GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS AS A SILENT PREDICTOR OF RESPONSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL BEHAVIOUR
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ABSTRACT: The purpose of this study was to investigate the regional differences in students’ awareness, perception, optimism and responsibility development toward environment. The data used for the study was obtained from the one produced by the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2006 and comprised of the Turkish sample of 4942 fifteen year-old students (2290 girls and 2652 boys) attending 160 schools across 78 provinces and 7 geographical regions. The data were statistically analyzed by using frequency distributions and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Results indicated that there is a significant effect of geographical regional differences, although small in magnitude, on students’ responsibility towards natural resources and environment.
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ÖZET: Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye’nin farklı coğrafi bölgelerinde yaşayan 15 yaş grubu öğrencilerin doğal kaynakları ve çevre ile ilgili sorunlara yönelik farkındalığı, kaygı, iyimserlik ve sorumluluk gelişmelerinin bölgelere göre değişimini araştırmaktır. Araştırmanın veri kaynağı ve örneklemesi 2006 Uluslararası Öğrenci Değerlendirme Programı (PISA) kapsamında Türkiye’nin 7 coğrafi bölgesinde, 7 ildeki 160 devlet ve özel okula okuluna devam etmeke olan 15 yaşındaki öğrenciler (2290 kız, 2652 erkek) ele alınan veriler oluşturmaktadır. Veriler, frekans dağılımları ve çoku varyans analizi (MANOVA) kullanarak analiz edilmiştir. MANOVA sonuçunda ele alınan sonuçlar, coğrafi bölge farklılıklarının öğrencilerin doğal kaynak ve çevre ile ilgili sorumluluk anlayışlarında etkili olduğunu göstermiştir.

Anahtar sözcükler: çevre eğitimi, çevre sorunlarına ilgi, çevre sorunları ile ilgili pozitif davranış, çevresel sürdürülebilirlik, coğrafi bölge.

1. INTRODUCTION

A considerable body of literature, across a number of countries, has addressed students’ views about environmental issues. Studies, generally, tended to explore the relationships between knowledge, attitudes and behavior toward the environment (e.g., Bradley, Waliczek, & Zajicek, 1999; DeChano, 2006; Kuhlemeyer, Bergh, & Huub Van Den Lagerweij, 1999; Negev, Sagy, Garb, Salzberg, & Tal, 2008; Said, Yahaya & Ahmadun, 2007). These studies, however, provided wide-ranging results concerning relationships among those variables. For example, studying with more than 9,000 Dutch ninth-grade students, Kuhlemeyer, Bergh, and Huub Van Den Lagerweij (1999) explored the link between environmental knowledge, attitudes, and behavior. Authors reported that more than half of the responded had a favorable attitude toward the environment. The students' knowledge about environmental problems, and their environmentally responsible behavior, however, was found to be inadequate. It was mentioned that majority of students lacked knowledge concerning: energy usage; soil, air, and water pollution; recycling; agricultural activities; tourism; transportation; and recreation. In her article, DeChano (2006) examined the relationship environmental knowledge and attitude by using high school students in Chile, England, Switzerland and United States. Results revealed that although participants have a favorable attitude toward environment, they exhibited low level of environmental knowledge. In addition, no significant association between environmental attitude and environmental knowledge was demonstrated.

In one of the studies, Gambro and Switzky (1992) examined the variables associated with knowledge about environmental issues regarding energy and pollution. Students’ knowledge about
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energy and pollution were found to be related to the gender, in favor of boys. Compared with male students, female students were less likely to hold higher environmental knowledge. In another study, Worsley and Skrzypiec (1998) investigated Australian high school students’ attitudes toward environment with respect to students’ regions, gender and socioeconomic status. The students living both in rural and urban regions were found to be concerned, but pessimistic, about environmental issues. Male students were reported to be more optimistic and more supportive of science solutions for environmental problems compared to female students. Recently, Chu et al., (2007) explored Korean children’s (Year 3) environmental literacy levels. Students were chosen from large cities, medium-sized cities, and rural areas. Children reported to lack knowledge related to the interrelationship among creatures and between plants and animals, food chains, energy sources of plants and humans or animals, and the roles of unattractive animals. It was also mentioned that children are not very well enlightened about endangered animals, wild animals, and other topical environmental issues. They, on the other hand, were found to be familiar with air pollution and water pollution. The environmental attitude and behavior dimensions, however, demonstrated that children were not responsive to environmental issues. Analyses suggested that while the correlation between attitude and behavior is the strongest, it is weakest between knowledge and behavior. Moreover, students’ gender, the source from where they obtain environmental information and school background of parents were found to be affecting all dimension of environmental literacy, namely, knowledge, attitude, behavior, and skills.

For example, compared to boys, girls exhibited better environmental literacy. In attitude scale, while boys gained the lowest mean score, girls earned the highest score. Authors concluded that girls have more responsible behavior towards the environment. Educational background of father found to be greatly influential on students’ attitude and knowledge compared to skill and behavior. Educational background of mothers, however, found to be highly influential on students’ knowledge compared to attitude, skill, and behavior.

Studies investigating the area of residence on environmental concern reported that students attending to rural schools as being highly concerned and optimistic about environmental issues than students from urban schools (e.g., Grodzinska-Jurczak, Stepska, Nieszporek & Bryda, 2006; Worsley & Skrzypiec, 1998). They claimed that students living in the urban area had less opportunity to care directly for the environment. For example, Grodzinska-Jurczak, et al. (2006) investigated pre-school children’s and their parents’ environmental attitude and the environmental knowledge level. They found that 6 years old children generally have a “strong environmental stance” and environmentally friendly attitudes. It was also reported that pre-school children’s environmental attitude depend on place of their residence. Tikka, Kuittunen, and Tynys (2000) claimed that environmental attitude can be shaped by the location and size of students’ hometown. Students living in the densely inhabited area found to develop more favorable attitudes compared to those living in the central part. In a recent study, Özden (2008) found that while Turkish student teachers living in Marmara Region had more favorable attitudes towards environmental problems than all the other six regions, student teachers living in South-eastern Anatolia region have the least environmental attitudes. He claimed that this finding may arise from the rural structure of the region and the low intensity of environmental problems compared to Marmara or other regions. Marmara region, however, is the most industrialized region of the Turkey where faced with many environmental problems, such as air and water pollution, and industrial wastes. Tikka et al, (2000) stated that “as a rule, people coming from the most densely crowded regions seem to be the most worried about the state of environment.” They claimed that environmental attitude can be shaped by the location and size of students’ hometown. Students living in the densely inhabited area found to develop more favorable attitudes compared to those living in the central part of Finland. Authors argued that students’ coming from the crowded, urbanized environment tended to become aware of existing problems and hence adopted sympathetic attitudes toward nature and protection of the environment. Worsley and Skrzypiec (1998) also reported that students living both in rural and urban regions were concerned, but pessimistic, about environmental issues. In particular, students from rural schools were found to be more concerned and expressed more optimism about environmental issues than students from urban schools. They claimed that students living in the urban area had less opportunity to care directly for the environment. However, no significant differences were demonstrated between rural and urban students with respect to their
attitudes towards environment. Hsu and Roth’s (1998) study also demonstrated rural-urban differences in environmental action. They reported that area of residence served as a silent predictor of responsible environmental behavior. In their study, Taiwanese teachers who lived and taught in area where they grow up and that teachers living in urban areas found to take more environmental action compared to those living in rural areas. They suggested that people living in urban area were more concerned about the environment since those people are more often exposed to environmental degradation compared to those living in rural areas. Hsu and Roth also claimed that urban residents tended to see human efforts as a suitable solution to environmental problems than those socialize in rural areas. They suggested that while developing and implementing environmental education, rural-urban differences should be taken into consideration. Bogner and Wiseman’s (1997) study indicated that there were no differences between rural and urban students regarding their environmental attitudes and behaviors. Recently, Alp, Ertepınar, Tekkaya, and Yılmaz (2007) determined 6th, 8th and 10th grade students’ environmental knowledge and attitudes. A statistically significant effect of grade level was found on environmental knowledge and attitudes. While the gender difference on environmental knowledge was not statistically significant, the effect of gender on attitudes toward the environment was statistically significant in favor of girls. Environmental knowledge found to be influential on behaviors not directly, but mediated by behavioral intentions and environmental affects. In a separate study, Alp, Ertepınar, Tekkaya, and Yılmaz (2008) explored elementary school students’ environmental knowledge and attitudes, the effects of socio-demographic variables on environmental knowledge and attitudes, and how self-reported environmentally friendly behaviour is related to environmental knowledge, behavioural intentions, environmental affects, and locus of control by using Children’s Environmental Attitudes and Knowledge Scale and Locus of Control Scale. Findings showed students had low levels of knowledge, but favourable attitudes toward the environment. Results also revealed significant main effect of father’s education level on students’ environmental knowledge. The gender difference on students’ attitudes toward the environment was found to be significant in favours of girls.

In line with these ideas, this study contributes to current understanding of students’ knowledge of environmental issues and their attitudes towards the environment by using data set obtained by OECD-PISA 2006, which includes awareness, concern, optimism and responsibility for environmental issues of the students’ across different regions of Turkey. The data obtained by PISA was the very valuable one for us, since the environmental education research in Turkey has not yet been accomplished with such data. Thus, the current study is designed to set up an overall picture of the state of environmental understanding of 15 years old Turkish students throughout the country and to detect the factors affecting the changes within the geographical provinces. The questions investigated by the study were:

a) What are 15-year-old Turkish students’ responsibility towards natural resources and the environment (i.e., awareness, concern, optimism and responsibility for environmental issues)?

b) Is there a significant difference in students’ responsibility towards natural resources and environment with respect to geographical region?

2. METHOD

2.1. Sample

The PISA 2006 Turkish data were gathered from 4942 fifteen-year-old students (2290 girls and 2652 boys) in 160 schools attending to Grade 7th (n = 23), 8th (n = 93), 9th (n = 2007), 10th (n = 2671) and 11th (n = 148) across 78 provinces and 7 geographical provinces.

2.2. Measures and Variables

The outcomes measure investigated in this research is students’ responsibility towards resources and environment that were measured by four indices in PISA 2006: The index of students awareness of environmental issues (ENVAware), the index of students’ level of concern for environmental issues (ENVPERC), the index of students’ optimism regarding environmental issues (ENVOPT), and
the index of students' responsibility for sustainable development (RESPDEV). The details of these indices are provided in OECD (2007, pp.340-341). The Cronbach’s Alpha reliability indexes for ENVWARE, ENVPERC, ENVOPT, and RESPDEV were 0.71, 0.83, 0.87 and 0.81 respectively for Turkish data.

2.3. Data Analysis

The survey data were statistically analyzed using frequency distributions and one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The dependent variables were the ENVWARE, ENVPERC, ENVOPT, and RESPDEV. The independent variable was region. All inferential analyses are conducted by weighing the data using PISA 2006 final student weight (W_FSTUWT).

3. RESULTS

3.1. Descriptive Statistics

Fifteen years old Turkish students’ responsibility towards resources and environment can be described as follows by means of the four components as measured in PISA 2006.

3.1.1. Awareness on environmental issues (ENVWARE)

Students’ awareness on 5 environmental issues (increase of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, the use of genetically modified organisms, acid rain, nuclear waste, and consequences of clearing forests for other land use) has been tested by means of asking their beliefs about their own level of information related to those issues. The issues and students’ responses were presented in Figure 1 with average frequencies. A minority of students, across seven regions reported being aware of the increase of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere (9.7%) and use of genetically modified organisms (9.8%). The percent of students who stated that they never heard about these issues were 26.5% and 22.1% in average, respectively. As far as the frequencies of the acid rain item have been considered, 18.2% stated that they were familiar and 9.2% stated that they never heard about the acid rain issue. Unlike other issues, an average of 30% of students reported being aware of nuclear waste issue. About 3% declared that they never heard about the nuclear waste. Furthermore, while 63.7% of the participants believed that they were familiar with the consequences of clearing forests for other land use, 3.9% declared that they never heard about the issue.

![Figure 1: Students’ beliefs regarding their own level of information on environmental issues.](image)

As a result, students’ beliefs regarding their own level of information on 5 environmental issues can be summarized as that, the issue they are most “familiar” is the consequences of clearing forests for other land use, the one that got the highest “know something” answer was nuclear waste, and the
issue that was answered as “never heard” by most of them is the increase of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

3.1.2. Level of concern for environmental issues (ENVPERC)

Turkish students’ levels of concern for environmental issues has been tested for 6 issues (air pollution, energy shortages, extinction of plants and animals, clearing forests by other land use, water shortages, nuclear waste) and the results are presented in Figure 2. As the figure displays, none of the issues were found as “not a concern at all” for Turkish students and more than 85% of the students declared all 6 issues as concern for not only themselves but also others. Only about 10% of the students reported that nuclear waste, energy shortage, clearing of forests for other land use, and extinction of plants and animals were serious environmental concern for other people in Turkey but not for them personally. This finding implies that majority of 15 years old students hold altruistic environmental concern, meaning that they had stronger belief about consequences of environmental damage for others.

![Figure 2: Students’ level of concern for environmental issues](image)

3.1.3. Optimism regarding environmental issues (ENVOOPT)

Students’ optimism regarding environmental issues was tested by means of asking the future trends of the problems. As the figure 3 displays, students of this study are far from being optimistic for the future trends of 6 environmental issues. More than 50% of the students stated for all the issues, except energy shortage, that the problem will get worse over the next 20 years.

For the energy shortage problem, on the other hand, almost 30% of the students stated that the problem will be about the same in 20 years and another 23% stated that the problem will be overcome in the next 20 years. The most probable explanation for such a result is that, since renewable energy sources are being declared as complementary for the non-renewable ones, students would think that the new energy sources will replace with the old ones and the problem will be solved.
Figure 3. Students’ optimism concerning the development over the next 20 years

3.1.4. Responsibility for sustainable development (RESPDEV)

Students’ level of agreement for 7 possible sustainable development policies is depicted in figure 4.

Figure 4. Students’ responsibility for sustainable development

Generally students agreed on the items related to their responsibility for sustainable development. For example, more than 90% of them supported policies on the protection of the habitats of endangered species and the importance of regular checks on the emissions from cars, and over 80% agreed on the items about having laws to regulate factory emissions in spite of increase in the prices.
3.2. Differences in the students’ responsibility toward natural resources and environment with respect to geographical regions

As presented in Table 1 and also in Figure 5, the mean scores for environmental perception, environmental awareness and responsibility development components show almost the same trend among the regions. Mean values for Aegean, Mediterranean, Marmara, Central Anatolia and Black Sea regions are higher than those for the Eastern Anatolia and South-eastern Anatolia Regions. Whereas, mean values for the environmental optimism component show a different pattern between the regions. As far as the mean values are considered, students in the Eastern Anatolia and South-eastern Anatolia Regions seem more optimistic than all other regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>ENVAVARE Mean</th>
<th>ENVAVARE SD</th>
<th>ENVPERC Mean</th>
<th>ENVPERC SD</th>
<th>RESPDEV Mean</th>
<th>RESPDEV SD</th>
<th>ENVOPT Mean</th>
<th>ENVOPT SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marmara</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>1.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Anatolia</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>-0.223</td>
<td>1.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>1.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Sea</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td>-0.247</td>
<td>1.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Anatolia</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>1.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-eastern Anatolia</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A clear picture can be seen from the Figure 5. The preliminary comment on this result may be related to the fact that, those regions in the Eastern part of Turkey are neither industrialized nor urbanized areas and thus they are not faced with the environmental problems that may make them pessimistic about their future. Furthermore, the students of these regions are not aware of the environmental problems both since they are not experienced them and they are not taught so.

3.4. Effect of geographical provinces on students’ responsibility towards resources and environment

A multivariate analysis of variance was performed to assess if there were differences between the seven geographic regions group on a linear combination of students’ awareness of environmental issues, level of concern for environmental issues, optimism regarding environmental issues, and responsibility for sustainable development. Total number of 4942 was reduced to 4890 with the deletion of missing scores. Results of evaluation of assumptions of normality, linearity, and multicollinearity were satisfactory. However, assumption of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices are violated as Box's M test was significant at \( p < .001 \). Since sample sizes and variances for each region differed considerably, we decided to use Pillai's criterion instead of Wilk's lambda to evaluate multivariate significance as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). After checking the key assumptions, a one way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effect of the geographical provinces on Turkish students’ responsibility towards resources and environment. With the use of Pillai's criterion (.037), the combined dependent variables were significantly affected by geographical province, \( F \) (4880, 19532) = 1027.98, \( p < .001 \). The multivariate value of .009 indicated 0.9 % of multivariate variance of the dependent variables was associated with the geographical province. The results reflected a low association between geographical provinces and the combined dependent variables. Region had an influence to a lesser extent on awareness of environmental issues, level of concern for environmental issues, optimism regarding environmental issues and responsibility for sustainable development responsibility towards resources and environment. It is necessary to note that although significant, the effect size is relatively small. We can say that this difference was significant due to the large dataset.
4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings suggested that 15 years old Turkish students’ responsibility towards resources and environment vary according to geographical regions of Turkey. In the first place, the results of the study provided some evidence that the place where students live had an effect on their environmental awareness, concern, optimism and responsibility for sustainable development. For example, the most noticeable characteristic related to the calculated mean values of the components for the seven geographical provinces of Turkey was that; although the students of the two of the least industrialized regions (Southeast Anatolia and East Anatolia) displayed lower awareness and concern toward environmental issues, they displayed highest degree of optimism concerning the development over the next 20 years of the problems associated with air pollution, energy shortages, extinction of plants and animals, clearing of forests for other land use, water shortages and nuclear waste. Concerning responsibility for sustainable development, on the other hand, while students living in the Aegean region exhibited the highest level of agreement, those of living in the Mediterranean displayed the least. In fact, these results reflect the transcontinental feature of Turkey. Among the 7 geographical provinces, Marmara having students with comparably higher environmental concern, responsibility but low degree of optimism, distinguishes from the others with its being heavily advanced in industry, commerce, tourism and transportation because of its close location to Europe. Thus the children living in such circumstances are more aware of the environmental problems, are concerned about them and pessimistic about the future state of the problems. The significant feature of Aegean, which has the students with very high environmental awareness, concern, responsibility toward environmental issues and comparably higher optimism, is that, most of the population and cities are concentrated on the coast line because of its convenience for sea transportation and tourism and it’s also being both industrialized and agriculturalized. Students from one of the most important trading and tourism centre and the rapidly growing port, the Mediterranean region, on the other hand revealed high awareness and concern but lowest optimism toward environmental issues. The students from the Black Sea region, one of the most heavily forested regions with very rich fauna and flora, revealed a similar trend with the former regions. The students from plateau-like heartland of the country, Central Anatolia, revealed comparably higher perception, responsibility and optimism toward environmental issues are considered. The students showing a distinguished feature, lowest awareness, perception, responsibility
but highest optimism toward environmental issues, in the current study come from the Eastern Anatolia, the population and habitat not dense because of the harsh climate and high mountains and has the highest unemployment rate in Turkey and South-eastern Anatolia where a special atmosphere exists throughout, uniquely different from other parts of the country, thus, reflecting a specific life style over its land. Thus, referring the very well known phrase of the environmental studies, *think globally act locally* (UNEP, 1972), efforts to explain environmental perceptions and concern as a function of social structure and socio-demographic characteristics can be combined with the regional features of a country and such a relationship, if any, is valuable for strategy development for developing environmental perceptions. Thus, as Matthews (1995) reviewed in his study, regional features and culture affect children's behavior in large-scale environments and it follows that as the life worlds of children from different socio cultural backgrounds differ, the way in which children encounter place and make sense of their everyday worlds are also likely to be at variance.

It can be concluded that the results of the current study supports the idea that “area of residence is a silent predictor of responsible environmental behavior”. Therefore, after finding the difference between the geographical regions in Turkey, as far as the 15 years old students’ awareness, concern, optimism and responsibility toward the environment is concerned, it is needed to integrate regional socio-economical features with the students’ perceptions towards environment. Such an evaluation will be very valuable leading the education specialists to establish a national strategy for developing environmentally literate generations and will help to make the strategy regional, as suggested in Chapter 36 of Agenda 21 (UNCED, 1992).

6. RECOMMENDATION

We recommend taking the data of the current study as a base for further research and strategy development studies to develop a national strategy for environmental education in Turkey. We also suggest revising the data and related evaluations for each year depending on the PISA test results, so as to have a data set on the development on environmental perceptions of the school children in Turkey. We believe that integrating socio economic and cultural features of the regions with the results of the current study will be very useful to construct the above mentioned data set in Turkey. And we also believe that it is the time for gathering the all data and information related to environmental perceptions of the Turkish students’ together to comprise a data set and start a combined work for constructing a national strategy to develop the current state in Turkey.
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GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Çevrenin ve buna bağlı doğal kaynakları korumanın en önemli araçlarından birisinin çevre eğitimi olduğu tüm dünyada tartışmasız kabul edilmektedir. Bu çerçevede yapılan araştırmalar çalışmalar, doğal çevrenin kalitesi konusunda bireysel ve sosyal farkındalık ve bunu takip eden kaygıların, çevreyi korumanın merkezindeki temel unsurlar olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Bu çalışmaların amacı Türkiye’nin farklı coğrafi bölgelerinde yaşayan 15 yaş grubu öğrencilere çevreye ve kaynaklara olan sorumluluk bilinci araştırılmaktur. Araştırma genelinde 2006 Uluslararası Öğrenci Değerlendirme Programı (PISA) kapsamında Türkiye’nin 7 coğrafi bölgesinde, 78 ildeki 160 devlet ve özel okula okuluna devam etmekte olan 15 yaşındaki toplam 4942 öğrenciden (2290 kiz, 2652 erkek) elde edilen verilerle ontvangmaktadır. Öğrencilerin çevresel etkileri sınıf düzeylerine göre dağıtımları ise şu şekildedir: 7. sınıf (n = 23), 8. sınıf (n = 93), 9. sınıf (n = 207), 10. sınıf (n = 2677) ve 11. sınıf (n = 148). PISA 2006’da öğrencilere çevreye ve kaynaklara olan sorumluluk bilinci dört indeks değişikliyle ölçülmiştir. Bunlar; (i) öğrencilere çevresel sorunlara yönelik farkındalık indeksi (ENVWARE), (ii) öğrencilere çevresel sorunlara yönelik kaygı indeksi (ENVPERC), (iii) öğrencilere çevresel sorunlara dair iyimserlik indeksi (ENVOPT), ve (iv) öğrencilere çevresel sürdürülebilirlik için sorumluluk indeksi (RESPDEV). Türk örneklemini için ENVWARE, ENVPERC, ENVOPT ve RESPDEV için Cronbach Alpha güvenilirlik değerleri sırasıyla 0.71, 0.83, 0.87 ve 0.81 olarak bulunmuştur.

Verilerin analizinde ilk olarak öğrencilere b isConnected indeksleri oluşturan sorulara verdikleri yanitlarının frekans dağılımları yapılmıştır. Ayrıca, ENVWARE, ENVPERC, ENVOPT ve RESPDEV indeksleri bağımlı değişik, öğrencinin içinde bulunduğu coğrafi bölge bağımız değişik olarak alınarak tek yönlü çoklu varsans analizi (MANOVA) yapılmıştır. MANOVA yapılmış veriler PISA 2006 veri tabanındaki son öğrenci ağrılıkları (W_FSTUWT) kullanılarak açıklanmıştır.

Bazı çevresel sorunlar hakkında bilgileri konusundaki inanısları incelemiştir, arazinin başka amaçlarla kullanılması için ormanların yok edilmesinin sonuçlarının 15 yaş grubu öğrencilereının en çok aşını oldukları konu olduğu, nükleer atıklar konusunun ise öğrencilere hakkında az çok bir şeyler duyduklarını konulara başka geldiği bulunmuştur. Öğrencilerin çoğu tarafından hiç duyluymayan konuları başında ise atmosferi yaşamın sıra gazlarının geldiği görülmektedir. Öte
yandan 15 yaş grubu öğrencilerin çoğunluğunun, çevrede verilen zararlara insanlara tekrar zara olarak döneceği yönünde kaygıları olduğu ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bununla birlikte, öğrencilerin bazı çevre sorunlarının gelecekteki eğilimleri konusundaki düşünceleri incelendiğinde, 15 yaş grubu öğrencilerinin çevresel sorunlar karşısında iyimserlikten çok uzak olduklarını görmekteyiz. Öte yandan 15 yaş grubu öğrencilerin, çevresel sürdürülebilirlik için kendilerine düşen sorumluluklar konusunda genel olarak hemfikir olduklarını görmekteyiz. Örneğin, öğrencilerin %90’dan fazla nesli tükenmekte olan hayvanların doğal ortamlarının korunması, otomobilinin düzenli olarak emisyon ölçümünün yapılması gibi politikaları desteklemektedir.
