) as well as in citizen mobilizations (e.g., Coalition Climat 21,

365   *http://coalitionclimat21.org/en*). Second, biodiversity was highlighted by French national policy-

366   makers in 2016, with the combination of a new important law for biodiversity (JO, 2016) and the

367   launching of the French Agency for Biodiversity. However, most of the 224 action-based definitions

368   referred to very general attitudes or behaviours, such as respect or a general need to protect or

369   conserve nature. This could be due to the history of the dissemination of the term biodiversity in

370   society since 1992, which has always been accompanied by associated threats (Maris, 2016).

371   However, surprisingly, no action mentioned related to activism or social involvement towards

372   biodiversity, such as social environmentalism (*sensus* Larson et al., 2015). This was surprising

373   because a significant proportion of students were part of the data set and since young people are

374   more prone to activism (Stern, 1999), we could have expected for it to have been mentioned in such

375   a political context.

376   Considering this variety of definitions, we should also considerwhat could be gained or lost by

377   adopting one universal definition of biodiversity. The adoption of a universal unequivocal definition

378   of biodiversity with a precise meaning may be seen as a great help to design and implement policies

379 and programmes for biodiversity conservation now and in the future (Swingland 2013). Erwin

380 (1991) argued that science allows transcultural policies. Basing the biodiversity definition on

381 science might thus help the related worldwide, transcultural conservations. However, the extensive

382 work of Takacs (1996) showed that scientific statements about biodiversity are informed by culture

383 and that biologists have only a part of the solution regarding biodiversity issues (pp. 332-336). A

384 diversity of biodiversity definitions, encompassing scientific and citizen definitions, could then be

385 helpful in understanding related local and global challenges, such as environmental justice.

386 Finally, interesting results would likely come from studying occurrences of biodiversity and its

387 definition in school and high school programmes. French school and high school programs

388 regularly change (every ten years roughly) and have incorporated biodiversity *per se* quite recently:

389 oldest respondents might not have come across the term at school. However, it may have appeared

390 indirectly, and a whole study would be necessary to understand the impact of French school

391 learning experiences on the understanding of biodiversity.

392 **4.4. Study limitations**

393 Our study faced limitations that are frequently encountered when gathering data from several

394 different studies. While allowing for larger datasets, the various sample sets were not collected with

395 exactly the same designs. However, all surveys were designed collaboratively within the same

396 research team using similar methods, and many questions were very similar. In addition, we

397 included the questionnaire subsets in our analyses to take this possible source of variability into

398 account. In all of the surveys, we obtained an over-representation of high socio-professional

399 categories, making our sample not statistically representative of French society. However, the high

400 sample size makes us confident in saying that this part of French society is aware of the

401 institutionally-defined biodiversity concept.

402 **5. Conclusion and perspectives**

403 Our results suggest several possible routes for conservation. First, the high proportion of people that

404 accurately defined biodiversity should make conservation scientists confident in the existence of a

405 general common understanding of biodiversity. The next issue for conservation scientists could be

406 therefore to increase the understanding ot the components of biodiversity, such as the dynamic

407 properties, for instance through closer collaborations with the media. The gap between this static

408 definition and the dynamic one of conservation science is likely to close progressively thanks to

409 communication and education on the definition of biodiversity.

410 However, the general understanding of biodiversity should not disguise the high diversity of

411 individual appropriations and interpretations of this term in society. In particular, some definitions

include interconnections between humans and nature. Because biodiversity serves the common goods, this range of definitions should be considered as an advantage; we encourage conservation scientists to encourage and take part in a co-construction of the meaning of biodiversity through bottom-up approaches. This could address the issue of the separation of modern societies from nature (Moscovici, 1976), or of the disconnection from nature and the 'extinction of experience' (Pyle, 2003; Soga et al., 2016).

Furthermore, the existence of action-based definitions of biodiversity suggests the personal involvement of laypeople in biodiversity issues. However, most cited actions rely on general injunctions to implement so-called "better" practices. One final conservation route could be to encourage individuals to enrich their definition of biodiversity based on their own experiences of nature and associated emotions and affects.

All these complementary routes would be a fertile ground to engage people and society in a social-ecological transition. We strongly encourage the conservationist community to disseminate more of their results, but also to encourage, explore and highlight relationships between citizens and nature that are likely to generate emotions and practices and to anchor their future research and communication strategies in this richness.

References

Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. J Stat Softw 67(1), 1-48. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01

Bennett, N.J., Roth, R., Klain, S.C., Chan, K., Christie, P., Clark, D.A., Cullman, G., Curran, D., Durbin, T.J., Epstein, G., Greenberg, A., Nelson, M.P., Sandlos, J., Stedman, R., Teel, T.L., Thomas, R., Verissimo, D., Wyborn, C., 2017. Conservation social science: Understanding and integrating human dimensions to improve conservation. Biol Conserv 205, 93–108. *https://doi.org/10.1080/00958969809599114*

442 Bermundez, G. M. A., Lindemann-Mathies, P., 2018. "What matters is species richness" -
443   high school students' understanding of the components of biodiversity. Res Sci Educ, in
444   press. doi.org/10.1007/s11165-018-9767-y

445 Besley, J. C., Tanner, A. H., 2011. What science communication scholars think about training
446   scientists to communicate. Sci Commun 33, 239-263.
447   *https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547010386972*

448 Biggs, D., Abel, N., Knight, A.T., Leitch, A., Langston, A., Ban, N.C., 2011. The implementation
449   crisis in conservation planning: Could "mental models" help? Conserv Lett 4, 169–183.
450   *https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2011.00170.x*

451 Buijs, A., 2009. Lay People's Images of Nature: Comprehensive Frameworks of Values, Beliefs,
452   and Value Orientations. Soc Nat Resour 22, 417–432.
453   https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920801901335

454 Buijs, A. E., Elands, B. H. (2013). Does expertise matter? An in-depth understanding of people's
455   structure of thoughts on nature and its management implications. Biol Conserv 168, 184-191.
456   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2013.08.020

457 Buijs, A.E., Fischer, A., Rink, D., Young, J.C., 2008. Looking beyond superficial knowledge gaps:
458   Understanding public representations of biodiversity. Int J Biodivers Sci Manag 4, 65–80.
459   https://doi.org/10.3843/Biodiv.4.2

460 Campos, C. M., Greco, S., Ciarlante, J. J., Balangione, M., Bender, L. B., Nates, J., Lindemann-
461   Matthies, P., 2012. Students' familiarity and initial contact with species in the Monte desert
462   (Mendoza, Argentina). J Arid Environ 82, 98-105.
463   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2012.02.013

464 Canfin, P., Staime, P. 2015. *Climat : 30 questions pour comprendre la conférence de Paris*, Les
465   petits matins, Paris.

466 Cerda, C., Bidegai, I., 2018. Spectrum of concepts associated with the term "biodiversity": a case
467   study in a biodiversity hotspot in South America. Environ Monit Assess 190, 207.
468   https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-018-6588-4

469 Chan, K.M.A., Balvanera, P., Benessaiah, K., Chapman, M., Díaz, S., Gómez-Baggethun, E.,
470   Gould, R., Hannahs, N., Jax, K., Klain, S., Luck, G.W., Martín-López, B., Muraca, B., Norton,
471   B., Ott, K., Pascual, U., Satterfield, T., Tadaki, M., Taggart, J., Turner, N., 2016. Opinion: Why
472   protect nature? Rethinking values and the environment. Proc Natl Acad Sci 113, 1462–1465.
473   https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1525002113

474   Chawla, L., 1998. Significant Life Experiences Revisited: a review of research on sources of
475   environmental sensitivity. Environ Educ Res 4, 369–382.
476   https://doi.org/10.1080/00958969809599114

477   Christensen, R.H.B., 2015. ordinal – Regression Models for Ordinal Data. R package version
478   2015.6-28. http://www.cran.r-project.org/package=ordinal/.

479   Cicchetti, D. V., 1994. Guidelines, Criteria, and Rules of Thumb for Evaluating Normed and
480   Standardized Assessment Instruments in Psychology. Psychol Assess 6, 284–290.
481   *https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.6.4.284*

482   CNIL, 2018. https://www.cnil.fr/fr/respecter-les-droits-des-personnes, last accessed February
483   2018.

484   Couix, N., Hazard, L., 2013. When the futures of biodiversity depends on researchers's and
485   stakeholders' thought-styles. Futures 53,13–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2013.09.005

486   Cox, D.T.C., Gaston, K.J., 2015. Likeability of Garden Birds: Importance of Species Knowledge &
487   Richness in Connecting People to Nature. PLoS One 10, e0141505.
488   *https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0141505*

489   Erwin, T. L., 1991. An evolutionary basis for conservation strategies. Science 253, 750-752.

490   European Commission, 2007. Attitudes of Europeans towards the issue of biodiversity, Flash
491   Eurobarometer survey.

492   European Commission, 2013. Attitudes towards biodiversity, Eurobarometer survey.

493   European Commission, 2015. Attitudes of Europeans towards biodiversity, Eurobarometer survey.

494   Fiebelkorn, F., Menzel, S., 2012. Student teachers' understanding of the terminology, distribution,
495   and loss of biodiversity: perspectives from a biodiversity hotspot and an industrialized country.
496   Res Sci Educ 43, 1593-1615. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-012-9323-0.

497   Fischer, A., Young, J.C., 2007. Understanding mental constructs of biodiversity: Implications for
498   biodiversity management and conservation. Biol Conserv 136, 271–282.
499   *https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2006.11.024*

500   Francis, R. A., M. K. Goodman. 2010. Post-normal science and the art of nature conservation. J Nat
501   Conserv 18, 89-105. *https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2009.04.002*

502   Frick, J., Kaiser, F. G., Wilson, M., 2004. Environmental knowledge and conservation behavior:
503   Exploring prevalence and structure in a representative sample. Pers Indiv Differ 37(8), 1597-
504   1613. *https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2004.02.015*

505   JO, 2016. LOI n° 2016-1087 du 8 août 2016 pour la reconquête de la biodiversité, de la nature et
506   des paysages. *https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/eli/loi/2016/8/8/2016-1087/jo/texte*, last accessed
507   February 2018.

508   Kelemen, E., Nguyen, G., Gomiero, T., Kovács, E., Choisis, J. P., Choisis, N., Paoletti, M.G.,
509   Podmaniczky, L., Ryschawy, J., Srthou, J-P., Herzog, F., Dennis, P., Balázs, K., 2013. Farmers'
510   perceptions of biodiversity: lessons from a discourse-based deliberative valuation study. Land
511   Use Policy, 35, 318-328. *https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2013.06.005*

512   Kilinc, A., Yeşiltaş, N. K., Kartal, T., Demiral, Ü., Eroğlu, B., 2013. School students' conceptions
513   about biodiversity loss: definitions, reasons, results and solutions. Res Sci Educ 43, 2277.
514   http://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-013-9255-0.

515   Larson, L.R., Stedman, R.C., Cooper, C.B., Decker, D.J., 2015. Understanding the multi-
516   dimensional structure of pro-environmental behavior. J Environ Psychol 43, 112–124.
517   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.06.004

518   Liefländer, A. K., Fröhlich, G., Bogner, F. X., Schultz, P. W., 2013. Promoting connectedness with
519   nature through environmental education. Environ Educ Res 19(3), 370-384.
520   https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2012.697545

521   Lindemann-Matthies, P., Bose, E., 2008. How many species are there? Public understanding and
522   awareness of biodiversity in Switzerland. Hum Ecol 36, 731–742.
523   https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-008-9194-1

524   Mace, G.M., 2013. Ecology must evolve. Nature 503, 191–192. https://doi.org/10.1038/503191a

525   Mace, G.M., 2014. Whose conservation? Changes in the perception and goals of nature
526   conservation requires a solid scientific basis. Science 345, 1558–1561.
527   *https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1254704*

528   Maris, V., 2016. *Philosophie de la biodiversité*. Buchet-Chastel.

529   Meinard, Y., F., Quétier. 2014. Experiencing biodiversity as a bridge over the Science-Society
530   communication gap. Conserv Biol 28, 705-712. https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12222

531   Moore, F. C., Obradovich, N., Lehner, F., Baylis P., 2019. Rapidly declining remarkability of
532   temperature anomalies may obscure public perception of climate change. PNAS,
533   201816541. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1816541116

534   Moscovici, S., 1961. *La psychanalyse, son image et son public*. Presses Universitaire de France,
535   Paris.

536   Moscovici, S., 1976. *Society Against Nature : The Emergence of Human Societies*. Branch Line.

537   Moss, A., Jensen, E., Gusset, M., 2015. Evaluating the contribution of zoos and aquariums to Aichi
538   Biodiversity Target 1. Conserv Biol 29, 537–544. https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12383

539   Moss, A., Jensen, E., Markus, G., 2016. Probing the link between biodiversity-related knowledge
540   and self-reported proconservation behavior in a global survey of zoo visitors. Conserv Lett 10,
541   33-40. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12233

542   Nisbet, M. C., D. A. Scheufele. 2009. What's next for science communication? Promising directions
543   and lingering distractions. Am J Bot, 96, 1767-1778. https://doi.org/10.3732/ajb.0900041.

544   Pilgrim, S., Smith, D., Pretty, J., 2007. A cross-regional assessment of the factors affecting
545   ecoliteracy: implications for policy and practice. Ecol Appl 17, 1742–1751.
546   https://doi.org/10.1890/06-1358.1

547   Prévot, A. C., Cheval, H., Raymond, R., & Cosquer, A., 2018. Routine experiences of nature in
548   cities can increase personal commitment toward biodiversity conservation. Biol Conserv 226,
549   1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.07.008

550   Primack, R., 2014. *Essentials of Conservation Biology*. Oxford university Press, 6 edition, Oxford

551   Pyle, R.M., 2003. Nature matrix: reconnecting people and nature. Oryx 37 , 206–214.
552   https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030605303000383

553   R Core Team, 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
554   Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/

555   Ripple, W.J., Wolf, C., Newsome, T.M., Galetti, M., Alamgir, M., Crist, E., Mahmoud, M.I.,
556   Laurance, W.F., 2017. World scientists' warning to humanity: A second notice. Bioscience 67,
557   1028–1030. *https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/bix125*

558   Robert A., Fontaine C., Veron S., Monnet A-C, Legrand M, Clavel J., Chantepie S., Couvet D.,
559   Ducarme F., Fontaine B., Jiguet F., le Viol I., Rolland J., Sarrazin F., Teplitsky C., Mouchet M..
560   2017. Fixism and conservation science. Conserv Biol 31(4), 781-788 10.1111/cobi.12876

561 Sarrazin, F., Lecomte, J., 2016. Evolution in the Anthropocene. Science 351, 922–923.
562   *https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad6756*

563 Schultz, W., 2001. The Structure of Environmental Concern: Concern for Self, Other People, and
564   the Biosphere. J Environ Psychol 21, 327–339. https://doi.org/10.1006/jevp.2001.0227

565 Soga, M., Gaston, K., Yamaura, Y., Kurisu, K., Hanaki, K., 2016. Both Direct and Vicarious
566   Experiences of Nature Affect Children's Willingness to Conserve Biodiversity. Int J Environ
567   Res Public Health 13, 529. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13060529

568 Soulé, M. E., 1985. What is conservation biology?. BioScience, 35(11), 727-734

569 Stern, P., 1999. A Value-Belief-Norm Theory of Support for Social Movements: The Case of
570   Environmentalism. Hum Ecol Rev 6, 81–97.

571 Swingland, I. R., 2013. Biodiversity, definition of. In S. A. Levin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of*
572   *biodiversity, 1* (pp. 377-391). San Diego: Academic.

573 Takacs, D., 1996. *The idea of biodiversity*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press.

574 Tam K-P., 2013. Concepts and measures related to connection to nature: Similarities and
575   differences. J Environ Psychol 34, 64–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2013.01.004

576 Van den Born, R. J. G., 2008. Rethinking nature: public visions in the Netherlands. Environ Value
577   17, 83–109. *https://doi.org/10.3197/096327108X271969*

1 **Figures**

2 Figure 1. Description of the content analysis of the definitions.

1

Definition lexical
breakdown

Grammatical
operative words :
what, we, the, with,
it, which

"What we eat, the
diversity which
comes with it"

Nouns :
diversity

Verbs :
eat, comes

Verbs (infinitive):
to eat, to come

Final set of
words used
in analyses

Adverbs : Ø

Adjectives : Ø

3

2

Tables

Table 1. Four examples of definitions provided by institutional bodies. Regarding the academic sphere, we included an example of a definition from a very popular textbook (Primack 2014).

Table 2. Description of questionnaire surveys.

Table 3. Characteristics associated with the IPI scoring of definitions (adapted from Moss et al., 2015).

Table 4. Estimates and p-values for the IPI ordinal model (N=1190). Interaction terms were not significant and are not shown; feminine gender and C survey are references factors for categorical data.

Table 5. List of the 11 words appearing in at least 100 definitions (French translation of words in brackets) and example of definitions given by respondents. French translations of examples are given in supplementary Table S1.

Table 6. Estimates and p-values for the proportions of definitions related to an action (categorization group 2), according to the tested dependent variables (N=902). Only significant interaction terms are shown; feminine gender, non-student category and C survey are references factors for categorical data.

1

17   Table 1. Four examples of definitions provided by institutional bodies. Regarding the academic

18   sphere, we included an example of a definition from a very popular textbook (Primack 2014).

Institutional/Academic body	Definition	Source
CBD	"The variety of life on Earth. It includes all organisms, species and populations; the genetic variation among them; and their complex assemblages of communities and ecosystems"	https://www.cbd.int/2011-2020/about/biodiversity
European Commission	"The variety of life on Earth. It refers not just to species but also to ecosystems and differences in genes within a single species"	http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/intro/index_en.htm
French government	The "variability of living organisms from all origins, including terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems, as well as the ecological complexes they belong to. It encompasses diversity within species and between species, ecosystem diversity and interactions between living organisms"	JO, 2016
Conservation biologists	"a set of information, material and energy fluxes relying on dynamical processes at various spatial and temporal scales. […] Biodiversity arises from ecological, evolutionary and developmental processes"	Primack, 2014

2

19   Table 2. Description of questionnaire surveys.

Sampling period	Targeted public	Method	Number of provided definitions of biodiversity	Total length of the questionnaire (location of the question)	Subset
2010 & 2015	Parisian zoo visitors	Face-to-face	135 & 32	20 questions (#4) & 21 questions (#8)	B Zoo
2015	French citizens	Self-administered (online or paper survey)	393	25 questions (#16)	C French 1
2016	Inhabitants of the south of Paris	Self-administered online survey	152	23 questions (#6)	D South Parisian1
	French citizens		310	36 questions (#6)	E French 2
	Inhabitants of the south of Paris, near the Fontainebleau Forest	Face-to-face	79	30 questions (#7)	F South Parisian 2
	Visitors of 3 Parisian parks		108	15 questions (#10)	A Parks

20   Table 3. Characteristics associated with the IPI scoring of definitions (adapted from Moss et al.,
21   2015).

Score	Definition characteristics	Number of definitions (this study)
1	Inaccurate, too vague to indicate accurate knowledge	154
2	Some accurate descriptions and some inaccurate ones	261
3	Positive evidence, mention of biological objects or concepts related to biodiversity (e.g., species), no details	421
4	Accurate descriptions, mention of animals or plants but not both, vague but accurate descriptions (e.g., variety of species on Earth)	243
5	No inaccurate elements, mention of both animals and plants	130

22

4

23 Table 4. Estimates and p-values for the IPI ordinal model (N=1190). Interaction terms were not
24 significant and are not shown; feminine gender and C survey are references factors for categorical
25 data.

Dependent variable	Estimate +/- SD	p-value [a]
Age	- 0.23 +/- 0.068	0.0006 ***
INS	-	0.53
Childhood living place	-	0.26
Gender (masculine)	-	0.83
Subset A	-	0.53
Subset B	- 1.32 +/- 0.41	0.0011 **
Subset D	- 0.93 +/- 0.35	0.009 **
Subset E	-	0.59
Subset F	- 2.2 +/- 0.69	0.0012 **

26 [a] Significance codes: *: <0.05; **: <0.01; ***: <0.001.

5

27 Table 5. List of the 11 words appearing in at least 100 definitions (French translation of words in
28 brackets) and example of definitions given by respondents. French translations of examples are
29 given in supplementary Table S1.

Word (French word)	Number of definitions with this word (%)	Examples
Species (Espèce)	522 (43.1)	*"All **species**, living beings in their environment, their interactions"* *"Preserving **species**"*
Living [a] (Vivant)	356 (29.4)	*"Several **living** systems which coexist, by natural link"* *"Diversity of **living** organisms, of habitats, genes"*
Diversity (Diversité)	304 (25.1)	*"**Diversity** of animal, plant and mineral species"* *"What we eat, the **diversity** which comes with it"*
All (Ensemble)	214 (17.7)	*"**All** animals, nature and humans; what lives on Earth"* *"**All** nature"*
Ecosystem (Écosystème)	170 (14.0)	*"It is an **ecosystem** with relationships among species"* *"An **ecosystem** to protect"*
Animal (Animal)	169 (14.0)	*"Cohabitation of high number of species (**animal**, plant, fungi, etc.) in a place, with equilibrium in resources sharing"* *"The quantity of **animal** and plant species"*
Plant (Végétal)	159 (13.1)	*"A mix of several species (animal or **plants**) which manage to live together!"* *"Quantity but also, and firstly, quality of species (animal, **plant**, etc.) constituting an ecosystem"*

Nature (Nature)	150 (12.4)	*"Numerous plant and **nature** essences"*
		*"Equilibrium between man-**nature**; to have a right place"*
Being (Être)	148 (12.2)	*"All **beings** who live in nature"*
		*"Diversity of landscapes, number of different living **beings** (qualitatively and quantitatively) in a given area"*
Fauna (Faune)	102 (8.4)	*"To preserve the multiplicity of species (**fauna** and flora) in their natural habitat"*
		*"Diversity **fauna** flora"*
Flora (Flore)	102(8.4)	*"Fauna, **flora** as well as the environment they live in"*
		*"To favour fauna and **flora** diversity in order to achieve natural equilibrium, without synthetic additions"*

---

30   [a] The word "living" has been separated from the expression "living being".

31   Table 6. Estimates and p-values for the proportions of definitions related to an action

32   (categorization group 2), according to the tested dependent variables (N=902). Only significant

33   interaction terms are shown; feminine gender, non-student category and C survey are reference

34   factors for categorical data

Dependent variable	Estimate +/- SD	p-value [a]
Age	-	0.50
Student (student)	-1.9 +/- 0.99	0.049*
INS	-	0.11
Childhood living place	-	0.74
Gender (Masculine)	-	0.51
Subset E	-1.6 +/- 0.78	0.037*
Subset E : age class	0.50 +/- 0.19	0.007**