DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 144 SE 029 961

AUTHOR Polinard, Jerry L.
TITLE Attitudes Toward Environmental Quality: Area, Ethnicity and SES.
INSTITUTION Pan American Univ., Edinburg, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
REPORT NO EPA-600-5-79-0004
PUB DATE Feb 79
GRANT EPA-68-01-2683
NOTE 130P.; Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original document.
AVAILABLE FROM National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, VA 22161 (no price quoted).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Anglo Americans; Attitudes; Economic Factors; *Environmental Education; *Ethnicity; Mass Media; Mexican Americans; *Rural Urban Differences; *Socioeconomic Status; *Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Environmental Attitudes; *Environmental Education Research; Environmental Problems

ABSTRACT

The results of a study which surveyed environmental attitudes and perceptions of residents of the San Antonio, Texas SMSA are presented and discussed. Respondents (N=1088) were selected on the basis of: (1) area stratification (urban, suburban, rural), (2) ethnicity (primarily Anglo and Mexican-American), and (3) economic and educational status (SES) income. The purposes of the study were: (1) to identify and evaluate variations in environmental attitude between and among individuals within the subgroups, relationships between environmental problems and non-environmental problems as perceived by the subgroup populations, extent to which individuals within and among the subgroups were willing to "pay" for improvement in environmental quality, and media influences which have the most significant impact in shaping the environmental attitudes of respondents; and (2) to correlate these findings with existing empirical data. Findings indicate, among others, that respondents do not believe environmental problems are among the most important faced by the nation, that respondents believe television is the most accurate source of information, concern for environmental problems decreases as one moves away from the center city, and that Mexican-Americans rank environmental concerns higher than Anglos. (Author/DC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

United States
Environmental Protection
Agency

Office of Monitoring and Technical
Support
Washington DC 20460

PB 295 496

EPA-600/5-79-004
February 1979

Research and Development

EPA

ED210144

# Attitudes Toward Environmental Quality

## Area, Ethnicity and SES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

029 961

## RESEARCH REPORTING SERIES

Research reports of the Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, have been grouped into nine series. These nine broad categories were established to facilitate further development and application of environmental technology. Elimination of traditional grouping was [illegible] planned to foster technology transfer and a maximum interface in related [illegible]. The nine series are:

1. Environmental Health Effects Research
2. Environmental Protection [illegible]
3. Ecological Research
4. [illegible]
5. [illegible]
6. [illegible]
7. [illegible] Development
8. [illegible] Reports
9. [illegible]

[illegible] assigned [illegible] ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES series. This series [illegible] [illegible] impacts of alternative [illegible] regional, state, and [illegible] [illegible] management and [illegible]

This document is available [illegible]

EPA-600/5-79-004
February 1979

# ATTITUDES TOWARD ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY: AREA, ETHNICITY AND SES

by

Jerry L. Polinard
Pan American University
Edinburg, Texas 78539

Contract No. 68-01-2683

Project Officer

Clyde C. Bishop, Jr.
Technical Support Division
Office of Monitoring and Technical Support
Washington, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF MONITORING AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

## DISCLAIMER

This report has been reviewed by the Office of Research and Development, Minority Institutions Research Support, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

## FOREWORD

The U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has the immense task of defining, evaluating, promulgating, regulating, educating and coercing activities which have a positive effect on environmental quality. The social and economic impacts of environmental decisions in the above categories can have a wide range of effects on human life and life-styles. The staggering costs of corrective action to Governments and industries could force a shift in policy toward educating and coercing people to lend a greater hand in developing and implementing abatement programs.

In order to develop effective abatement programs, the EPA must have a base of information on the attitudes, preceptions and willingness of the populace to cooperate. This report presents quantitative data on these variables and shows the stratification of each variable in a range of economic and social settings in the inner-city, suburban, and rural societies.

A. C. Trakowski
Deputy Assistant Administrator
for Monitoring and Technical Support

## ABSTRACT

Americans are less than three generations removed from an era when virgin land, clean water, pure air and quiet neighborhood were an integral part of the nation's life style. This era, however, has passed. A host of problems, including overcrowding, unclean air, impure water and high noise levels, has formed what is known as "the environmental crisis."

In confronting this crisis our government is faced with different options. And, as the nature of our political system is such that public attitude are important influences on policy outputs, indeed, that public policy is expected to reflect public values, it is essential that the environmental attitude of the American public be known. This study focuses on the environmental attitudes of residents in the San Antonio SMSA.

The data indicate that, while the respondents believe the environment is deteriorating, they do not believe environmental problems are among the most important faced by the nation. We found also that our respondents view the environment in both physical and social terms. Respondents believe television, from which they derive most of their information relating to environmental problems, is the most accurate source of information (with radio a distant second source).

We found significant relationships between environmental attitude and area, ethnicity and SES. Our data indicate that concern with environmental problems decrease as one moves away from the center city to the rural area. Suburban respondents are more optimistic about current and future environmental conditions than respondents living in the center city or rural areas.

Mexican-Americans rank environmental concerns higher than Anglos. Anglos, although more optimistic about environmental conditions, are much more aware of and active in organizations (both public and private) which focus on the environment.

High SES respondents were more aware of environmental problems and more actively involved in environmental organizations than low or middle SES respondents.



This report was submitted in fulfillment of Contract No. 68-01-2683 by Pan American University under the sponsorship of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. This report covers the period September 1974 to September 1977, and work was completed as of May 16, 1978.

CONTENTS

Foreword . . . . . iii

Abstract . . . . . iv

Tables . . . . . vi

1. Introduction . . . . . 1

2. Purpose, Scope and Methodology . . . . . 4

3. Frequencies . . . . . 6

4. Area Responses to Environmental Problems . . . . . 29

5. Ethnicity and the Environment . . . . . 48

6. SES . . . . . 66

7. Media Influence . . . . . 86

8. Multivariate Analysis . . . . . 107

9. Conclusions . . . . . 112

Bibliography . . . . . 115

TABLES


| Number | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Most Important Problems | 11 |
| 2 | Definition of Environment | 12 |
| 3 | Perception of Present Environment | 13 |
| 4 | Perception of Past Environment | 14 |
| 5 | Perception of Future Environment | 15 |
| 6 | Contributors to Environmental Problems | 16 |
| 7 | National Media Use | 17 |
| 8 | State Media Use | 18 |
| 9 | Local Media Use | 19 |
| 10 | Media Accuracy | 20 |
| 11 | Read Story on Environment | 21 |
| 12 | Saw TV Report on Environment | 22 |
| 13 | Life Styles and Environmental Problems | 23 |
| 14 | Knowledge of Governmental Environmental Agencies | 24 |
| 15 | Knowledge of Civic Environmental Agencies | 25 |
| 16 | Membership in Environmental Group | 26 |
| 17 | Contacts With Public Officials | 27 |
| 18 | Attendance at Environmental Meetings | 28 |
| 19 | Important Problems By Area | 33 |
| 20 | Definition of Environment By Area | 34 |

| Number | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 21 | Perception of Present Environment By Area | 35 |
| 22 | Perception of Future Environment By Area | 36 |
| 23 | Contributors to Environmental Problems By Area | 37 |
| 24 | Life Styles and Environmental Problems By Area | 38 |
| 25 | Allocation of Money to Auto Exhaust By Area | 39 |
| 26 | Allocation of Money to Water Pollution By Area | 40 |
| 27 | Allocation of Money to Noise Pollution By Area | 41 |
| 28 | Allocation of Money to Trash Pollution By Area | 42 |
| 29 | Allocation of Money to Recreation By Area | 43 |
| 30 | Knowledge of Governmental Environmental Agencies By Area | 44 |
| 31 | Knowledge of Civic Environmental Agencies By Area | 45 |
| 32 | Membership in Environmental Group By Area | 46 |
| 33 | Contacts With Public Officials By Area | 47 |
| 34 | Most Important Problems By Ethnic Group | 51 |
| 35 | Definition of Environment By Ethnicity | 52 |
| 36 | Perception of Present Environment By Ethnicity | 53 |
| 37 | Perception of Future Environment By Ethnicity | 54 |
| 38 | Contributors to Environmental Problems By Ethnicity | 55 |
| 39 | Allocation of Money to Auto Exhaust By Ethnicity | 56 |
| 40 | Allocation of Money to Water Pollution By Ethnicity | 57 |
| 41 | Allocation of Money to Noise Pollution By Ethnicity | 58 |
| 42 | Allocation of Money to Trash Pollution By Ethnicity | 59 |
| 43 | Allocation of Money to Recreation By Ethnicity | 60 |
| 44 | Life Styles and Environmental Problems By Ethnicity | 61 |
| 45 | Knowledge of Governmental Environmental Agencies By Ethnicity | 62 |

| Number | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 46 | Knowledge of Civic Environmental Agencies By Ethnicity | 63 |
| 47 | Membership in Environmental Group By Ethnicity | 64 |
| 48 | Contacts With Public Officials By Ethnicity | 65 |
| 49 | Most Important Problems By SES | 70 |
| 50 | Definition of Environment By SES | 71 |
| 51 | Perception of Present Environment By SES | 72 |
| 52 | Perception of Future Environment By SES | 73 |
| 53 | Contributors to Environmental Problems By SES | 74 |
| 54 | Life Styles and Environmental Problems By SES | 75 |
| 55 | Allocation of Money to Auto Exhaust By SES | 76 |
| 56 | Allocation of Money to Water Pollution By SES | 77 |
| 57 | Allocation of Money to Noise Pollution By SES | 78 |
| 58 | Allocation of Money to Trash Pollution By SES | 79 |
| 59 | Allocation of Money to Recreation By SES | 80 |
| 60 | Knowledge of Governmental Environmental Agencies By SES | 81 |
| 61 | Knowledge of Civic Environmental Agencies By SES | 82 |
| 62 | Membership in Environmental Group By SES | 83 |
| 63 | Contacts With Public Officials By SES | 84 |
| 64 | Attendance at Environmental Meetings By SES | 85 |
| 65 | National Media Use By Area | 89 |
| 66 | State Media Use By Area | 90 |
| 67 | Local Media Use By Area | 91 |
| 68 | National Media Use By Ethnicity | 92 |
| 69 | State Media Use By Ethnicity | 93 |
| 70 | Local Media Use By Ethnicity | 94 |

| Number | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 71 | National Media Use By SES | 95 |
| 72 | State Media Use By SES | 96 |
| 73 | Local Media Use By SES | 97 |
| 74 | Media Accuracy By Area | 98 |
| 75 | Media Accuracy By Ethnicity | 99 |
| 76 | Media Accuracy By SES | 100 |
| 77 | Read Environmental Story By Area | 101 |
| 78 | Saw TV Environmental Report By Area | 102 |
| 79 | Read Environmental Story By Ethnicity | 103 |
| 80 | Saw TV Environmental Report By Ethnicity | 104 |
| 81 | Read Environmental Story By SES | 105 |
| 82 | Saw TV Environmental Report By SES | 106 |
| 83 | Summary Table: Results From Multiple Regression | 110 |
| 84 | Summary Table: Results From Factor Analysis | 111 |

## SECTION I

## INTRODUCTION

Americans are less than three generations removed from an era when virgin land, clean water, pure air and quiet neighborhoods were an integral part of the nation's life style. The nearness of this historical link explains, in part, America's surprise at the recent emergence of environmental quality as one of its most viable domestic concerns (in January, 1971, Time magazine identified the environment as "the issue of the year").

A host of problems, including overcrowding, unclean air, impure water and high noise levels, has formed what is known as "the environmental crisis." The energy crisis of 1974-75 added the element of scarcity to the expanding list of environmental problems.

In response to this crisis something nebulously called "the environment movement" has developed. Americans have begun seriously evaluating their role in the human environment system, defined by the Council of Environmental Quality as including not only "the earth, its surrounding envelope of life-giving water and air... but also the public's interaction with its natural and artificial surroundings.

The present environmental "movement" is not the first time Americans have evidenced awareness of their ecology. In the 19th Century legislation existed which prohibited the polluting of water and required forms of land use (see, for instance, Euclid v. Amber Reality Co., 272 U.S. 365 (1926), for a concise history of early land use legislation). Additional legislation relating to air and water pollution appeared more than a generation ago.

Most of this early legislation, however, while recognizing in minor ways a need to protect the human environment, was predicated on the traditional values of the period in which the legislation was passed. These beliefs included the sanctity of property rights, the non-interference of government in the economy and the pursuance of economic success, even at the expense of environmental destruction. The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, for example, prohibited throwing refuse into any navigable waterway of the United States. The pruposé of the Act, however, was not to provide clean water, but rather to eliminate potential shipping hazards.

To be sure, these values still are evident today. However, the contemporary environmental movement has taken a different tack. The present orientation is more toward social, rather than economic needs. The writings of Rachael Carson, Lewis Mumford and William Douglas have focused on the relationship of environmental factors to the quality of life, and this focus was

embraced by the activists of the 1960's.

Nonetheless, the energy crisis of the 1970's has demonstrated clearly that the environmental system cannot be divorced from either social and/or economic considerations. The public must consider what qualitative and monetary tradeoffs they are willing to make for environmental improvement. They must strive for a balance between a qualitative environment and a viable economy.

And, as the nature of our political system is such that public attitudes are important influences on policy outputs, that public policy indeed is expected to reflect public values, it is essential that the environmental attitudes of the American public be known.

This study hopes to contribute to this knowledge.

American attitudes toward the environment already have been the subject of much inquiry. Many public and private surveys have added to our knowledge of how America is reacting to environment problems. In general, surveys have shown:

1. Between 1965 and 1970 the percentage of Americans who identified our pollution among the three major public problems increased 300 percent. No other issue about which the public was polled evidenced such growth in recognition;

2. After 1970 the public response to environmental problems began to be tempered with an increased awareness of the potential economic costs of resolving these problems;

3. Americans believe the environment is continuing to deteriorate;

4. Americans believe our problems are more or as important as welfare, national spending, and taxes, but less important than inflation, national security and corruption in government;

5. Although few Americans are willing to pay the necessary "personal costs" to achieve economic goals, they do believe the current public expenditures should not be decreased;

6. Americans view environmental problems primarily in terms of water and air pollution;

7. Communities characterized by higher income and education levels are more sensitive to environmental problems and are more willing to act, or support action, to improve environmental conditions;

8. Most Americans rely on television and radio for information relating to environmental quality.

This knowledge is important. It not only informs us, but also aids public agencies in their efforts to address the problems of environmental

quality. The most important public agency in the development of our national environmental policy is the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The EPA needs to know what, why and how the public perceives environmental problems if it is to execute its tasks effectively.

If the EPA is to control the cause and effects of environmental problems, if it is to establish national standards relating to the use of the environment, and if it is to enforce these actions it must know what the public thinks.

Public opinion is not static; it is continually in a state of flux. That is why we need to continually ascertain the public attitudes toward the environment. We need to ascertain what relationship, if any, the public's awareness of environmental conditions has with respect to its awareness of other problems, e.g., inflation, unemployment, taxes. We need to know at any given time what cost trade-offs the public is willing to accept in return for environmental improvements.

We need to know also how the public perceives the environment itself and how this perception relates to individual lifestyles. We need to ascertain the influence of the news media on the formation of environmental attitudes, and which specific area of the media has the most significant impact.

The diversity of the American public has important consequences for agencies involved in developing public policy. People living in the same area do not necessarily think alike. Therefore, we need to know what effects this diversity has on the public's perception of the environment. Do people living in the same spatial regions, but residing in different spatial units (e.g., inner city, suburbs, rural) perceive their environment and environmental problems differently? What are people willing to "give up" to initiate environmental change, and how does the willingness vary from one segment of the population to another? Are perceptions of the environment affected by ethnicity? By income?

These are the general types of questions which need to be asked about the environment, and this study is directed toward these questions.

The second section of this report explains the purpose, scope and methodology of this study. The third section describes the general frequency of responses to the survey instrument. The fourth section explores the results of the survey as they relate to people living in urban, suburban and rural areas. The fifth section addresses the relationship between SES income and survey responses. The seventh section explores the influence of the media on the respondent's attitudes. The eighth section employes the tools of multivariate analysis to learn in more detail what the survey data tells us. The ninth section offers conclusions and suggestions for further study.

## SECTION 2

## PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

### PURPOSE

This study is designed to add to our knowledge of environmental attitudes and perceptions. The central thrust of this study is to identify and measure those aspects of environmental quality which have a significant impact on respondents selected on the basis of (1) area stratification (i.e., urban, suburban and rural areas), (2) ethnicity (primarily Anglo and Mexican-American), and (3) SES income.

Focusing on these three sub-groups, the central objectives of this study are:

1. To identify and evaluate the extent to which environmental attitude may vary between and among individuals within the related subgroup populations.

2. To identify and evaluate the relationships between environmental problems and non-environmental problems as perceived by these subgroup populations.

3. To identify and evaluate the extent to which individuals within and among the subgroup population are willing to "pay" (in economic and non-economic terms) for improvement in environmental quality.

4. To identify and evaluate the media influences which have the most significant impact in shaping the environmental attitudes of respondents.

5. To correlate these findings with existing empirical data.

Several tentative hypotheses suggest themselves as guidelines for our inquiry:

1. Affluence and education will be in direct relationship to one's awareness of environmental problems. That is, the higher one's income and more extensive one's education, the more likely one is to be aware of and sensitive to the environmental system.

2. Individuals residing in a deteriorating environment are more likely to be aware of environmental problems than those residing in a

healthy environment. Note that this hypothesis may be incompatible with the first.

3. Individuals with a greater awareness of the environmental system will manifest also a greater awareness of the relationship of the environmental system to all facets of life styles.

4. Individuals with a greater awareness of the environmental system will be more willing to accept the "costs" of improving that system.

SCOPE

The regional scope of this study is the San Antonio, Texas SMSA, which includes a population of almost one million people. These people reside in defined urban, suburban and rural units. The population is also clearly stratified by ethnicity with a large Mexican-American population (38%).

METHODOLOGY

The methodology utilized in this study is survey research. An interview schedule of forty-two questions was administered to 1088 people from an initial sample design of 1650. The design was developed by drawing cluster samples using block statistics. The clusters were composed of three housing units, randomly selected from the 260,925 housing units in the SMSA. Within each housing unit, one adult, also randomly selected through a respondent selective randoming device, was scheduled to be interviewed. Five hundred and fifty area cluster samples were used. The total number of housing units divided by 550 resulted in the figure 474. Therefore, starting with a randomly-selected housing unit, every 474th housing unit and the housing unit on each side were selected for interviews.

Callbacks were made three times before a substitution housing unit or respondent was selected. When substitutions were made, the data from these interviews was collected and correlated with non-substitution results to ascertain if significant differences existed. Similarily, at the end of the survey, a sample of respondents who had refused earlier interviews was drawn. These respondents were contacted again and the data collected to ascertain if there were significant differences between those who refused and the regular data.

The survey instrument was administered in both English and Spanish. The interviewing was conducted by students of Pan American University (the contractor). The students were trained in three separate sessions and performed well in the field. Quality control checks were conducted during the interviewing periods.

The sample thus obtained significantly underrepresented the Anglo population of the SMSA. Thus, it was necessary to weight the respondents. The procedure used was the weight procedure of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The reweighted percentage of Anglos was thus 64% of the sample.

## SECTION 3

## FREQUENCIES

This section is an overview of the data collected by the study. Such an overview is important to an understanding of the relationships examined in later sections.

It is important to understand the perceived relationship between environmental problems and other public issues. We asked respondents first to identify the various public problems with which they were concerned. Two problem areas were identified most often: economy and crime. The economic area, which included unemployment, was identified by almost half of the respondents as a national problem and by a third as a community problem. Crime and corruption were cited by 16% as a national problem and by 15.5% as a community problem.

Only 2.7% of the respondents identified the environment as a specific national problem, 3.8% agreed it was a local problem, while a slightly higher percentage (7.4%) saw the energy shortage as a national problem (5.6% viewed it as a local problem).

To examine one aspect of the relationship between these problems we asked respondents to rank eight common problems according to which they believed most important, second most important, and third most important. We arranged a scale score on a 5-3-1 basis, 5 points for most important, 3 for second most important, and 1 for third most important.

Table 1 shows that economic problems (i.e., state of the economy and unemployment) and crime and violence are perceived to be the most important problems. If we add energy shortage to environmental problems, there is a significant increase in the importance of the environmental area. However, fewer than three hundred respondents identified the environment as one of the three most important problems.

Most of the respondents, thus, do not see the environment as a major problem facing either the nation or San Antonio.

We were interested in how people defined the term "environment." We asked, "Will you tell me in your own words what the environment means to you?" Their answers were placed in the categories found in Table 2. Over half of the respondents (55.1%) identified the environment as including both physical and social components. The next largest category was "no idea," with 14.8% of the respondents selecting this category. Thirteen and a half

percent of the respondents viewed the environment primarily in physical terms as contrasted with 8.6% who saw it primarily in a social context.

One issue which has been studied frequently concerns the trend of our environment. We asked the respondents to identify the conditions of the present environment, the environment five years earlier and five years into the future. The question: "Here is a ladder. Imagine that the top of the ladder represents the best possible environmental conditions, and the bottom of the ladder represents the worst possible environmental conditions. Where do you think San Antonio stands on the ladder at the present time?" A nine would indicate the best possible conditions; a zero, the worst possible conditions.

Table 3 shows that respondents generally viewed the present environment in positive terms. If we take 0 through 3 to be below average, 4 through 6 to be average, and 7 through 9 to be above average, we find that 40.5% of the respondents identified present environmental conditions as above average, 38% as average and 21.6% as below average. This might, in part, explain the low percentage of responses identifying environmental problems as a major problem (see above, p. 6)

Table 4 looks back to the past and presents a slightly more pessimistic perception. About 40% of the respondents (38.4%) still identified the environment as above average, but now 35.4% see past environmental conditions as below average and 26.4% as average.

Table 5 offers us a picture of the future and a not-very-bright picture at that. About half of the respondents (44.0%) believe the future conditions of the environment will be worse than that of either the present or past. One-third believe the environment will improve the next five years and 22.3% believe it will be average.

In order to develop public policy relating to any problem it is most important to identify the source of the problem. We asked the respondents to name what they thought contributed the most to our environmental problems. The question: "Who or what do you feel is contributing most to the environmental problems in this area?"

The contributor identified by the largest single group of respondents (32.4%) was "individual" (see Table 6). However, 22.1% identified no source. Industry, frequently publicized as a major pollutant, was cited by 10.6% and ranked behind government which was singled out by 12.8%.

We were interested in the impact of the media on the public's perception of environmental problems. First, we asked each respondent to identify the media source from which they obtained most of their information about national state and local events. As Tables 7, 8, and 9 indicate, television and newspapers far exceed any other media source in informing the respondents. In each case about one half of the respondents obtained most of the information from TV and 1/4 to 1/5 obtained their information from newspapers. It is interesting to note that the impact of television lessens as one moves from national to state to local news while the impact of radio increases.

We asked the respondents to identify the media source they considered most accurate. The question: "Which of these sources of information do you think is most likely to give you an unbiased and accurate report of news events?" Table 10 shows that 42.5% believed television to be most accurate, followed by newspapers and radio. Fourteen and a half percent contended that none of the media sources were unbiased.

We then asked the respondents if they recalled any recent news coverage of environmental events. Table 11 reports data concerning the newspaper coverage. About half (48.2%) of the respondents recalled reading something in a newspaper relating to the environment (note that 81% of the respondents indicated they continually read a newspaper). Table 12 focused on television coverage. Forty-five and a half percent of the respondents believed they had seen something on TV relating to the environment; 49.8% had not seen anything concerning the environment. Of the 74.1% respondents who listen to a radio, only 23.3% could recall anything recently that commented on the environment. These figures were almost identical to those responding to similar questions concerning magazines. Seventy percent said they read or subscribed to magazines on a regular basis, but only 23.5% recalled any article relating to the environment.

There has been much discussion concerning America's life style and how it contributes to many of our problems. We asked the respondents: "Do you think that the ways that Americans live contributes to environmental problems?"

Table 13 reveals that an overwhelming 67.3% of the respondents did see our life styles as contributing to environmental problems. Only 16.4% categorically rejected such an idea.

The knowledge of how much money the public is willing to spend is of critical importance to public officials. We identified five general areas of environmental problems: auto exhaust, water pollution, noise, garbage and waste disposal, and creating recreational areas. We asked each respondent: "If your total taxes for such items as sales tax, amusement tax, liquor tax and the like were to be increased, say by $100, how much out of this $100 would you be willing to spend for the following: auto exhaust, water pollution, noise, garbage and waste disposal and creating recreational areas to maintain a clear environment?"

The first problem identified was "auto exhaust pollution." About 50% of the respondents (44.0%) were unwilling to spend any of the $100 here. Fifteen and a half percent were willing to contribute $20 and 10.9%, $25. Almost three-fourths (71.1%) of the respondents were unwilling to distribute more than $20.

The second problem was water pollution. Thirty-six point one percent of the respondents did not want any of the money distributed here. Fifteen point three percent agreed to allocate $20 and 12.9%, $25. Ten point two percent agreed to allocate $50. In general the respondents seem to attach more importance to water pollution than to auto exhaust problems.

The third problem concerned "noise." Fifty-eight point nine percent of the respondents refused to allocate any money to this problem. Nine point eight percent were willing to contribute $10 and 12.8%, $20, but with over 75% of the respondents allocating less than $20, noise did not seem to be a major problem.

The fourth area was trash and waste disposal. Here, the respondents seemed more concerned. Still, over one-third (37.5%) allocated no money. Fifteen point two percent were willing to allocate $20 and 12.6%, $25. Ten percent allocated $50.

The final problem area identified concerned recreational areas. This seemed by far to be the category which generated an allocation of money. Only 28.3% refused to distribute any of their money to this problem. Fourteen and a half percent donated $20, 10.6%, $25 and 14.8% spent $50. Less than 40% were unwilling to spend at least $20 on this problem.

With the exception of the latter problem, none of the problems claimed a disproportionate amount of money from the respondents.

Citizen involvement in public policy is very important. We were interested both in the citizens' knowledge of governmental agencies focusing on environmental issues and in their knowledge of and membership in relevant citizen groups or civic agencies.

We asked "Do you happen to know if there are any governmental agencies or organizations in the San Antonio area which are concerned with the protection of the environment?"

Table 14 indicates that 52.5% of the respondents were aware of some governmental agencies concerned with environmental problems. Of these respondents 24.6% could identify the agency, with 6.6% recognizing the EPA as such an agency. Thirty-seven point eight percent of the respondents know of no government agency in the San Antonio area concerned with environmental problems. Only 90 respondents identified the EPA.

We asked also if there were any citizens groups or civic clubs in the San Antonio area that study environmental problems or take stands on environmental problems.

Here we found that more respondents were aware of local, non-governmental agencies than had been aware of governmental agencies. Sixty point four percent of the respondents were aware of such organizations (see Table 15). Of these, 31.5% could identify the local organization by name, with the Sierra Club being most widely recognized (8.2%).

We then asked, "Do you happen to belong to any organization that studies or takes stands on environmental issues?"

"No," was the overwhelming answer. Table 16 indicates that about nine out of ten respondents did not belong to any environmentally-active organization. Of the 9.9% that do belong to an organization, no more than 1.1%

belong to the same organization, indicating that no single environmentally-active organization even remotely has a following in San Antonio.

We sought to identify other indices of environmental activism. We asked, "Have you ever written any letters, telephoned or personally called on anyone concerning environmental issues?"

As might be expected from the answer to the previous question, a significant number of respondents had never utilized any of these approaches. Eighty point four percent had never contacted anyone concerning environmental issues (see Table 17). Of the 17.9% who had made contact, 9.1% had called a public official and 5.6% had written a public official.

Finally, we asked, "Have you ever attended any meetings or rallies to complain or learn about the environmental problems?"

Again, the answers were consistent with responses to previous questions concerning activities. Table 18 indicates that 85.8% of the respondents had never attended a meeting.

A demographic profile of the survey follows. Sixty point three percent of the sample had resided in the San Antonio area five years or more (22.4% had resided in the area for over 15 years). Twenty-six point three percent of the respondents had lived there two years or less. Forty-nine point two percent were employed. Twenty-eight percent of the sample had completed high school, 15.6% had completed college. Nineteen and a half percent had an 8th grade education or less. Virtually all adult age groups were evenly represented with 30-34 year olds comprising the smallest portion of the sample (10%) and 45-54 (16.5%) and 18-24 (16.4%) the largest. Twenty-five point nine percent of the respondents had incomes of $15,000 or more; 45.4 had incomes of less than $10,000. Fifty-eight point three percent of the respondents were female. Sixty-four point one percent of the sample were Anglo and almost one-third were Mexican-American. Sixty point eight percent lived in the center city area, 8.1% in the suburbs and 17.1 in the rural areas.

TABLE 1. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEMS

| PROBLEM | SCORE |
|---|---|
| Crime and Violence | 2848 |
| State of the Economy | 2652 |
| Unemployment | 2026 |
| Drug Abuse | 1594 |
| Energy Shortage | 1340 |
| Governmental Conception | 1071 |
| Environmental Problems | 493 |
| Race Relations | 303 |

Scale Scores were controlled on a 5-3-1 basis: 5 points for most ~~important; 3, se~~cond most important; 1, third most important.

TABLE 2. DEFINITION OF ENVIRONMENT

ENVPROB

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PHYSICAL CHAR | 1. | 185 | 13.5 | 15.9 | 15.9 |
| INC NB CHAR | 2. | 83 | 6.1 | 7.1 | 23.0 |
| PRIMARILY SOCIAL | 3. | 118 | 8.6 | 12.1 | 33.1 |
| PHYSICAL AND | 4. | 755 | 55.1 | 64.8 | 97.9 |
| TIMES WE LIVE IN | 5. | 24 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 1 | 2.1 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| NO IDEA | 9. | 203 | 14.8 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 3.300

VALID CASES 1165 MISSING CASES 274

TABLE 3. PERCEPTION OF PRESENT ENVIRONMENT

ENVNOW

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| POOR | 1. | 38 | 2.8 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| | 2. | 10 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 4.1 |
| | 3. | 62 | 4.5 | 5.2 | 9.3 |
| | 4. | 90 | 6.6 | 7.6 | 16.9 |
| | 5. | 257 | 18.8 | 21.7 | 38.6 |
| | 6. | 173 | 12.6 | 14.6 | 53.3 |
| | 7. | 209 | 15.3 | 17.7 | 70.9 |
| | 8. | 228 | 16.7 | 19.3 | 90.2 |
| EXCELLENT | 9. | 116 | 8.5 | 9.8 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 186 | 13.6 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 6.135

VALID CASES 1183 MISSING CASES 186

TABLE 4. PERCEPTION OF PAST ENVIRONMENT

ENV5P

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (%) | ADJUSTED FREQ (%) | CUM FREQ (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| POOR | 1. | 25 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| | 2. | 31 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 5.5 |
| | 3. | 85 | 6.2 | 8.3 | 13.7 |
| | 4. | 94 | 6.9 | 9.2 | 22.9 |
| | 5. | 146 | 10.7 | 14.2 | 37.1 |
| | 6. | 120 | 8.8 | 11.7 | 48.8 |
| | 7. | 135 | 9.9 | 13.2 | 62.0 |
| | 8. | 215 | 15.7 | 21.0 | 82.9 |
| EXCELLENT | 9. | 175 | 12.8 | 17.1 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 343 | 25.1 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 6.246

VALID CASES 1026 MISSING CASES 343

TABLE 5. PERCEPTION OF FUTURE ENVIRONMENT

ENV5F

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| POOR | 1. | 94 | 6.9 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| | 2. | 76 | 5.6 | 7.3 | 16.3 |
| | 3. | 103 | 7.5 | 9.9 | 26.2 |
| | 4. | 81 | 5.9 | 7.8 | 34.0 |
| | 5. | 128 | 9.3 | 12.3 | 46.3 |
| | 6. | 97 | 7.1 | 9.3 | 55.6 |
| | 7. | 133 | 9.7 | 12.8 | 68.4 |
| | 8. | 195 | 14.2 | 18.7 | 87.1 |
| EXCELLENT | 9. | 134 | 9.8 | 12.9 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 328 | 24.0 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1359 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 5.570

VALID CASES 1041 MISSING CASES 328

TABLE 6. CONTRIBUTORS TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

MSTCONT

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (%) | ADJUSTED FREQ (%) | CUM FREQ (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0. | 92 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 |
| INDUSTRY | 1. | 145 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 17.3 |
| INDIVIDUALS | 2. | 443 | 32.4 | 32.4 | 49.7 |
| GOVT | 3. | 175 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 62.5 |
| TRAFFIC | 4. | 110 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 70.5 |
| NONE | 5. | 45 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 73.8 |
| DRUGS | 6. | 34 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 76.3 |
| CORRUPTION | 7. | 15 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 77.4 |
| TOO MANY ANIMALS | 8. | 8 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 77.9 |
| NO RESPONSE | 9. | 302 | 22.1 | 22.1 | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 3.880

VALID CASES 1369 MISSING CASES 0

TABLE 7. NATIONAL MEDIA USE

NTLMEDIA

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NEWSPAPERS | 1. | 284 | 20.7 | 21.6 | 21.6 |
| MAGAZINES | 2. | 58 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 26.0 |
| RADIO | 3. | 106 | 7.7 | 8.1 | 34.0 |
| TELEVISION | 4. | 714 | 52.2 | 54.3 | 88.3 |
| FRIENDS | 5. | 13 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 89.3 |
| OTHER | 6. | 10 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 90.0 |
| RADIO AND TV | 7. | 21 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 91.6 |
| NEWSPAPER & TV | 8. | 85 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 98.1 |
| NO RESPONSE | 9. | 25 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 53 | 3.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 3.610

VALID CASES 1316 MISSING CASES 53

TABLE 8. STATE MEDIA USE

SMEDIA

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NEWSPAPERS | 1. | 396 | 28.9 | 29.7 | 29.7 |
| MAGAZINES | 2. | 20 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 31.2 |
| RADIO | 3. | 121 | 8.8 | 9.1 | 40.3 |
| TELEVISION | 4. | 625 | 45.7 | 46.9 | 87.2 |
| FRIENDS | 5. | 15 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 88.3 |
| OTHER | 6. | 12 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 89.2 |
| RADIO AND TV | 7. | 25 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 91.1 |
| NEWSPAPER & TV | 8. | 89 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 97.7 |
| NO RESPONSE | 9. | 32 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 36 | 2.6 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 3.453

VALID CASES 1333 MISSING CASES 36

TABLE 9. LOCAL MEDIA USE

LMEDIA

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NEWSPAPERS | 1. | 398 | 29.1 | 29.9 | 29.9 |
| MAGAZINES | 2. | 8 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 30.5 |
| RADIO | 3. | 151 | 11.0 | 11.3 | 41.8 |
| TELEVISION | 4. | 583 | 42.6 | 43.8 | 85.6 |
| FRIENDS | 5. | 38 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 88.5 |
| OTHER | 6. | 10 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 89.3 |
| RADIO AND TV | 7. | 23 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 91.0 |
| NEWSPAPER & TV | 8. | 95 | 6.9 | 7.1 | 98.1 |
| NO RESPONSE | 9. | 25 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 38 | 2.8 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 3.452

VALID CASES 1331 MISSING CASES 38

TABLE 10. MEDIA ACCURACY

ACCINFO

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NEWSPAPERS | 1. | 278 | 20.3 | 20.3 | 20.3 |
| MAGAZINES | 2. | 97 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 27.4 |
| RADIO | 3. | 144 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 38.0 |
| TV | 4. | 582 | 42.5 | 42.6 | 80.5 |
| OTHER | 5. | 20 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 82.0 |
| NONE | 6. | 199 | 14.5 | 14.6 | 96.6 |
| NEWSPAPER&TV | 7. | 3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 96.8 |
| NO RESPONSE | 9. | 44 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 2 | 0.1 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 3.616

VALID CASES 1367 MISSING CASES 2

TABLE 11. READ STORY ON ENVIRONMENT

READS?

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| READ-TAKES PAPER | 1. | 545 | 39.8 | 39.9 | 39.9 |
| READ-DOESN'T TAKE | 2. | 115 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 48.3 |
| TAKES-DIDN'T READ | 3. | 447 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 81.0 |
| DNT-DID NOT READ | 4. | 239 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 98.5 |
| NO RESP | 9. | 21 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 2 | 0.1 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 2.386

VALID CASES 1367 MISSING CASES 2

TABLE 12. SAW TV REPORT ON ENVIRONMENT

TVSTO

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SAW STORY | 1. | 623 | 45.5 | 45.6 | 45.6 |
| DIDN'T SEE | 2. | 682 | 49.8 | 49.9 | 95.5 |
| | 3. | 36 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 98.1 |
| | 4. | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 98.2 |
| NO RESP | 9. | 25 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 2 | 0.1 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 1.700

VALID CASES 1367 MISSING CASES 2

TABLE 13. LIFE STYLES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

LIVECNT

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 922 | 67.3 | 67.6 | 67.6 |
| NO | 2. | 224 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 84.1 |
| BOTH | 3. | 87 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 90.5 |
| | 4. | 2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 90.6 |
| | 5. | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 90.7 |
| NO RESPONSE | 9. | 127 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 6 | 0.4 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 2.045

VALID CASES 1363 MISSING CASES 6

TABLE 14. KNOWLEDGE OF GOVERNMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES

KNGAGN

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES-IDENTIFY | 1. | 337 | 24.6 | 24.7 | 24.7 |
| YES-CAN'T ID | 2. | 382 | 27.9 | 28.0 | 52.6 |
| NO | 3. | 518 | 37.8 | 37.9 | 90.6 |
| NOT SURE | 4. | 113 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 98.8 |
| | 5. | 2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 99.0 |
| | 7. | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 99.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 9. | 13 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 3 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 2.373

VALID CASES 1366 MISSING CASES 3

TABLE 15. KNOWLEDGE OF CIVIC ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES

CIVIC

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES-ID | 1. | 431 | 31.5 | 31.6 | 31.6 |
| YES-CAN'T ID | 2. | 395 | 28.9 | 29.0 | 60.6 |
| NO | 3. | 411 | 30.0 | 30.1 | 90.7 |
| NOT SURE | 4. | 114 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 99.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 9. | 13 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 5 | 0.4 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 2.219

VALID CASES 1364 MISSING CASES 5

TABLE 16. MEMBERSHIP IN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP

MEMORG

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM. FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0. | 6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| YES | 1. | 136 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 10.4 |
| NO | 2. | 1216 | 88.8 | 88.8 | 99.2 |
| NO RESPONSE | 3. | 3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 99.4 |
| | 9. | 8 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 1.985

VALID CASES 1369 MISSING CASES 0

TABLE 17. CONTACTS WITH PUBLIC OFFICIALS

CONTOFF

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES-CALL OFF | 1. | 124 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 9.1 |
| YES-WROTE OFF | 2. | 76 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 14.6 |
| YES-VISIT OFF | 3. | 28 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 16.7 |
| YES -CALL NP | 4. | 7 | 0.5 | 2.5 | 17.2 |
| YES-WROTE NR | 5. | 10 | 0.7 | 2.7 | 17.9 |
| NO | 7. | 1101 | 80.4 | 82.5 | 98.5 |
| | 8. | 2 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 98.6 |
| NO RESPONSE | 9. | 19 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 2 | 0.1 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 6.095

VALID CASES 1367 MISSING CASES 2

TABLE 18. ATTENDANCE AT ENVIRONMENTAL MEETINGS

ATTMEET

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ ( % ) | ADJUSTED FREQ ( % ) | CUM FREQ ( % ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 180 | 13.1 | 13.2 | 13.2 |
| NO | 2. | 1174 | 85.8 | 85.9 | 99.1 |
| | 4. | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 99.2 |
| NO RESPONSE | 9. | 11 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| | 0. | 3 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 1369 | 100.0 | 100.2 | |

MEAN 1.926

VALID CASES 1366 MISSING CASES 3

## SECTION 4

## AREA RESPONSES TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

The San Antonio SMSA was selected as the geographical focus for the survey because it offered the opportunity to stratify our sample along rural, suburban and center city lines. It has been suggested in other studies that individuals residing in a deteriorating environment are more likely to be aware of environmental problems than those residing in a healthy environment. Or, more generally, that where one lives can directly affect one's perception of environmental problems. This section looks at the responses stratified according to area.

Does area affect the perception respondents have concerning the importance of public problems? Table 19 shows a significant relationship between the area in which respondents live and their ranking of public problems. Center city residents placed much emphasis on problems relating to the economy (26.7%) and crimes (16.0%). Twenty-three point seven percent of the suburban residents also cited the economy as the most important problem, but 21.6% were unsure and cited no problem as most important. Rural respondents were more concerned about the economy than their two counterparts (41.1% of the rural respondents named the economy) and 14.4% identified crime as the most important.

Thus, the state of the economy is the most important problem named by all three groups, but in different proportions. Center city and rural residents find crime to be a significant problem while suburban residents evidence more uncertainty than the other two areas.

None of the three groups identified "environmental problems" to a significant degree. Four point nine percent of the center city residents, 4.1% of the suburban residents and 4.0% of the rural residents mentioned the environment by name. If we combine environmental problems with energy and refuse, however, the significance is much higher. Twenty-one point three percent of the center city residents, 22.6% of the suburban residents and 20.8% of the rural respondents cite these three areas as most important.

There is a significant relationship between area and the definition of "environment." All three areas agreed that the environment should be defined in terms of both physical and social characteristics (see Table 20). Sixty point three percent of the center city respondents, 74% of the suburban respondents and 66.1% of the rural respondents viewed the environment in this dual manner. The data also indicate that center city and suburban residents are more likely than their rural counterparts to see the environment in primarily physical terms.

We also attempted to identify what trends, if any, the respondents anticipated in the area of environmental improvement. We asked them to establish, on a scale of one to nine, with higher numbers reflecting a better environment, what conditions they believed the environment to be in today, and what condition they anticipated five years hence. One through three would be below average, four through six, average, and seven through nine, above average.

There is a significant relationship between area and respondents' perception of present and future environmental conditions. Table 21 shows that suburban residents see present environmental conditions as better than either center city or rural respondents. Fifty-eight point three percent of the suburban respondents ranked the present environment as above average and 37.8% saw it as average. Only 3.9% labeled it below average. Center city residents believed present conditions were average or above average with 9.4% choosing below average. Rural residents, however, were not so pleased. Twelve and a half percent saw the present environment as below average and not quite one third rated it above average.

These relationships remained significant when we asked about environmental conditions five years hence (see Table 22). Over a third of the rural respondents believed the environment would be below average. Center city and suburban residents were less positive than they had been about present conditions. One fourth of the center city residents predicted the environment would be below average in five years. Suburban respondents remained the most optomistic, but three times as many respondents as before now believed the environment would be below average.

We asked the respondents to identify who or what they believed were contributing most to our environmental conditions. Table 23 demonstrates again a distinction based upon geographical stratification. All three areas viewed individuals as contributing most to our environmental problems with 36.0% of the suburban dwellers holding such a viewpoint followed by 34.2% of the rural respondents and 32.0% of those residing in the center city area. The three areas were rarely separated by more than a few percentage points regardless of which contributor they were naming. However 12.4% of the center city did cite industry as contrasted with 7.2% of the suburban residents. As one moved away from the core city, government became more of a contributor.

When asked if the way Americans live contributes to our environmental problems all three areas agreed that it did. However, there is no relationship between area and response. Sixty-four point one percent of the center city respondents agreed that America's life style was a significant factor in our environmental deterioration and 64% and 64.1% of the suburban and rural respondents respectively supported this proposition (see Table 24).

Turning to the key issue of costs, we asked the respondents to distribute the sum of $100 over a group of environmental problems. We placed respondent allocations into four categories: $0, $1-19, $20-49, and $50 plus.

Tables 25 through 29 relate our findings. We found relationships be-

tween response and area in all five problems examined. Suburban and rural residents are more willing than center city residents to allocate money to control auto exhaust. This is somewhat surprising as one might anticipate that the center city area would be most adversely affected by auto exhaust. Still, one-third of the center city respondents and rural respondents and 35.1% of the suburban respondents would spend $20 to $49 on auto exhaust control. About half of the center city respondents, however, would allocate no money to this area.

Suburban residents seemed slightly more concerned with water pollution than the two area counterparts. Forty-five percent would spend $20 to $49 and 18.9% would spend over $50. Center city residents were the least concerned with over one-third unwilling to contribute any money to this area.

Noise caused the least concern among all three groups. No more than 4.5% of any group was willing to contribute $50 or more and over half of the center city and suburban respondents were unwilling to allocate any money. Rural residents evidenced more interest in this area than either other group, but even then, 47.9% would not allocate any money to controlling noise.

Waste disposal was an important concern of the suburban and rural areas, but center city respondents were unwilling to spend $50 or more and 41% would spend $20 to $49. Suburban residents would allocate slightly more money, with 16.2% and 41.4% responding respectively. Over one-third of the center city residents would spend no money here.

The most popular problem was recreation. Twenty-six point nine percent of the rural residents, 26.3% of the center city residents and 18.9% of the suburban residents were willing to commit $50 or more to recreational areas. Over half of the suburban residents (51.4%) would contribute $20 to $49 as would 40.2% of the rural residents and 31.6% of the center city respondents. This was the only category in which no respondent area exceeded 40% in allocating $0 to the problem.

In the area of citizen recognition and citizen participation we found the following results. We asked respondents if they knew of any governmental agencies or organizations in the San Antonio area which was concerned with the protection of the environment. Fifty-six point seven percent of the suburban respondents were aware of such organizations (25.2% of urban could identify the organization(s)). Fifty-three point nine percent of the center city respondents made the same claim (24.8% could identify the organization(s)). However, less than half (47.4%) of the rural respondents indicated such awareness (see Table 30).

When we referred to their knowledge of citizen groups or civic clubs rather than governmental organizations, we did find a relationship between area and response. Table 31 indicates that 65.7% of the suburban respondents, 61.8% of the center city respondents and 60.2% of the rural respondents were aware of such organizations. Suburban residents were least likely to be unable to identify any such organization. The ability to identify specifically the organizations remained at one-third or less for all three

groups of respondents.

When asked which organizations they could identify, few respondents could recall the specific organization. Fifty-four center city, 12 suburban and 8 rural respondents could identify the EPA while 75 center city residents, 9 suburban and 28 rural respondents were able to name COPS.

Asked to identify non-government groups, respondents singled out the Sierra Club. Fifty-six center city, 18 suburban and 9 rural respondents identified the Sierra Club.

When questioned about actual membership in any of these organizations, the respondents reflected no significant relationship based upon where they lived. Table 32 shows that 13.5% of the suburban respondents belong to some environment-oriented organization, 9.9% of the center city residents and 7.7% of the rural respondents.

We examined the activism of our respondents by asking about their contacting public officials and their actual attendance at meetings concerning the environment. As might be expected from the responses to the questions concerning knowledge of and membership in environmental organizations, the level of activism among all these groups was quite low.

Table 33 shows that about 80% of the respondents in the center city, suburban and rural areas have never contacted a public official or a newspaper about environmental issues. Of the few who have made contact, telephoning or writing a public official appears to be the most common method of contact. No distinction along geographical lines is apparent. There is no significant relationship here between area and response.

TABLE 19. IMPORTANT PROBLEMS BY AREA

| AREA | COUNT / ROW / COL / TOTAL | IMPTPBS1 CRIME 1. | ECONOMY 2. | ENERGY CRISIS 3. | ENV PROBS 4. | GOVT 5. | CORRUPTION 6. | REFUSE 7. | NOT SURE 8. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0. | 16<br>11.9<br>9.1<br>1.4 | 35<br>25.9<br>10.3<br>3.0 | 13<br>9.6<br>17.8<br>1.1 | 7<br>5.2<br>12.5<br>0.6 | 11<br>8.1<br>19.6<br>0.9 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 12<br>8.9<br>9.4<br>1.0 | 33<br>24.4<br>16.9<br>2.8 | 8<br>5.9<br>6.1<br>0.7 | 135<br>11.4 |
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 120<br>16.0<br>68.2<br>10.2 | 200<br>26.7<br>58.7<br>16.9 | 39<br>5.2<br>53.4<br>3.3 | 37<br>4.9<br>66.1<br>3.1 | 29<br>3.9<br>51.8<br>2.5 | 22<br>2.9<br>81.5<br>1.9 | 84<br>11.2<br>66.1<br>7.1 | 122<br>16.0<br>61.5<br>10.2 | 97<br>13.0<br>74.0<br>8.2 | 748<br>63.3 |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 11<br>11.3<br>6.3<br>0.9 | 23<br>23.7<br>6.7<br>1.9 | 10<br>10.3<br>13.7<br>0.8 | 4<br>4.1<br>7.1<br>0.3 | 4<br>4.1<br>7.1<br>0.3 | 3<br>3.1<br>11.1<br>0.3 | 8<br>8.2<br>6.3<br>0.7 | 21<br>21.6<br>10.8<br>1.8 | 13<br>13.4<br>9.9<br>1.1 | 97<br>8.2 |
| RURAL | 4. | 29<br>14.4<br>16.5<br>2.5 | 83<br>41.1<br>24.3<br>7.0 | 11<br>5.4<br>15.1<br>0.9 | 8<br>4.0<br>14.3<br>0.7 | 12<br>5.9<br>21.4<br>1.0 | 2<br>1.0<br>7.4<br>0.2 | 23<br>11.4<br>18.1<br>1.9 | 21<br>10.4<br>10.8<br>1.8 | 13<br>6.4<br>9.9<br>1.1 | 202<br>17.1 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 176<br>14.9 | 341<br>28.8 | 73<br>6.2 | 56<br>4.7 | 56<br>4.7 | 27<br>2.3 | 127<br>10.7 | 195<br>16.5 | 131<br>11.1 | 1182<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 56.43948 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 187

TABLE 20. DEFINITION OF ENVIRONMENT BY AREA

| AREA | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | ENVPROB: PHYSICAL CHAR 1. | INC NR C HAR 2. | PRIMARIL Y SOCIAL 3. | PHYSICAL AND 4. | TIMES WE LIVE IN 5. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2. | 12 | [illegible] | 2 | 115 | 0 | 127 |
| | | 7.9 | [illegible] | 1.6 | 92.6 | 0.0 | 10.9 |
| | | 5.4 | [illegible] | 1.7 | 15.2 | 0.0 | |
| | | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 9.9 | 0.0 | |
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 135 | 58 | 74 | 424 | 12 | 703 |
| | | 19.2 | 8.3 | 10.5 | 60.3 | 1.7 | 60.3 |
| | | 73.0 | 69.9 | 62.7 | 56.2 | 50.0 | |
| | | 11.6 | 5.0 | 6.4 | 36.4 | 1.0 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 16 | 1 | 6 | 77 | 4 | 104 |
| | | 15.4 | 1.0 | 5.8 | 74.0 | 3.8 | 8.9 |
| | | 8.6 | 1.2 | 5.1 | 10.2 | 16.7 | |
| | | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.6 | 0.3 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 14 | 12 | 32 | 121 | 4 | 183 |
| | | 7.7 | 6.6 | 17.5 | 86.1 | 2.2 | 15.7 |
| | | 7.6 | 14.5 | 27.1 | 16.0 | 16.7 | |
| | | 1.2 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 10.4 | 0.3 | |
| | 6. | 10 | 10 | 4 | 18 | 4 | 48 |
| | | 21.7 | 21.7 | 8.7 | 39.1 | 8.7 | 3.9 |
| | | 5.4 | 12.0 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 16.7 | |
| | | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 0.3 | |
| | 7. | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| | | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| | | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 185 | 83 | 118 | 755 | 24 | 1165 |
| | | 15.9 | 7.1 | 10.1 | 64.8 | 2.1 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 131.50232 WITH 20 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 204

TABLE 21. PERCEPTION OF PRESENT ENVIRONMENT BY AREA

| AREA | ENVNOW (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) POOR 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | EXCELLENT 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. CENTER CITY | 21<br>2.9<br>55.3<br>2.0 | 7<br>1.0<br>70.0<br>0.7 | 40<br>5.5<br>74.1<br>3.7 | 57<br>7.9<br>67.9<br>5.3 | 146<br>20.1<br>62.4<br>13.6 | 108<br>14.9<br>65.9<br>10.1 | 128<br>17.6<br>67.0<br>11.9 | 144<br>19.8<br>72.7<br>13.4 | 75<br>10.3<br>74.3<br>7.0 | 726<br>67.6 |
| 3. SUBURBAN | 3<br>2.9<br>7.9<br>0.3 | -<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>1.0<br>1.9<br>0.1 | 2<br>1.9<br>2.4<br>0.2 | 20<br>19.4<br>8.5<br>1.9 | 17<br>16.5<br>10.4<br>1.6 | 17<br>16.5<br>8.9<br>1.6 | 28<br>27.2<br>14.1<br>2.6 | 15<br>14.6<br>14.9<br>1.4 | 103<br>9.6 |
| 4. RURAL | 13<br>6.3<br>34.2<br>1.2 | 3<br>1.4<br>30.0<br>0.3 | 10<br>4.8<br>18.5<br>0.9 | 23<br>11.1<br>27.4<br>2.1 | 58<br>28.0<br>24.8<br>5.4 | 32<br>15.5<br>19.5<br>3.0 | 37<br>17.9<br>19.4<br>3.4 | 23<br>11.1<br>11.6<br>2.1 | 8<br>3.9<br>7.9<br>0.7 | 207<br>19.3 |
| 6. | 1<br>2.6<br>2.6<br>0.1 | -<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 3<br>7.9<br>5.6<br>0.3 | 2<br>5.3<br>2.4<br>0.2 | 10<br>26.3<br>4.3<br>0.9 | 7<br>18.4<br>4.3<br>0.7 | 9<br>23.7<br>4.7<br>0.8 | 3<br>7.9<br>1.5<br>0.3 | 3<br>7.9<br>3.0<br>0.3 | 38<br>3.5 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 38<br>3.5 | 10<br>0.9 | 54<br>5.0 | 84<br>7.8 | 234<br>21.8 | 164<br>15.3 | 191<br>17.8 | 198<br>18.4 | 101<br>9.4 | 1074<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 49.76756 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0015

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 295

TABLE 22. PERCEPTION OF FUTURE ENVIRONMENT BY AREA

| AREA | ENVSF (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) POOR 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | EXCELLENT 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. CENTER CITY | 53 | 47 | 60 | 50 | 77 | 58 | 79 | 114 | 88 | 626 |
| | 8.5 | 7.5 | 9.6 | 8.0 | 12.3 | 9.3 | 12.6 | 18.2 | 14.1 | 67.2 |
| | 60.2 | 69.1 | 64.5 | 63.3 | 64.7 | 68.2 | 69.9 | 68.3 | 73.9 | |
| | 5.7 | 5.0 | 6.4 | 5.4 | 8.3 | 6.2 | 8.5 | 12.2 | 9.5 | |
| 3. SUBURBAN | 5 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 14 | 6 | 24 | 9 | 86 |
| | 5.8 | 2.3 | 4.7 | 8.1 | 17.4 | 16.3 | 7.0 | 27.9 | 10.5 | 9.2 |
| | 5.7 | 2.9 | 4.3 | 8.9 | 12.6 | 16.5 | 5.3 | 14.4 | 7.6 | |
| | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 2.6 | 1.0 | |
| 4. RURAL | 25 | 16 | 23 | 16 | 19 | 12 | 27 | 24 | 22 | 184 |
| | 13.6 | 8.7 | 12.5 | 8.7 | 10.3 | 6.5 | 14.7 | 13.0 | 12.0 | 19.8 |
| | 28.4 | 23.5 | 24.7 | 20.3 | 16.0 | 14.1 | 23.9 | 14.4 | 18.5 | |
| | 2.7 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.4 | |
| 6. | 5 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 35 |
| | 14.3 | 8.6 | 17.1 | 17.1 | 22.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 3.8 |
| | 5.7 | 4.4 | 6.5 | 7.6 | 6.7 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 0.0 | |
| | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 88 | 68 | 93 | 79 | 119 | 85 | 113 | 167 | 119 | 931 |
| | 9.5 | 7.3 | 10.0 | 8.5 | 12.8 | 9.1 | 12.1 | 17.9 | 12.8 | 100.0 |

CHI-SQUARE = 49.99868 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0014

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 438

## TABLE 23. CONTRIBUTORS TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS BY AREA

| AREA | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | INDUSTRY 1. | INDIVIDUALS 2. | GOVT 3. | TRAFFIC 4. | NONE 5. | DRUGS 6. | CORRUPTION 7. | TOO MANY ANIMALS 8. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2. | 19 | 11 | 42 | 14 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 142 |
| | | 13.4 | 7.7 | 28.2 | 9.9 | 8.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 26.8 | 10.4 |
| | | 20.7 | 7.6 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 10.9 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 12.6 | |
| | | 1.4 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.8 | |
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 48 | 103 | 266 | 99 | 74 | 23 | 22 | 9 | 5 | 183 | 832 |
| | | 5.8 | 12.4 | 32.0 | 11.9 | 8.9 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 22.0 | 60.8 |
| | | 52.2 | 71.0 | 60.0 | 56.6 | 67.3 | 51.1 | 64.7 | 60.0 | 62.5 | 60.6 | |
| | | 3.5 | 7.5 | 19.4 | 7.2 | 5.4 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 13.4 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 11 | 8 | 40 | 16 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 111 |
| | | 9.9 | 7.2 | 36.0 | 14.4 | 9.0 | 7.2 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 12.6 | 8.1 |
| | | 12.0 | 5.5 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 17.8 | 8.8 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 4.6 | |
| | | 0.6 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.0 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 10 | 22 | 80 | 48 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 53 | 234 |
| | | 4.3 | 9.4 | 34.2 | 17.1 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 22.6 | 17.1 |
| | | 10.9 | 15.2 | 18.1 | 22.9 | 8.2 | 15.6 | 26.5 | 6.7 | 37.5 | 17.5 | |
| | | 0.7 | 1.6 | 5.8 | 2.9 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 3.9 | |
| | 6. | 4 | 1 | 17 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 48 |
| | | 8.3 | 2.1 | 35.4 | 12.5 | 10.4 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 3.5 |
| | | 4.3 | 0.7 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 4.0 | |
| | | 0.3 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.9 | |
| | 7. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.1 |
| | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | |
| | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 92 | 145 | 443 | 175 | 110 | 45 | 34 | 15 | 8 | 302 | 1369 |
| | | 6.7 | 10.6 | 32.4 | 12.8 | 8.0 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 22.1 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 56.29199 WITH 45 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0141

TABLE 24. LIFE STYLES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS BY AREA

| AREA | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | YES 0. | NO 1. | BOTH 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2. | 2 | 99 | 24 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 142 |
| | | 1.4 | 69.7 | 16.9 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 10.4 |
| | | 0.2 | 10.7 | 12.7 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.9 | |
| | | 0.0 | 7.2 | 1.8 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | |
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 5 | 561 | 129 | 49 | 2 | 0 | 86 | 832 |
| | | 0.6 | 67.4 | 15.5 | 5.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 60.8 |
| | | 83.3 | 60.8 | 57.6 | 56.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 67.7 | |
| | | 0.4 | 41.0 | 9.4 | 3.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 6.3 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 0 | 71 | 15 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 111 |
| | | 0.0 | 64.0 | 13.5 | 16.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 8.1 |
| | | 0.0 | 7.7 | 6.7 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.5 | |
| | | 0.0 | 5.2 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 1 | 150 | 49 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 234 |
| | | 0.4 | 64.1 | 20.9 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 9.4 | 17.1 |
| | | 16.7 | 16.3 | 21.9 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 17.3 | |
| | | 0.1 | 11.0 | 3.6 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.6 | |
| | 6. | 0 | 30 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 40 |
| | | 0.0 | 81.3 | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 3.5 |
| | | 0.0 | 4.2 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | |
| | | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | |
| | 7. | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| | | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 6 | 922 | 224 | 87 | 2 | 1 | 127 | 1369 |
| | | 0.4 | 67.3 | 16.4 | 6.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 9.3 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 40.92984 WITH 30 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0050

TABLE 25. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO AUTO EXHAUST BY AREA

| AREA | AUTOEX (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) 0. | 1-19 1. | 20-49 2. | 50+ 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CENTER CITY 1. | 373<br>44.8<br>70.8<br>30.4 | 84<br>10.1<br>55.3<br>6.8 | 280<br>33.7<br>69.1<br>22.8 | 95<br>11.4<br>66.4<br>7.7 | 832<br>67.8 |
| SUBURBAN 3. | 42<br>37.8<br>8.0<br>3.4 | 18<br>16.2<br>11.8<br>1.5 | 39<br>35.1<br>9.6<br>3.2 | 12<br>10.8<br>8.4<br>1.0 | 111<br>9.0 |
| RURAL 4. | 88<br>37.6<br>16.7<br>7.2 | 41<br>17.5<br>27.0<br>3.3 | 78<br>33.3<br>19.3<br>6.4 | 27<br>11.5<br>18.9<br>2.2 | 234<br>19.1 |
| 6. | 22<br>45.8<br>4.2<br>1.8 | 9<br>18.8<br>5.9<br>0.7 | 8<br>16.7<br>2.0<br>0.7 | 9<br>18.8<br>6.3<br>0.7 | 48<br>3.9 |
| 7. | 2<br>100.0<br>0.4<br>0.2 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>0.2 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 527<br>43.0 | 152<br>12.4 | 405<br>33.0 | 143<br>11.7 | 1227<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 23.38509 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0246

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 142

TABLE 26. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO WATER POLLUTION BY AREA

| AREA | CNTH20 (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | 0. | 1-19 1. | 20-49 2. | 50+ 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 307 | 72 | 311 | 142 | 832 |
| | | 36.9 | 8.7 | 37.4 | 17.1 | 67.8 |
| | | 70.3 | 58.1 | 67.0 | 70.3 | |
| | | 25.0 | 5.9 | 25.3 | 11.6 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 33 | 7 | 50 | 21 | 111 |
| | | 29.7 | 6.3 | 45.0 | 18.9 | 9.0 |
| | | 7.6 | 5.6 | 10.8 | 10.4 | |
| | | 2.7 | 0.6 | 4.1 | 1.7 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 73 | 39 | 92 | 30 | 234 |
| | | 31.2 | 16.7 | 39.3 | 12.8 | 19.1 |
| | | 16.7 | 31.5 | 19.8 | 14.9 | |
| | | 5.9 | 3.2 | 7.5 | 2.4 | |
| | 6. | 24 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 48 |
| | | 50.0 | 12.5 | 22.9 | 14.6 | 3.9 |
| | | 5.5 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 3.5 | |
| | | 2.0 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 0.6 | |
| | 7. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.2 |
| | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | |
| | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 437 | 124 | 464 | 202 | 1227 |
| | | 35.6 | 10.1 | 37.8 | 16.5 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 36.35796 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0003

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 142

UL 56

TABLE 27. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO NOISE POLLUTION BY AREA

| AREA | RNOISE (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | 0. | 1-19 1. | 20-49 2. | 50+ 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 495 | 163 | 149 | 25 | 832 |
| | | 59.5 | 19.6 | 17.9 | 3.0 | 67.8 |
| | | 71.1 | 65.2 | 62.3 | 59.5 | |
| | | 40.3 | 13.3 | 12.1 | 2.0 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 61 | 25 | 20 | 5 | 111 |
| | | 55.0 | 22.5 | 18.0 | 4.5 | 9.0 |
| | | 8.8 | 10.0 | 8.4 | 11.9 | |
| | | 5.0 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 0.4 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 112 | 56 | 60 | 6 | 234 |
| | | 47.9 | 23.9 | 25.6 | 2.6 | 19.1 |
| | | 16.1 | 22.4 | 25.1 | 14.3 | |
| | | 9.1 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 0.5 | |
| | 6. | 26 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 48 |
| | | 54.2 | 12.5 | 20.8 | 12.5 | 3.9 |
| | | 3.7 | 2.4 | 4.2 | 14.3 | |
| | | 2.1 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.5 | |
| | 7. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| | | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| | | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 696 | 250 | 239 | 42 | 1227 |
| | | 56.7 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 3.4 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 28.06756 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0054

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 142

TABLE 28. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO TRASH POLLUTION BY AREA

| AREA | TSH: 0 | 1-19 | 20-49 | 50+ | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0. | 1. | 2. | 3. | |
| 1. CENTER CITY | 322<br>38.7<br>72.2<br>26.2 | 108<br>13.0<br>66.3<br>8.8 | 285<br>34.3<br>64.8<br>23.2 | 117<br>14.1<br>65.7<br>9.5 | 832<br>67.8 |
| 3. SUBURBAN | 32<br>28.8<br>7.2<br>[illegible] | 15<br>13.5<br>9.2<br>1.2 | 46<br>41.4<br>10.5<br>3.7 | 18<br>16.2<br>10.1<br>1.5 | 111<br>9.0 |
| 4. RURAL | 64<br>27.4<br>14.3<br>5.2 | 37<br>15.8<br>22.7<br>3.0 | 96<br>41.0<br>21.8<br>7.8 | 37<br>15.8<br>20.8<br>3.0 | 234<br>19.1 |
| 6. | 26<br>54.2<br>5.8<br>2.1 | 3<br>6.3<br>1.8<br>0.2 | 13<br>27.1<br>3.0<br>1.1 | 6<br>12.5<br>3.4<br>0.5 | 48<br>3.9 |
| 7. | 2<br>100.0<br>0.4<br>0.2 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>0.2 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 446<br>36.3 | 163<br>13.3 | 440<br>35.9 | 178<br>14.5 | 1227<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 23.[illegible]618 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0206

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 142

TABLE 29. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO RECREATION BY AREA

| AREA | INEWREC<br>COUNT<br>ROW %<br>COL %<br>TOTAL % | 0 | 1-19 | 20-49 | 50+ | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 0. | 1. | 2. | 3. | |
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 248<br>29.8<br>74.0<br>20.2 | 102<br>12.3<br>72.3<br>8.3 | 263<br>31.6<br>61.3<br>21.4 | 219<br>26.3<br>68.0<br>17.8 | 832<br>67.8 |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 24<br>21.6<br>7.2<br>2.0 | 9<br>8.1<br>6.4<br>0.7 | 57<br>51.4<br>13.3<br>4.6 | 21<br>18.9<br>6.5<br>1.7 | 111<br>9.[illegible] |
| RURAL | 4. | 49<br>20.9<br>14.6<br>4.0 | 28<br>12.0<br>19.9<br>2.[illegible] | 94<br>40.2<br>21.9<br>7.7 | 63<br>26.9<br>19.6<br>5.1 | 234<br>19.1 |
| | 6. | 12<br>25.0<br>3.6<br>1.0 | 2<br>4.2<br>1.4<br>0.2 | 15<br>31.3<br>3.5<br>1.2 | 19<br>39.6<br>5.9<br>1.5 | 48<br>3.9 |
| | 7. | 2<br>100.0<br>0.6<br>0.2 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>0.2 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 335<br>27.3 | 141<br>11.5 | 429<br>35.0 | 322<br>26.2 | 1227<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 34.70516 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0005

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 142

TABLE 30. KNOWLEDGE OF GOVERNMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES BY AREA

| KNGAGN | AREA (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | 1. CENTER CITY | 3. SUBURBAN | 4. RURAL | 6. | 7. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES-IDENTIFY | 1. | 206 | 28 | 49 | 13 | [illegible] | 296 |
| | | 69.6 | 9.5 | 16.6 | 4.4 | [illegible] | 24.2 |
| | | 24.8 | 25.2 | 20.9 | 27.1 | [illegible] | |
| | | 16.8 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 1.1 | [illegible] | |
| YES-CAN'T ID | 2. | 241 | 35 | 62 | 15 | [illegible] | 353 |
| | | 68.3 | 9.9 | 17.6 | 4.2 | [illegible] | 28.8 |
| | | 29.1 | 31.5 | 26.5 | 31.3 | [illegible] | |
| | | 19.7 | 2.9 | 5.1 | 1.2 | [illegible] | |
| NO | 3. | 317 | 34 | 97 | 20 | 2 | 470 |
| | | 67.4 | 7.2 | 20.6 | 4.3 | 0.4 | 38.4 |
| | | 38.2 | 30.6 | 41.5 | 41.7 | 100.0 | |
| | | 25.9 | 2.8 | 7.9 | 1.6 | [illegible] | |
| NOT SURE | 4. | 56 | 13 | 23 | 0 | [illegible] | 92 |
| | | 60.9 | 14.1 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.5 |
| | | 6.8 | 11.7 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 4.6 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | 7. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1 |
| | | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | [illegible] | 0.1 |
| | | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | [illegible] | |
| | | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | [illegible] | |
| NO RESPONSE | 9. | 8 | 1 | 3 | 0 | [illegible] | 12 |
| | | 66.7 | 8.3 | 25.0 | 0.0 | [illegible] | 1.0 |
| | | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 0.0 | [illegible] | |
| | | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | [illegible] | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 829 | 111 | 234 | 48 | [illegible] | 1224 |
| | | 67.7 | 9.1 | 19.1 | 3.9 | [illegible] | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 17.55681 WITH 20 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.6159

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 145

TABLE 31. KNOWLEDGE OF CIVIC ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES BY AREA

| AREA | CIVIC (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | YES-ID 1. | YES, CAN'T ID 2. | NO 3. | NOT SURE 4. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0. | 44 | 29 | 59 | 7 | 1 | 140 |
| | | 31.4 | 20.7 | 42.1 | 5.0 | 0.7 | 10.7 |
| | | 10.5 | 7.6 | 15.2 | 6.2 | 8.3 | |
| | | 3.3 | 2.2 | 4.5 | 0.5 | 0.1 | |
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 281 | 233 | 237 | 73 | 5 | 829 |
| | | 33.9 | 28.1 | 28.6 | 8.8 | 0.6 | 63.1 |
| | | 67.2 | 60.8 | 61.1 | 64.6 | 41.7 | |
| | | 21.4 | 17.7 | 18.0 | 5.6 | 0.4 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 30 | 43 | 24 | 14 | 0 | 111 |
| | | 27.0 | 38.7 | 21.6 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 8.4 |
| | | 7.2 | 11.2 | 6.2 | 12.4 | 0.0 | |
| | | 2.3 | 3.3 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 0.0 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 63 | 78 | 68 | 19 | 6 | 234 |
| | | 26.9 | 33.3 | 29.1 | 8.1 | 2.6 | 17.8 |
| | | 15.1 | 20.4 | 17.5 | 16.8 | 50.0 | |
| | | 4.8 | 5.9 | 5.2 | 1.4 | 0.5 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 418 | 383 | 388 | 113 | 12 | 1314 |
| | | 31.8 | 29.1 | 29.5 | 8.6 | 0.9 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 35.71190 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 55

TABLE 32. MEMBERSHIP IN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP BY AREA

| AREA | MEMORG COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | YES 1. | NO 2. | NO RESPONSE 3. | 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0. | 15 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 140 |
| | | 10.7 | 89.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.7 |
| | | 11.5 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 1.1 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | 2. | 82 | 736 | 3 | 7 | 828 |
| CENTER CITY | | 9.9 | 88.9 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 63.1 |
| | | 63.1 | 62.8 | 100.0 | 87.5 | |
| | | 6.2 | 56.1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | |
| | 3. | 15 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| SUBURBAN | | 13.5 | 86.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.5 |
| | | 11.5 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 1.1 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | 4. | 18 | 215 | 0 | 1 | 234 |
| RURAL | | 7.7 | 91.9 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 17.8 |
| | | 13.8 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 12.5 | |
| | | 1.4 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 130 | 1172 | 3 | 8 | 1313 |
| | | 9.9 | 89.3 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 100.0 |

CHI-SQUARE = 7.16933 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.6195

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 56

TABLE 33. CONTACTS WITH PUBLIC OFFICIALS BY AREA

| AREA | CONTOFF COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | 1. YES-CALL OFF | 2. YES-WROT OFF | 3. YES-VISIT OFF | 4. YES -CALL NP | 5. YES-WROT NP | 7. NO | 8. | 9. NO RESPONSE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 81 | 48 | 17 | 5 | 6 | 660 | 2 | 11 | 830 |
| | | 9.8 | 5.8 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 79.5 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 67.8 |
| | | 71.7 | 64.9 | 77.3 | 83.3 | 60.0 | 67.0 | 100.0 | 84.6 | |
| | | 6.6 | 3.9 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 53.9 | 0.2 | 0.9 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| | | 10.8 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 80.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
| | | 10.6 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 17 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 190 | 0 | 2 | 234 |
| | | 7.3 | 7.7 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 81.2 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 19.1 |
| | | 15.0 | 24.3 | 18.2 | 16.7 | 20.0 | 19.3 | 0.0 | 15.4 | |
| | | 1.4 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | |
| | 6. | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| | | 6.3 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 91.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 |
| | | 2.7 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | 7. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 113 | 74 | 22 | 6 | 10 | 995 | 2 | 13 | 1225 |
| | | 9.2 | 6.0 | 1.8 | 3.5 | 0.8 | 80.4 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.04867 WITH 28 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.9651

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 144

## SECTION

## ETHNICITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Most existing knowledge concerning American attitudes toward the environment is based on surveys done of Anglo-Americans. One of the more interesting facets of our study was the bi-ethnic nature of the inquiry. We used both a Spanish and English survey instrument with approximately 18% of the sample interviews conducted in Spanish.

The section examines the responses to the survey stratified in terms of ethnicity.

When the respondents were asked to rank the public problems they considered most important, economic problems and crime/violence were ranked as the most important. Anglos identified the state of the economy as most important while Mexican-Americans rated crime and violence as most important (see Table 34). Concern for the environment and energy shortages were ranked low, seventh and fifth respectively for Anglos and Mexican-Americans. With the exception of the slight reversal at the top from the two ethnic samples, the rankings were very consistent as was the relative saliency of the issue areas. For example, the number one rated problem scale score for Anglos is approximately 42% of the total possible score, while the scale scores for the Mexican-American number one rated problem is approximately 44%. Here there is virtually no difference in environmental concerns between the Anglo and Mexican-American samples.

It is also important to know if different ethnic groups perceive the environment in different ways. We asked each respondent to tell us in their own words what the word "environment" meant. There was no significant ethnic difference in the way most respondents perceived the environment (see Table 35). Sixty-five and a half percent of the Anglos defined the environment in both physical and social terms while 63.3% of the Mexican-Americans did so. The only other significant bloc occured when almost one fourth of the Mexican-Americans had no definition (this conceiveably may have resulted from a language problem; there is not an exact Spanish translation for the term "environment").

We were interested also in the perception that the respondents had concerning the future of the environment. We asked our sample to rate the current conditions of the environment on an ascending scale of 1 to 9. Then we asked them to think about the environment five years from now and rate what they thought it would be on the same scale. One to three would be below average, four through six average, and seven through nine, above average.

Our data indicates a significant relationship between the perception

that respondents have of present and future environmental conditions and ethnicity. Table 36 shows that about twice as many Mexican-Americans as Anglos believe the present environment is in below average condition. At the other end of the scale, 57.7% of the Anglos believe environmental conditions are above average, while less than a third of the Mexican-Americans perceive the environment in such positive terms.

When we look at the perception respondents have of future environmental conditions, again there is a significant relationship based on ethnicity. The number of Mexican-Americans who see the future environment as below average have almost tripled as has the number of Anglos (see Table 37). Anglos continue to be more optimistic than Mexican-Americans (48.7% see future conditions as above average while 36.3% of the Mexican-American respondents agree), but the percentage has decreased from the perceptions of present environmental conditions.

Generally, then, Mexican-Americans perceive the environment to be in worse shape than Anglos, both now and five years hence.

Anglos and Mexican-Americans differed also when identifying the major contributors to the area's environmental problems. By far, the largest contributor singled out was the category for "individuals." Thirty-five point two percent of the Mexican-Americans and 34.4% of the Anglos identified individuals as the major source of environmental trouble (see Table 38). Government and industry were seen as the next worse offenders with 11.1% and 18.1% of the Anglo and Mexican-American respondents respectively identifying government and 12.9% and 8.7% identifying industry. Anglos also viewed traffic as a more serious contributor than Mexican-Americans.

One of the most important questions asked by the survey concerns the amount of money respondents are willing to spend on specific areas of environmental improvement. We gave each respondent a hypothetical $100 and asked how they would divide the money between five general environmental areas; auto exhaust pollution, water pollution, noise, waste disposal and recreational facilities. We placed respondent allocations into four categories: $0, $1-19, $20-49, and $50 plus.

Tables 39 through 43 include our findings in this area. We find no significant relationship between allocation of money and ethnicity in the problem areas of auto exhaust (39), noise (41), and trash (42). We do find a significant relationship when we look at water pollution (40) and development of recreational areas (43). Almost 20% of the Anglo respondents would be willing to allocate $50 or more to the problem of water pollution while 13.6% of the Mexican-Americans would do likewise. Over one-third of each group would spend nothing. Recreation appears to invite more participation than any other area. Only 23.2% of the Mexican-American respondents and 31.2% of the Anglo respondents (the lowest figures for any of the five problem areas) would contribute nothing to this issue. Mexican-American respondents are willing to allocate larger portions of their $100 than Anglos, but here, too, Anglos are willing to contribute more than to the other areas. Both groups seemed least concerned with the issue of noise.

We asked the respondents if they believed American's life style was contributing to our environmental problems. We found a significant, though slight, difference based on ethnicity. Table 44 shows that 69.6% of the

Anglo respondents said yes and 64.2% of the Mexican-American respondents said yes. This seems to support the data displayed in Table 38 (see above, p. 49) where individuals, rather than institutions, were singled out as contributing to much of our environmental difficulties.

In the general area of citizen knowledge and activism concerning the environment we again found significant relationships based on ethnicity. We tried first to ascertain the state of familiarity the respondents had with the various public and private organizations that address environmental concerns.

We asked if they knew of government organizations relating to the environment. Table 45 indicates that 39.2% of the Anglos responding did know of environment-oriented organizations as contrasted with 40% of the Mexican-American respondents. The number of respondents, however, who actually could identify the organizations was very low. Eighty-six Anglos identified the EPA while only four Mexican-Americans cited the agency. A local public service organization, COPS (Community Organized for Public Service, a group organized around Alinsky principles) had the widest recognition with 88 Anglos and 43 Mexican-Americans naming them.

When we asked about knowledge of local civic organizations with environmental concerns, the differences based on ethnicity were not as marked as with the knowledge of government organizations. Table 46 shows that 63.8% of the Anglo respondents and 54.7% of the Mexican American respondents were aware of such organizations. Again, the number of respondents who could identify specifically the organization was very small. Thirty-eight Anglos identified both COPS and the San Antonio Conservation Society; twenty-eight Mexican-Americans cited COPS.

We asked if respondents were members of these organizations. Only 11.7% of the Anglo respondents and 6.9% of the Mexican-American respondents held membership in an organization with environmental concerns (see Table 47). In other words about twice as many Anglos as Mexican-Americans belong to an organization which addresses environmental problems, but an overwhelming number of each group belongs to no such organization. Of these respondents who did belong to organizations, 14 Anglos were members of the SA Conservation Society and 10 Mexican-Americans were members of COPS.

Membership is, of course, only one measure of citizen activism. One of the most common ways people get involved in government is by contacting public officials or the media to offer viewpoints concerning public problems. Table 48 indicates that there is a significant relationship between ethnicity and respondents who contact public officials and the media. Eighty-five point seven percent of the Mexican-American respondents had made no such contact as contrasted with 77.6% of the Anglo respondents. Of those respondents that had made some contact, 9.8% of the Anglos and 7.7% of the Mexican-Americans did so by phoning a public official. Six point six percent of the Anglos had written public officials, but only 3.7% of the Mexican-Americans had done so.

Finally, we asked respondents if they had ever attended a meeting or rally which focused on environmental problems. There was no significant relationship between attendance and ethnicity. Eighty-seven point two percent of the Anglo respondents and 83.7% of the Mexican-American respondents had never attended any meeting with an environmental orientation.

TABLE 34. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEMS BY ETHNIC GROUP

| PROBLEM | ETHNIC GROUP (Rank) Anglo (N=548) | Mexican-American (N=385) |
|---|---|---|
| State of the Economy | 1156 (1) | 581 (3) |
| Crime and Violence | 1088 (2) | 864 (1) |
| Unemployment | 734 (3) | 696 (2) |
| Drug Abuses | 502 (4) | 481 (4) |
| Energy Shortages | 500 (5) | 372 (5) |
| Governmental Corruption | 476 (6) | 263 (6) |
| Environmental Problems | 216 (7) | 104 (7) |
| Racial Relations | 148 (8) | 75 (8) |

Scale Scores were controlled on a 5-3-1 basis: 5 points for most important; 3, second most important; 1, third most important.

TABLE 35. DEFINITION OF ENVIRONMENT BY ETHNICITY

| DEFINITION | ETHNICITY Anglo | Mexican-American |
|---|---|---|
| Physical Characteristics | 73 (16.6) | 39 (7.9) |
| Neighborhood Characteristics | 25 (5.7) | 33 (6.7) |
| Social Characteristics | 31 (7.1) | 56 (11.4) |
| Physical & Social Characteristics | 262 (59.7) | 231 (47.0) |
| Times We Live In | 9 (2.1) | 6 (1.2) |
| No Idea | 39 (8.9) | 125 (25.5) |
| TOTAL | 439 | 490 |

TABLE 36. PERCEPTION OF PRESENT ENVIRONMENT BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | ENVNOW<br>COUNT<br>ROW %<br>COL %<br>TOTAL % | 1. POOR | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | 9. EXCELLENT | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 8<br>1.1<br>21.1<br>0.7 | 2<br>0.3<br>20.0<br>0.2 | 42<br>5.6<br>67.7<br>3.6 | 60<br>8.0<br>66.7<br>5.1 | 140<br>18.6<br>54.5<br>11.8 | 112<br>14.9<br>64.7<br>9.5 | 142<br>18.8<br>67.9<br>12.0 | 164<br>21.8<br>71.9<br>13.9 | 84<br>11.1<br>72.4<br>7.1 | 754<br>63.7 |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 30<br>7.0<br>78.9<br>2.5 | [illegible]<br>1.9<br>80.0<br>0.7 | 20<br>4.7<br>32.3<br>1.7 | 30<br>7.0<br>33.3<br>2.5 | 117<br>27.3<br>45.5<br>9.9 | 61<br>14.2<br>35.3<br>5.2 | 67<br>15.6<br>32.1<br>5.7 | 64<br>14.9<br>28.1<br>5.4 | 32<br>7.5<br>27.6<br>2.7 | 429<br>36.3 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 38<br>3.2 | 1[illegible]<br>0.8 | 62<br>5.2 | 90<br>7.6 | 257<br>21.7 | 173<br>14.6 | 209<br>17.7 | 228<br>19.3 | 116<br>9.8 | 1183<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 60.60889 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 186

TABLE 37. PERCEPTION OF FUTURE ENVIRONMENT BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | ENV5F (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) POOR 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | EXCELLENT 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. ANGLO | 38 | 39 | 62 | 56 | 80 | 74 | 94 | 146 | 90 | 678 |
| | 5.6 | 5.6 | 9.1 | 8.3 | 11.8 | 10.9 | 13.9 | 21.5 | 13.3 | 65.1 |
| | 40.4 | 50.0 | 60.2 | 69.1 | 62.5 | 76.3 | 70.7 | 74.9 | 67.2 | |
| | 3.7 | 3.7 | 6.0 | 5.4 | 7.7 | 7.1 | [illegible].0 | 14.0 | 8.6 | |
| 2. MEX-AMERICAN | 56 | 39 | 41 | 25 | 48 | 23 | 39 | 49 | 44 | 364 |
| | 15.4 | 10.5 | 11.3 | 6.9 | 13.2 | 6.3 | 10.7 | 13.5 | 12.1 | 34.9 |
| | 59.6 | 50.0 | 39.8 | 30.9 | 37.5 | 23.7 | [illegible] | 25.1 | 32.8 | |
| | 5.4 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 2.4 | 4.6 | 2.2 | [illegible]7 | 4.7 | 4.2 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 94 | 75 | 103 | 81 | 128 | 97 | 133 | 195 | 134 | 1041 |
| | 9.0 | 7.3 | 9.9 | 7.8 | 12.3 | 9.3 | 12.8 | 18.7 | 12.9 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 50.50067 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 328

TABLE 38. CONTRIBUTORS TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS BY ETHNICITY

MSTCONT

| ETHNIC | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | INDUSTRY 1. | INDIVIDUALS 2. | GOVT 3. | TRAFFIC 4. | NONE 5. | DRUGS 6. | CORRUPTION 7. | TOO MANY ANIMALS 8. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 104 | 278 | 90 | 92 | 34 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 178 | 808 |
| | | 12.9 | 34.4 | 11.1 | 11.4 | 4.2 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 22.0 | 63.3 |
| | | 71.7 | 62.8 | 51.4 | 83.6 | 75.6 | 52.9 | 53.3 | 75.0 | 58.9 | |
| | | 8.1 | 21.8 | 7.0 | 7.2 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 13.9 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 41 | 165 | 85 | 18 | 11 | 16 | 7 | 2 | 124 | 469 |
| | | 8.7 | 35.2 | 18.1 | 3.8 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 26.4 | 36.7 |
| | | 28.3 | 37.2 | 48.6 | 16.4 | 24.4 | 47.1 | 46.7 | 25.0 | 41.1 | |
| | | 3.2 | 12.9 | 6.7 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 9.7 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 145 | 443 | 175 | 110 | 45 | 34 | 15 | 8 | 302 | 1277 |
| | | 11.4 | 34.7 | 13.7 | 8.6 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 23.6 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 42.73521 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 92

TABLE 39. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO AUTO EXHAUST BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | AUTOEX (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | 0 | 1-19 | 20-49 | 50+ | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 0 | 1. | 2. | 3. | |
| ANGLO | 1. | 388 | 96 | 274 | 120 | 878 |
| | | 44.2 | 10.9 | 31.2 | 13.7 | 64.1 |
| | | 64.5 | 58.9 | 63.3 | 70.2 | |
| | | 28.3 | 7.0 | 20.0 | 8.8 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 214 | 67 | 159 | 51 | 491 |
| | | 43.6 | 13.6 | 32.4 | 10.4 | 35.9 |
| | | 35.5 | 41.1 | 36.7 | 29.8 | |
| | | 15.6 | 4.9 | 11.6 | 3.7 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 602 | 163 | 433 | 171 | 1369 |
| | | 44.0 | 11.9 | 31.6 | 12.5 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 4.82172 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1853

TABLE 40. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO WATER POLLUTION BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | CNTH2O (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | 0 | 1-19 | 20-49 | 50+ | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 310 | 72 | 324 | 172 | 878 |
| | | 35.3 | 8.2 | 36.9 | 19.6 | 64.1 |
| | | 62.8 | 55.8 | 63.9 | 72.0 | |
| | | 22.6 | 5.3 | 23.7 | 12.6 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 184 | 57 | 183 | 67 | 491 |
| | | 37.5 | 11.6 | 37.3 | 13.6 | 35.9 |
| | | 37.2 | 44.2 | 36.1 | 28.0 | |
| | | 13.4 | 4.2 | 13.4 | 4.9 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 494 | 129 | 507 | 239 | 1369 |
| | | 36.1 | 9.4 | 37.0 | 17.5 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 10.67754 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0136

TABLE 41. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO NOISE POLLUTION BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | RNOISE COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | 0 | 1-19 | 20-49 | 50+ | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 0. | 1. | 2. | 3. | |
| ANGLO | 1. | 540 | 168 | 144 | 26 | 878 |
| | | 61.5 | 19.1 | 16.4 | 3.0 | 64.1 |
| | | 66.9 | 61.8 | 58.1 | 61.9 | |
| | | 39.4 | 12.3 | 10.5 | 1.9 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 267 | 104 | 104 | 16 | 491 |
| | | 54.4 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 3.3 | 35.9 |
| | | 33.1 | 38.2 | 41.9 | 38.1 | |
| | | 19.5 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 1.2 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 807 | 272 | 248 | 42 | 1369 |
| | | 58.9 | 19.9 | 18.1 | 3.1 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 7.43870 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0592

TABLE 42. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO TRASH POLLUTION BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | TSH COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | 0. | 1-19 1. | 20-49 2. | 50+ 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 350 | 106 | 302 | 120 | 878 |
| | | 39.9 | 12.1 | 34.4 | 13.7 | 64.1 |
| | | 68.1 | 60.6 | 62.4 | 61.2 | |
| | | 25.6 | 7.7 | 22.1 | 8.8 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 164 | 69 | 182 | 76 | 491 |
| | | 33.4 | 14.1 | 37.1 | 15.5 | 35.9 |
| | | 31.9 | 39.4 | 37.6 | 38.8 | |
| | | 12.0 | 5.0 | 13.3 | 5.6 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 514 | 175 | 484 | 196 | 1369 |
| | | 37.5 | 12.8 | 35.4 | 14.3 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 5.82507 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1204

TABLE 43. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO RECREATION BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | INEWREC (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | 0. | 1-19 1. | 20-49 2. | 50+ 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 274 | 98 | 286 | 220 | 878 |
| | | 31.2 | 11.2 | 32.6 | 25.1 | 64.1 |
| | | 70.6 | 64.5 | 61.8 | 60.1 | |
| | | 20.0 | 7.2 | 20.9 | 16.1 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 114 | 54 | 177 | 146 | 491 |
| | | 23.2 | 11.0 | 36.0 | 29.7 | 35.9 |
| | | 29.4 | 35.5 | 38.2 | 39.9 | |
| | | 8.3 | 3.9 | 12.9 | 10.7 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 388 | 152 | 463 | 366 | 1369 |
| | | 28.3 | 11.1 | 33.8 | 26.7 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 10.80179 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0129

TABLE 44. LIFE STYLES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | LIVECNT COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | YES 1. | NO 2. | BOTH 3. | 4. | 5 | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 608 | 128 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 874 |
| | | 69.6 | 14.6 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 64.1 |
| | | 65.9 | 57.1 | 75.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.7 | |
| | | 44.6 | 9.4 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 314 | 96 | 21 | 2 | 1 | 55 | 489 |
| | | 64.2 | 19.6 | 4.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 11.2 | 35.9 |
| | | 34.1 | 42.9 | 24.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 43.3 | |
| | | 23.0 | 7.0 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 4.0 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 922 | 224 | 87 | 2 | 1 | 127 | 1363 |
| | | 67.6 | 16.4 | 6.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 9.3 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 19.69344 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0014

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =

TABLE 45. KNOWLEDGE OF GOVERNMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES BY ETHNICITY

| KNGAGN | ETHNIC: ANGLO (1.) | MEXAMERICAN (2.) | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. YES-IDENTIFY | 258<br>76.6<br>29.5<br>18.9 | 79<br>23.4<br>16.1<br>5.8 | 337<br>24.7 |
| 2. YES-CAN'T ID | 260<br>68.1<br>29.7<br>19.0 | 122<br>31.9<br>24.9<br>8.9 | 382<br>28.0 |
| 3. NO | 282<br>54.4<br>32.2<br>20.6 | 236<br>45.6<br>48.2<br>17.3 | 518<br>37.9 |
| 4. NOT SURE | 70<br>61.9<br>8.0<br>5.1 | 43<br>38.1<br>8.8<br>3.1 | 113<br>8.3 |
| 5. | 2<br>100.0<br>0.2<br>0.1 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>0.1 |
| 7. | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>100.0<br>0.2<br>0.1 | 1<br>0.1 |
| 9. NO RESPONSE | 4<br>30.8<br>0.5<br>0.3 | 9<br>69.2<br>1.8<br>0.7 | 13<br>1.0 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 876<br>64.1 | 490<br>35.9 | 1366<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 55.76831 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 46. KNOWLEDGE OF CIVIC ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | CIVIC: YES-ID 1. | YES-CAN'T ID 2. | NO 3. | NOT SURE 4. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 312 | 246 | 240 | 72 | 4 | 874 |
| | | 35.7 | 28.1 | 27.5 | 8.2 | 0.5 | 64.1 |
| | | 72.4 | 62.3 | 58.4 | 63.2 | 30.8 | |
| | | 22.9 | 18.0 | 17.6 | 5.3 | 0.3 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 119 | 149 | 171 | 42 | 9 | 490 |
| | | 24.3 | 30.4 | 34.9 | 8.6 | 1.8 | 35.9 |
| | | 27.6 | 37.7 | 41.6 | 36.8 | 69.2 | |
| | | 8.7 | 10.8 | 12.5 | 3.1 | 0.7 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 431 | 395 | 411 | 114 | 13 | 1364 |
| | | 31.6 | 29.0 | 30.1 | 8.4 | 1.0 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 25.56741 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

TABLE 47. MEMBERSHIP IN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | MEMORG COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | YES 1. | NO 2. | NO RESPONSE 3. | 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 102 | 764 | 0 | 6 | 872 |
| | | 11.7 | 87.6 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 64.[illegible] |
| | | 75.0 | 62.8 | 0.0 | 75.0 | |
| | | 7.5 | 56.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 34 | 452 | 3 | 2 | 49[illegible] |
| | | 6.9 | 92.1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 36.[illegible] |
| | | 25.0 | 37.2 | 100.0 | 25.0 | |
| | | 2.5 | 33.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 136 | 1216 | 3 | 8 | 136[illegible] |
| | | 10.0 | 89.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 100.[illegible] |

CHI SQUARE = 13.61540 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0035

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 48. CONTACTS WITH PUBLIC OFFICIALS BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | CONTOFF COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | 1. YES-CALL OFF | 2. YES-WROT E OFF | 3. YES-VISIT OFF | 4. YES-CAL L NP | 5. YES-WROT E NP | 7. NO | 8. | 9. NO RESPONSE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 86 | 58 | 22 | 2 | 14 | 680 | 2 | 16 | 876 |
| | | 9.8 | 6.6 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 77.6 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 64.1 |
| | | 69.4 | 76.3 | 78.6 | 28.6 | 100.0 | 61.8 | 100.0 | 84.2 | |
| | | 6.3 | 4.2 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 49.7 | 0.1 | 1.2 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 38 | 18 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 421 | 0 | 3 | 491 |
| | | 7.7 | 3.7 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 35.9 |
| | | 30.6 | 23.7 | 21.4 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 38.2 | 0.0 | 15.8 | |
| | | 2.8 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 30.8 | 0.0 | 0.2 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 124 | 76 | 28 | 7 | 14 | 1101 | 2 | 19 | 1367 |
| | | 9.1 | 5.6 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 80.5 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 25.47363 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0006

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

## SECTION 6

## SES

We are interested in learning if a person's economic and educational status (SES) affects their perception of and responses to environmental problems. We might hypothesize, for example, that affluence and education will bear a direct relationship to one's ranking of environmental problems. That is, the higher one's income and more extensive one's education; the more likely one is to be aware of environmental problems. Or, one might suggest that individuals residing in deteriorating environments (i.e., low SES respondents) are more likely to be aware of environmental problems than those residing in a healthy environment. Note the potential conflict between these two assertions.

This section reports on the effect of SES on environmental attitudes. We have divided SES into three categories: low, medium, and high. Low SES represents an annual income of less than $5000 and less than high school educational level. Middle SES includes an income of $6000 through $15,000 and an educational level of high school. High SES stands for an income of above $15,000 and an educational level of college.

Do respondents at different SES levels differ in their perception of which public problems are most important? Table 49 indicates a relationship between SES and the ranking of public problems. Low SES respondents were concerned with economic issues (29.6%) and crime (17.5%). Middle SES respondents also focused on the economy (27.0%) and crime (17.3%). Upper SES respondents also cited the economy (29.8%), but were more concerned with "refuse" (11.1%) than with crime (10.6%). Upper SES respondents also saw government as an important problem (8.7%) while middle SES (4.1%) and lower SES (1.8%) respondents were less concerned.

The perception of the environment as our number one problem bore a direct relationship to SES. The higher the SES, the greater the concern with the environment. Two point seven percent of the lower SES respondents named the environment, as did 4.9% of the middle SES respondents and 6.6% of the upper SES respondents.

If we include "refuse" and "energy crisis" as environmental categories, there is a significant upswing in response. Seventeen point five percent of the low SES respondents, 22% of the middle SES respondents and 23.8% of the upper SES respondents then identify this general environmental category as our major problem.

When asked for a definition of "environment," we find that all three levels agreed to define "environment" in both physical and social terms (see Table 50). Sixty-nine point one percent of the middle level, 60.9% of the upper SES and 55.8% of the lower SES respondents defined "environment" this way. Over one-fourth (26.1%) of the higher SES respondents viewed the environment primarily in physical terms while almost a fifth (19.4%) of the lower SES respondents saw the environment in primarily social terms. There was a significant relationship between SES and response.

Does SES have an effect on the way respondents view today's environmental conditions and the way they anticipate conditions will be in the future? We did find a relationship between responses and SES. Table 51 displays data concerning present environmental conditions. Upper SES respondents believe today's environment is in better condition than respondents from either other SES level. Fifty-seven point one percent of the upper level respondents declared today's environment to be above average; 35.9% believed it was average and only 7% believed it below average. This is compared to 45.6%, 46%, and 8.4% for middle SES respondents and 36.3%, 50%, and 13.7% for lower SES respondents. In other words, the higher one's SES level the more positive one views the environmental conditions.

When we look five years into the future, the relationship between SES levels becomes less ordered (see Table 52). More upper SES respondents still view future conditions as average or above average than any other SES group, but now more middle SES respondents (48.3%) believe the future environment will be above average than do upper SES respondents (45.4%). Lower SES respondents are still the most pessimistic about environmental conditions with over one-third (34.3%) identifying future environmental conditions as below average. Note, however, that the percentage of upper and middle level respondents who believe that future environmental conditions will be below average have tripled.

We asked respondents to identify the major contributors to environmental problems; there was again a relationship between SES and responses. Table 53 indicates that 60% of the higher SES respondents, 42% of the lower SES respondents and 40.9% of the middle SES respondents believe that "individuals" contribute mostly to our environmental conditions. The only other category to receive consistant though minor support was "government" with 22.3%, 13.6%, and 13.3% of the lower, middle and upper class respondents respectively identifying it. Interestingly, industry, probably the most publicized polluter, was identified by no higher SES respondent.

The respondents also were influenced by SES when asked if Americans' life style contributes to our environmental problems. Eighty-one percent of the higher SES respondents, 78.1% of the middle SES respondents and 67.0% of the lower SES respondents said yes (see Table 54). This supports the data found in Table 53 in that individuals, rather than institutions are perceived to be the major contributors to environmental conditions.

Tables 55 through 59 identify the willingness of respondents to allocate a specified sum of money ($100) to help resolve various environmental problems. We divided responses into four categories: $0, $1-19, $20-49, and

$50 plus. We found a significant relationship between SES and the willingness to allocate money to the problem area of water pollution (see Table 56) and recreational areas (Table 59). There was no significant relationship between SES and the allocation of money to auto exhaust problems (Table 55), noise (Table 57), and trash and waste disposal (Table 58).

Upper SES respondents were more willing to allocate money to control water pollution than either of the other SES groups. Twenty point six percent of the higher SES would allocate $50 or more and 37% would appropriate between $20 and $49. The middle level SES respondents were almost as concerned with water problems. Nineteen percent would give $50 or more and 37.8%, $20-$49. Only 11.6% would give nothing (as contrasted with 34.9% and 33.7% of the middle and upper SES respondents respectively). Thus, the higher one's SES level, the more willing one was to allocate money to water problems.

Middle SES respondents were more concerned than the other two levels with recreational areas. Thirty-one point seven percent would allocate $50 or more and 75% would allocate at least $50 and 71%, at least $10. The upper SES respondents, perhaps because they had access to alternative recreational outlets, were less willing to contribute money to this area with about a third (32.4%) refusing to allocate any money at all.

Public action on the environment may be directly related to the public's knowledge of andparticipation in the various civic and governmental groups concerned with the environment. We examined the affect of SES on citizen knowledge and action.

When questioned about their awareness of government agencies or organizations in the San Antonio area concerned with the environment, respondents were influenced by SES. Table 60 indicates that over half of the lower SES respondents (52.2%) know of no agency so involved while 61% of the middle level respondents and 54.1% of the upper level respondents were able to identify some organizations. In the latter two responses almost one-third of the respondents were able to identify specifically which agency or organization they knew. There was, however, no overall consensus relating to which agencies or organizations could be identified. Only 9.8% of the middle level respondents cited the EPA as an organization focusing on the environment while 1.7% of the lower level and an astonishingly 0% of the upper level respondents did so. Only one organization, COPS (a local organization which has generated considerable publicity in San Antonio for its activities in public affairs) was identified by more than 10% of the respondents at any level (11.2% of the middle level respondents cited COPS).

The respondents knowledge of local citizen or civic groups was much broader than their knowledge of government organizations. Forty-nine point nine percent of the lower SES respondents, 67.2% of the middle level respondents and 63.8% of the upper level respondents did have some knowledge of such groups (see Table 61). There is a relationship here between SES and the responses.

As with government organizations, the knowledge of such groups was quite general with few respondents actually able to name a specific group. Nine

point one percent of the upper level respondents were able to identify the San Antonio Conservation Society, but no other group was identified by more than 6% of any SES level of respondents.

No SES level contained a significant number of respondents who admitted to holding membership in a group oriented toward environmental concerns. Table 62 shows that 11.9% of the middle level respondents and 7.4% of the lower level respondents said they were members of some organization concerned with the environment. No upper level respondents held memberships. There was no significant relationship based on SES.

When questioned about personal involvement in public issues relating to the environment, respondents were affected by SES (see Table 63). Eighty-seven point four percent of the lower SES respondents, 78.5% of the middle SES respondents and 66.7% of the upper SES respondents had never contacted any public official concerning environmental problems, but no other method of contact was utilized frequently by any SES level.

Table 64 contains the general patterns of public apathy by indicating that very few respondents at any SES level had attended any meeting concerning the environment. The middle and lower SES respondents were almost identical in their responses, with 13.5% and 13.4% respectively having attended some meetings. No upper SES respondent had attended such a meeting. There was no significant relationship based on SES.

These latter tables describe an overwhelmingly apathetic reaction to environmental problems.

TABLE 49. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEMS BY SES

IMPTPBS1

| SES | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | CRIME 1. | ECONOMY 2. | ENERGY RISIS 3. | C ENV PROB S 4. | GOVT 5. | CORRUPTION 6. | REFUSE 7. | NOT SURE 8. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 58 | 98 | 15 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 34 | 71 | 35 | 331 |
| | | 17.5 | 29.6 | 4.5 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 10.3 | 21.5 | 10.6 | 27.0 |
| | | 31.0 | 28.0 | 20.0 | 15.3 | 10.2 | 18.5 | 26.8 | 35.5 | 25.0 | |
| | | 4.7 | 8.0 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 2.8 | 5.8 | 2.9 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 89 | 139 | 37 | 25 | 21 | 20 | 51 | 79 | 54 | 515 |
| | | 17.3 | 27.0 | 7.2 | 4.9 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 9.9 | 15.3 | 10.5 | 42.0 |
| | | 47.6 | 39.7 | 49.3 | 42.4 | 35.0 | 74.1 | 40.2 | 39.5 | 38.6 | |
| | | 7.3 | 11.3 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 4.2 | 6.4 | 4.4 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 40 | 113 | 23 | 25 | 33 | 2 | 42 | 50 | 51 | 379 |
| | | 10.6 | 29.8 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 8.7 | 0.5 | 11.1 | 13.2 | 13.5 | 30.9 |
| | | 21.4 | 32.3 | 30.7 | 42.4 | 55.0 | 7.4 | 33.1 | 25.0 | 36.4 | |
| | | 3.3 | 9.2 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 0.2 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 4.2 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 187 | 350 | 75 | 59 | 60 | 27 | 127 | 200 | 140 | 1225 |
| | | 15.3 | 28.6 | 6.1 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 2.2 | 10.4 | 16.3 | 11.4 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 57.29708 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 144

TABLE 50. DEFINITION OF ENVIRONMENT BY SES

ENVPROB

| SES | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | PHYSICAL CHAR 1. | INC NB C HAR 2. | PRIMARIL Y SOCIAL 3. | PHYSICAL AND 4. | TIMES WE LIVE IN 5. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 30 | 31 | 55 | 128 | 4 | 248 |
| | | 12.1 | 12.5 | 22.2 | 51.6 | 1.6 | 21.3 |
| | | 16.2 | 37.3 | 46.6 | 17.0 | 16.7 | |
| | | 2.6 | 2.7 | 4.7 | 11.0 | 0.3 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 94 | 29 | 40 | 359 | 10 | 532 |
| | | 17.7 | 5.5 | 7.5 | 67.5 | 1.9 | 45.7 |
| | | 50.8 | 34.9 | 33.9 | 47.5 | 41.7 | |
| | | 8.1 | 2.5 | 3.4 | 30.8 | 0.9 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 61 | 23 | 23 | 268 | 10 | 385 |
| | | 15.8 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 69.6 | 2.6 | 33.0 |
| | | 33.0 | 27.7 | 19.5 | 35.5 | 41.7 | |
| | | 5.2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 23.0 | 0.9 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 185 | 83 | 118 | 755 | 24 | 1165 |
| | | 15.9 | 7.1 | 10.1 | 64.8 | 2.1 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 71.34039 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 204

TABLE 51. PERCEPTION OF PRESENT ENVIRONMENT BY SES

| SES | ENVNOW (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | 1. POOR | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | 9. EXCELLENT | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 19 | 2 | 20 | 16 | 64 | 50 | 53 | 37 | 19 | 300 |
| | | 6.3 | 0.7 | 6.7 | 5.3 | 28.0 | 16.7 | 17.7 | 12.3 | 6.3 | 25.4 |
| | | 50.0 | 20.0 | 32.3 | 17.8 | 32.7 | 28.9 | 25.4 | 16.2 | 16.4 | |
| | | 1.6 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 7.1 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 3.1 | 1.6 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 12 | 6 | 26 | 42 | 130 | 69 | 97 | 91 | 51 | 524 |
| | | 2.3 | 1.1 | 5.0 | 8.0 | 24.8 | 13.2 | 18.5 | 17.4 | 9.7 | 44.3 |
| | | 31.6 | 60.0 | 41.9 | 46.7 | 50.6 | 39.9 | 46.4 | 39.9 | 44.0 | |
| | | 1.0 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 3.6 | 11.0 | 5.8 | 8.2 | 7.7 | 4.3 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 7 | 2 | 16 | 32 | 43 | 54 | 59 | 100 | 46 | 359 |
| | | 1.9 | 0.6 | 4.5 | 8.9 | 12.0 | 15.0 | 16.4 | 27.9 | 12.8 | 30.3 |
| | | 18.4 | 20.0 | 25.8 | 35.6 | 16.7 | 31.2 | 28.2 | 43.9 | 39.7 | |
| | | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 5.0 | 8.5 | 3.9 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 38 | 10 | 62 | 90 | 257 | 173 | 209 | 228 | 116 | 1183 |
| | | 3.2 | 0.8 | 5.2 | 7.6 | 21.7 | 14.6 | 17.7 | 19.3 | 9.8 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 72.72937 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = -0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 186

TABLE 52. PERCEPTION OF FUTURE ENVIRONMENT BY SES

| SES | ENVSF<br>COUNT<br>ROW %<br>COL %<br>TOTAL % | 1. POOR | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | 9. EXCELLENT | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 42<br>16.3<br>44.7<br>4.0 | 19<br>7.4<br>25.0<br>1.8 | 27<br>10.5<br>26.2<br>2.6 | 18<br>7.0<br>22.2<br>1.7 | 33<br>12.8<br>25.8<br>3.2 | 25<br>9.7<br>25.8<br>2.4 | 29<br>11.3<br>21.8<br>2.8 | 33<br>12.8<br>16.9<br>3.2 | 31<br>12.1<br>23.1<br>3.0 | 257<br>24.7 |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 26<br>5.7<br>27.7<br>2.5 | 38<br>8.3<br>50.0<br>3.7 | 46<br>10.1<br>44.7<br>4.4 | 37<br>8.1<br>45.7<br>3.6 | 54<br>11.8<br>42.2<br>5.2 | 35<br>7.7<br>36.1<br>3.4 | 61<br>13.4<br>45.9<br>5.9 | 98<br>21.5<br>50.3<br>9.4 | 61<br>13.4<br>45.5<br>5.9 | 456<br>43.8 |
| HIGH | 3. | 26<br>7.9<br>27.7<br>2.5 | 19<br>5.8<br>25.0<br>1.8 | 30<br>9.1<br>29.1<br>2.9 | 26<br>7.9<br>32.1<br>2.5 | 41<br>12.5<br>32.0<br>3.9 | 37<br>11.3<br>38.1<br>3.6 | 43<br>13.1<br>32.3<br>4.1 | 64<br>19.5<br>32.8<br>6.1 | 42<br>12.8<br>31.3<br>4.0 | 328<br>31.5 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 94<br>9.0 | 76<br>7.3 | 103<br>9.9 | 81<br>7.8 | 128<br>12.3 | 97<br>9.3 | 133<br>12.8 | 195<br>18.7 | 134<br>12.9 | 1041<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 33.94043 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0055

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 328

TABLE 53. CONTRIBUTORS TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS BY SES

| SES | MSTCONT COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | INDUSTRY 1. | INDIVIDUALS 2. | GOVT 3. | TRAFFIC 4. | NONE 5. | DRUGS 6. | CORRUPTION 7. | TOO MANY ANIMALS 8. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 21 | 102 | 59 | 19 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 122 | 360 |
| | | 5.8 | 28.3 | 16.4 | 5.3 | 3.9 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 33.9 | 28.2 |
| | | 14.5 | 23.0 | 33.7 | 17.3 | 31.1 | 32.4 | 53.3 | 50.0 | 40.4 | |
| | | 1.6 | 8.0 | 4.6 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 9.6 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 69 | 216 | 74 | 42 | 21 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 97 | 539 |
| | | 12.8 | 40.1 | 13.7 | 7.8 | 3.9 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 18.0 | 42.2 |
| | | 47.6 | 48.8 | 42.3 | 38.2 | 46.7 | 38.2 | 33.3 | 25.0 | 32.1 | |
| | | 5.4 | 16.9 | 5.8 | 3.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 7.6 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 55 | 125 | 42 | 49 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 83 | 378 |
| | | 14.6 | 33.1 | 11.1 | 13.0 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 22.0 | 29.6 |
| | | 37.9 | 28.2 | 24.0 | 44.5 | 22.2 | 29.4 | 13.3 | 25.0 | 27.5 | |
| | | 4.3 | 9.8 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 6.5 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 145 | 443 | 175 | 110 | 45 | 34 | 15 | 8 | 302 | 1277 |
| | | 11.4 | 34.7 | 13.7 | 8.6 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 23.6 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 72.33075 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 92

TABLE 54. LIFE STYLES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS BY SES

| SES | LIVECNT (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | YES 1. | NO 2. | BOTH 3. | 4. | 5. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 209 | 92 | 19 | 0 | 2 | 52 | 372 |
| | | 56.2 | 24.7 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 27.3 |
| | | 22.7 | 41.1 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.9 | |
| | | 15.3 | 6.7 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 420 | 89 | 32 | 2 | 1 | 38 | 582 |
| | | 72.2 | 15.3 | 5.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 6.5 | 42.7 |
| | | 45.6 | 39.7 | 36.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 29.9 | |
| | | 30.8 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 2.8 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 293 | 43 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 409 |
| | | 71.6 | 10.5 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 30.0 |
| | | 31.8 | 19.2 | 41.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 29.1 | |
| | | 21.5 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 922 | 224 | 87 | 2 | 1 | 127 | 1363 |
| | | 67.6 | 16.4 | 6.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 9.3 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 57.71412 WITH 10 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 55. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO AUTO EXHAUST BY SES

| SES | AUTOEX (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | 0 | 1-19 | 20-49 | 50+ | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 161 | 48 | 126 | 37 | 372 |
| | | 43.3 | 12.9 | 33.9 | 9.9 | 27.2 |
| | | 26.7 | 29.4 | 29.1 | 21.6 | |
| | | 11.8 | 3.5 | 9.2 | 2.7 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 266 | 68 | 178 | 72 | 584 |
| | | 45.5 | 11.6 | 30.5 | 12.3 | 42.7 |
| | | 44.2 | 41.7 | 41.1 | 42.1 | |
| | | 19.4 | 5.0 | 13.0 | 5.3 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 175 | 47 | 129 | 62 | 413 |
| | | 42.4 | 11.4 | 31.2 | 15.0 | 30.2 |
| | | 29.1 | 28.8 | 29.8 | 36.3 | |
| | | 12.8 | 3.4 | 9.4 | 4.5 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 602 | 163 | 433 | 171 | 1369 |
| | | 44.0 | 11.9 | 31.6 | 12.5 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 5.94883 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.4289

TABLE 56. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO WATER POLLUTION BY SES

| SES | CNTM20 (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | 0. | 1. | 2. | 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 151 | 45 | 133 | 43 | 372 |
| | | 40.6 | 12.1 | 35.8 | 11.6 | 27.2 |
| | | 30.6 | 34.9 | 26.2 | 18.0 | |
| | | 11.0 | 3.3 | 9.7 | 3.1 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 204 | 43 | 221 | 111 | 584 |
| | | 34.9 | 8.2 | 37.8 | 19.0 | 42.7 |
| | | 41.3 | 37.2 | 43.6 | 46.4 | |
| | | 14.9 | 3.5 | 16.1 | 8.1 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 139 | 36 | 153 | 85 | 413 |
| | | 33.7 | 8.7 | 37.0 | 20.6 | 30.2 |
| | | 28.1 | 27.9 | 30.2 | 35.6 | |
| | | 10.2 | 2.6 | 11.2 | 6.2 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 494 | 129 | 507 | 239 | 1369 |
| | | 36.1 | 9.4 | 37.0 | 17.5 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 17.71563 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0070

TABLE 57. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO NOISE POLLUTION BY SES

| SES | RNOISE (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | 0. | 1-19 1. | 20-49 2. | 50+ 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 198<br>53.2<br>24.5<br>14.5 | 77<br>20.7<br>28.3<br>5.6 | 86<br>23.1<br>34.7<br>6.3 | 11<br>3.0<br>26.2<br>0.8 | 372<br>27.2 |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 361<br>61.6<br>44.7<br>26.4 | 108<br>18.5<br>39.7<br>7.9 | 98<br>16.8<br>39.5<br>7.2 | 17<br>2.9<br>40.5<br>1.2 | 584<br>42.7 |
| HIGH | 3. | 248<br>60.0<br>30.7<br>18.1 | 87<br>21.1<br>32.0<br>6.4 | 64<br>15.5<br>25.8<br>4.7 | 14<br>3.4<br>33.3<br>1.0 | 413<br>30.2 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 807<br>58.9 | 272<br>19.9 | 248<br>18.1 | 42<br>3.1 | 1369<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 11.42739 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0760

TABLE 58. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO TRASH POLLUTION BY SES

| SES | TSH (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | 0. | 1-19 1. | 20-49 2. | 50+ 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 137<br>36.8<br>26.7<br>10.0 | 53<br>14.2<br>30.3<br>3.9 | 120<br>32.3<br>24.8<br>8.8 | 62<br>16.7<br>31.6<br>4.5 | 372<br>27.2 |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 224<br>38.4<br>43.6<br>16.4 | 60<br>10.3<br>34.3<br>4.4 | 211<br>36.1<br>43.6<br>15.4 | 89<br>15.2<br>45.4<br>6.5 | 584<br>42.7 |
| HIGH | 3. | 153<br>37.2<br>29.8<br>11.2 | 62<br>15.2<br>35.4<br>4.5 | 153<br>37.2<br>31.6<br>11.2 | 45<br>10.9<br>23.0<br>3.3 | 413<br>32.2 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 514<br>37.5 | 175<br>12.8 | 484<br>35.4 | 196<br>14.3 | 1369<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 11.88655 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0645

TABLE 59. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO RECREATION BY SES

| SES | INEWREC (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | 0. | 1. (1-19) | 2. (20-49) | 3. (50+) | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 108<br>29.0<br>27.8<br>7.9 | 38<br>10.2<br>25.0<br>2.8 | 138<br>37.1<br>29.8<br>10.1 | 88<br>23.7<br>24.0<br>6.4 | 372<br>27.2 |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 146<br>25.0<br>37.6<br>10.7 | 53<br>9.1<br>34.9<br>3.9 | 200<br>34.2<br>43.2<br>14.6 | 185<br>31.7<br>50.5<br>13.5 | 584<br>42.7 |
| HIGH | 3. | 134<br>32.4<br>34.5<br>9.8 | 61<br>14.8<br>40.1<br>4.5 | 125<br>30.3<br>27.0<br>9.1 | 93<br>22.5<br>25.4<br>6.8 | 413<br>30.2 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 388<br>28.3 | 152<br>11.1 | 463<br>33.8 | 366<br>26.7 | 1369.<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 24.40435 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004

TABLE 60. KNOWLEDGE OF GOVERNMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES BY SES

| SES | KNGAGN: COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | YES-IDENTIFY 1. | YES-CANT ID 2. | NO 3. | NOT SURE 4. | 5. | 7. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 50 | 83 | 198 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 370 |
| | | 13.5 | 22.4 | 53.5 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 27.1 |
| | | 14.8 | 21.7 | 38.2 | 27.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 61.5 | |
| | | 3.7 | 6.1 | 14.5 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 148 | 162 | 219 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 583 |
| | | 25.4 | 27.8 | 37.6 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 42.7 |
| | | 43.9 | 42.4 | 42.3 | 43.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.5 | |
| | | 10.8 | 11.9 | 16.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 139 | 137 | 101 | 33 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 413 |
| | | 33.7 | 33.2 | 24.5 | 8.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 30.2 |
| | | 41.2 | 35.9 | 19.5 | 29.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 10.2 | 10.0 | 7.4 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 337 | 382 | 518 | 113 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 1366 |
| | | 24.7 | 28.0 | 37.9 | 8.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 100.51026 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 61. KNOWLEDGE OF CIVIC ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES BY SES

| SES | CIVIC COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | YES-ID 1. | YES-CAN'T ID 2. | NO 3. | NOT SURE 4. | NO RESPO. NSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 73 | 101 | 152 | 41 | 3 | 370 |
| | | 19.7 | 27.3 | 41.1 | 11.1 | 0.8 | 27.1 |
| | | 16.9 | 25.6 | 37.0 | 36.0 | 23.1 | |
| | | 5.4 | 7.4 | 11.1 | 3.0 | 0.2 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 202 | 157 | 169 | 48 | 7 | 583 |
| | | 34.6 | 26.9 | 29.0 | 8.2 | 1.2 | 42.7 |
| | | 46.9 | 39.7 | 41.1 | 42.1 | 53.8 | |
| | | 14.8 | 11.5 | 12.4 | 3.5 | 0.5 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 156 | 137 | 90 | 25 | 3 | 411 |
| | | 38.0 | 33.3 | 21.9 | 6.1 | 0.7 | 30.1 |
| | | 36.2 | 34.9 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 23.1 | |
| | | 11.4 | 10.0 | 6.6 | 1.8 | 0.2 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 431 | 395 | 411 | 114 | 13 | 1364 |
| | | 31.6 | 29.0 | 30.1 | 8.4 | 1.0 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 58.29601 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

TABLE 62. MEMBERSHIP IN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP BY SES

| SES | MEMORG (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | YES 1. | NO 2. | NO RESPONSE 3. | 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 23 | 347 | 0 | 0 | 370 |
| | | 6.2 | 93.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.1 |
| | | 16.9 | 28.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 1.7 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 63 | 512 | 2 | 7 | 584 |
| | | 10.8 | 87.7 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 42.8 |
| | | 46.3 | 42.1 | 66.7 | 87.5 | |
| | | 4.6 | 37.6 | 0.1 | 0.5 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 50 | 357 | 1 | 1 | 409 |
| | | 12.2 | 87.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 30.0 |
| | | 36.8 | 29.4 | 33.3 | 12.5 | |
| | | 3.7 | 26.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 136 | 1216 | 3 | 8 | 1363 |
| | | 10.0 | 89.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.82733 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0099

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 63: CONTACTS WITH PUBLIC OFFICIALS BY SES

| SES | CONTOFF COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | YES-CALL OFF 1. | YES-WROTE OFF 2. | YES-VISIT OFF 3. | YES-CALL NP 4. | YES-WROTE NP 5. | NO 7. | 8. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 35 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 325 | 2 | 1 | 370 |
| | | 9.5 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 87.8 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 27.1 |
| | | 28.2 | 2.6 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 29.5 | 100.0 | 5.3 | |
| | | 2.6 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 23.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 45 | 44 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 467 | 0 | 7 | 584 |
| | | 7.7 | 7.5 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 42.7 |
| | | 36.3 | 57.9 | 39.3 | 85.7 | 40.0 | 42.4 | 0.0 | 36.8 | |
| | | 3.3 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 34.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 44 | 30 | 13 | 0 | 6 | 309 | 0 | 11 | 413 |
| | | 10.7 | 7.3 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 74.8 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 30.2 |
| | | 35.5 | 39.5 | 46.4 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 28.1 | 0.0 | 57.9 | |
| | | 3.2 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 22.6 | 0.0 | 0.8 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 124 | 76 | 28 | 7 | 10 | 1101 | 2 | 19 | 1367 |
| | | 9.1 | 5.6 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 80.5 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 58.70102 WITH 14 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 6 ATTENDANCE AT ENVIRONMENTAL MEETINGS BY SES

| SES | ATTMEET COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | YES 1. | NO 2. | 4. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 46 | 324 | 0 | 2 | 372 |
| | | 12.4 | 87.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 27.2 |
| | | 25.6 | 27.6 | 0.0 | 18.2 | |
| | | 3.4 | 23.7 | 0.0 | 0.1 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 84 | 492 | 1 | 6 | 583 |
| | | 14.4 | 84.4 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 42.7 |
| | | 46.7 | 41.9 | 100.0 | 54.5 | |
| | | 6.1 | 36.0 | 0.1 | 0.4 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 50 | 358 | 0 | 3 | 411 |
| | | 12.2 | 87.1 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 30.1 |
| | | 27.8 | 30.5 | 0.0 | 27.3 | |
| | | 3.7 | 26.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 180 | 1174 | 1 | 11 | 1366 |
| | | 13.2 | 85.9 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 3.52706 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.7404

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

## SECTION 7

## MEDIA INFLUENCE

The people's perception of any public problem will be directly affected by the sources from which information about the problems are derived. We wanted to know which media sources respondents relied on and what amount of trust they placed in the media. During the period in which the survey was conducted, we monitored the San Antonio area media to identify any major coverage of environmental conditions. No environmental issue emerged which could be considered a story of major importance to the media. The media did cover related stories (e.g., traffic problems, general energy issues, etc.), and we attempted to ascertain if respondents were aware of this coverage.

This section addresses the influence of the media on respondents' environmental attitudes..

We asked the respondents to identify the media sources from which they derived information concerning national, state and local events. As noted in Section 3 (see above, p. 7 ), television was the primary source for information at all three levels with newspapers the most frequently cited secondary source.

Tables 65, 66, and 67 show that area does not affect television's dominance as the primary media source. Over half of the respondents living in the center city, suburbs and rural areas gleaned most of their information re national events from TV. Center city residents relied on TV the most; of those 69.7% citing TV, most resided in the center city. This pattern remained essentially the same when we looked at state and local problems.

When we control for ethnicity, we find that more Anglos than Mexican-Americans rely on TV for information at the national and state levels, while Mexican-Americans rely more on TV for information concerning local problems (see Tables 68, 69, 70). At all three levels, the differences, though significant by Chi Square, are slight. We find also that Mexican-Americans are more likely than Anglos to utilize the radio as an informational source at all three levels.

The single exception to television's number one position as a news source is found when we control for SES. Focusing on national and state problems, all three SES groups identify TV as their major news source (see Tables 71, 72, 73). However, upper SES respondents said they used newspapers more than television to garner news concerning local problems. We found also that lower SES respondents utilize the radio much more than their counterparts

at the other levels.

We asked the respondents to identify which source of information they believed was most likely to give an unbiased and accurate report of news events. Overall, 42.5% of the respondents believed TV to be the most accurate while 20.3% cited newspapers (and 14.5% said "none") (see above, Section 3, p. 8).

This trust in the probity of television existed regardless of where the respondent lived. Table 74 shows that 45.1% of the rural respondents, 43.1% of the inner city respondents and 36.9% of the suburban respondents found TV to be the most reliable source. These figures reflect, however, a large amount of distrust in that no news source is believed by at least half of the respondents to be accurate. Over one-fifth of the suburban respondents found no news source reliable. Note, however, that ChiSquare indicates no significance when we control for area.

We do find significance where we control for ethnicity. Table 75 shows that of those identifying television as the most trustworthy, 60.9% are Anglos and 39.2, Mexican-Americans (although Mexican-Americans trust TV reporting more than any other source). Anglos also are more suspicious of all forms of reporting with 85.4% of those answering "none" while only 14.6% of the Mexican-American respondents believed that no media source was accurate.

When we look at SES, again we find significant differences. Lower and middle SES respondents identified TV as the most accurate news source, but over one-third of the upper SES respondents said no news source was accurate, and another third identified newspapers as the most accurate source (see Table 76). Only 12.5% of the upper respondents believed TV to be reliable (this was less than 1% of all respondents who identified TV).

Did the respondents recall reading or seeing or hearing stories concerning the environment? We found that 48.2% of the respondents recalled reading an environmental story in a newspaper and 45.5% had recently seen an environmental story on television (see above, Section 3, p. 7).

Table 77 shows that of those that had recently read something concerning the environment in the newspaper, most resided in the center city. At the same time over half of the suburban residents recalled reading such a story (as contrasted with 38.5% of those in the center city and 30% of those living in rural areas). Note that 79.4% of the center city respondents, 93.6% of the suburban residents and 69% of the rural residents take newspapers.

Suburban residents also recalled seeing more environmental reports on TV than the other two areas (see Table 78). Over half of the rural residents and half (49.2%) of the center city did not recall seeing any story on television relating to the environment.

Controlling for ethnicity, we find that 87.7% of the Anglos take a newspaper as contrasted with 68.9% of the Mexican-Americans (see Table 79). Fifty-five point one percent of the Anglos had recently read newspaper stories concerning the environment while 3[illegible] of the Mexican-Americans had seen en-

vironmental stories.

Almost half of each ethnic group recalled seeing television stories that related to environmental conditions (see Table 80). Forty-six point seven percent of the Anglo respondents and 43.6% of the Mexican-American respondents had viewed some television comment concerning the environment.

We controlled for SES and again found significant relationships. Ninety-five point eight percent of the upper level SES respondents took newspapers, 89.3% of the middle SES respondents did likewise, while only 66.4% of the lower SES level respondents took a newspaper (see Table 81). We find significant differences between the SES level among those respondents who recalled reading a newspaper story on the environment. Only 33.9% of the lower SES had read such stories, contrasted with 58.3% and 56.6% of the upper and middle level respondents respectively.

As might be expected, the awareness of television shows was distributed somewhat more evenly (see Table 82). Here 39.9% of the lower SES respondents recalled seeing an environmental story while 50% of the upper and middle level respondents had such recollection.

TABLE 65. NATIONAL MEDIA USE BY AREA

| AREA | NTLMEDIA COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | 1. NEWSPAPERS | 2. MAGAZINES | 3. RADIO | 4. TELEVISION | 5. FRIENDS | 6. OTHER | 7. RADIO AND TV | 8. NEWSPAPER & TV | 9. NO RESPONSE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 161 | 37 | 50 | 451 | 8 | 9 | 13 | 58 | 12 | 792 |
| | | 20.3 | 3.8 | 6.3 | 56.9 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 7.3 | 1.5 | 67.3 |
| | | 63.9 | 58.8 | 55.6 | 69.7 | 72.7 | 90.0 | 72.2 | 78.4 | 52.2 | |
| | | 13.7 | 2.6 | 4.3 | 38.4 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 4.9 | 1.0 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 27 | 11 | 2 | 61 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 111 |
| | | 24.3 | 9.9 | 1.8 | 55.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 5.4 | 9.4 |
| | | 10.7 | 21.6 | 2.2 | 9.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 2.7 | 26.1 | |
| | | 2.3 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 50 | 6 | 34 | 115 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 227 |
| | | 22.0 | 2.6 | 15.0 | 50.7 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 4.4 | 2.2 | 19.3 |
| | | 19.8 | 11.8 | 37.8 | 17.8 | 27.3 | 10.0 | 16.7 | 13.5 | 21.7 | |
| | | 4.3 | 0.5 | 2.9 | 9.8 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.4 | |
| | 6. | 14 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 44 |
| | | 31.8 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 45.5 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 3.7 |
| | | 5.6 | 7.8 | 4.4 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | |
| | | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | |
| | 7. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | |
| | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 252 | 51 | 90 | 647 | 11 | 10 | 18 | 74 | 23 | 1176 |
| | | 21.4 | 4.3 | 7.7 | 55.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.5 | 6.3 | 2.0 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 90.22754 WITH 32 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 193

TABLE 66. STATE MEDIA USE BY AREA

| AREA | MEDIA (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | NEWSPAPERS 1. | MAGAZINES 2. | RADIO 3. | TELEVISION 4. | FRIENDS 5. | OTHER 6. | RADIO AND TV 7. | NEWSPAPER & TV 8. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1. | 51 | 3 | 11 | 51 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 3 | 142 |
| | | 35.9 | 2.1 | 7.7 | 35.9 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 3.5 | 10.6 | 2.1 | 11.1 |
| | | 13.4 | 15.0 | 9.5 | 8.5 | 13.3 | 8.3 | 20.0 | 17.6 | 10.0 | |
| | | 4.0 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.2 | |
| CENTER CITY | 2. | 229 | 11 | 67 | 396 | [illegible] | 8[illegible] | 15 | 57 | 16 | 804 |
| | | 28.5 | 1.4 | 8.3 | 48.5 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 7.1 | 2.0 | 62.6 |
| | | 60.3 | 55.0 | 59.8 | 64.9 | 73.3 | 66.7 | 60.0 | 67.1 | 53.3 | |
| | | 17.8 | 0.9 | 5.2 | 30.4 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 4.4 | 1.2 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 42 | 2 | 2 | 51 | [illegible] | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 111 |
| | | 37.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 45.9 | 2.[illegible] | 1.8 | 1.8 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 8.6 |
| | | 11.1 | 10.0 | 1.7 | 8.5 | 0.[illegible] | 16.7 | 8.0 | 4.7 | 20.0 | |
| | | 3.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 4.0 | 0.[illegible] | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 58 | 4 | 36 | 109 | [illegible] | 1 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 227 |
| | | 25.6 | 1.8 | 15.9 | 48.0 | 2.9 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 2.2 | 17.7 |
| | | 15.3 | 20.0 | 31.0 | 18.1 | 13.3 | 8.3 | 12.0 | 10.6 | 16.7 | |
| | | 4.5 | 0.3 | 2.8 | 8.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.4 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 380 | 20 | 110 | 601 | 15 | 12 | 25 | 85 | 30 | 1284 |
| | | 29.6 | 1.6 | 9.0 | 46.8 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 6.6 | 2.3 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 47.82241 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0027

TABLE 67. LOCAL MEDIA USE BY AREA

| AREA | MEDIA COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | NEWSPAPERS 1. | MAGAZINES 2. | RADIO 3. | TELEVISION 4. | FRIENDS 5. | OTHER 6. | RADIO AND TV 7. | NEWSPAPER & TV 8. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0. | 38 | 2 | 15 | 57 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 27.5 | 1.4 | 10.9 | 41.3 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 3.6 | 8.7 | 2.2 | 10 |
| | | 10.0 | 25.0 | 10.3 | 10.1 | 13.2 | 10.0 | 21.7 | 13.5 | 12.0 | |
| | | 3.0 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 4.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.2 | |
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 235 | 6 | 84 | 364 | 26 | 6 | 13 | 66 | 12 | 8 |
| | | 29.2 | 0.7 | 10.4 | 45.2 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 8.2 | 1.5 | 62 |
| | | 61.8 | 75.0 | 57.5 | 64.7 | 68.4 | 60.0 | 56.5 | 74.2 | 48.0 | |
| | | 18.3 | 0.5 | 6.6 | 28.4 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 5.1 | 0.9 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 44 | 0 | 6 | 49 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 39.6 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 44.1 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 5.4 | 8 |
| | | 11.6 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 8.7 | 5.3 | 20.0 | 8.7 | 2.2 | 24.0 | |
| | | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 63 | 0 | 41 | 93 | 13 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 2 |
| | | 27.8 | 0.0 | 18.1 | 41.0 | 5.7 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 17 |
| | | 16.6 | 0.0 | 28.1 | 16.5 | 34.2 | 10.0 | 13.0 | 10.1 | 16.0 | |
| | | 4.9 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 7.3 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.3 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 380 | 8 | 146 | 563 | 38 | 10 | 23 | 89 | 25 | 12 |
| | | 29.6 | 0.6 | 11.4 | 43.9 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 6.9 | 2.0 | 100 |

CHI SQUARE = 54.20238 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 87

TABLE 68. NATIONAL MEDIA USE BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNI | COUN ROW % COL % TOTAL % | NTLMEDIA NEWSPAPERS 1. | MAGAZINES 2. | RADIO 3. | TELEVISION 4. | FRIENDS 5. | OTHER 6. | RADIO AND TV 7. | NEWSPAPER & TV 8. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 178 | 42 | 42 | 476 | [illegible] | 8 | 14 | 62 | 16 | 844 |
| | | 21.1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 56.4 | 2.[illegible] | 0.9 | 1.7 | 7.3 | 1.9 | 64.1 |
| | | 62.7 | 72.4 | 39.6 | 66.7 | 46.2 | 80.0 | 66.7 | 72.9 | 64.0 | |
| | | 13.5 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 36.2 | 2.5 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 4.7 | 1.2 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 106 | 16 | 64 | 238 | [illegible] | 2 | 7 | 23 | 9 | 472 |
| | | 22.5 | 3.4 | 13.6 | 50.4 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 4.9 | 1.9 | 35.9 |
| | | 37.3 | 27.6 | 60.4 | 33.3 | 53.8 | 20.0 | 33.3 | 27.1 | 36.0 | |
| | | 8.1 | 1.2 | 4.9 | 18.1 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 0.7 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 284 | 58 | 106 | 714 | 13 | 10 | 21 | 85 | 25 | 1316 |
| | | 21.6 | 4.4 | 8.1 | 54.3 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 6.5 | 1.9 | 100.0 |

CHI-SQUARE = 37.5190 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 53

TABLE 69. STATE MEDIA USE BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | NEWSPAPE -S 1. | MAGAZINE S 2. | RADIO 3. | TELEVISI ON 4. | FRIENDS 5. | OTHER 6. | RADIO AN D TV 7. | NEWSPAPE R & TV 8. | NO RESPO NSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 272 | 10 | 50 | 402 | 10 | 6 | 18 | 66 | 22 | 856 |
| | | 31.8 | 1.2 | 5.8 | 47.0 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 2.1 | 7.7 | 2.6 | 64.2 |
| | | 68.7 | 50.0 | 41.3 | 64.3 | 66.7 | 50.0 | 72.0 | 74.2 | 73.3 | |
| | | 20.4 | 0.8 | 3.8 | 30.2 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 5.0 | 1.7 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 124 | 10 | 71 | 223 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 23 | 8 | 477 |
| | | 26.0 | 2.1 | 14.9 | 46.8 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 4.8 | 1.7 | 35.8 |
| | | 31.3 | 50.0 | 58.7 | 35.7 | 33.3 | 50.0 | 28.0 | 25.8 | 26.7 | |
| | | 9.3 | 0.8 | 5.3 | 16.7 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 0.6 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 396 | 20 | 121 | 625 | 15 | 12 | 25 | 89 | 30 | 1333 |
| | | 29.7 | 1.5 | 9.1 | 46.9 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 6.7 | 2.3 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 30.47179 WITH 0 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 36

TABLE 70. LOCAL MEDIA USE BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | MEDIA (COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %) | NEWSPAPERS 1. | MAGAZINES 2. | RADIO 3. | TELEVISION 4. | FRIENDS 5. | OTHER 6. | RADIO AND TV 7. | NEWSPAPER & TV 8. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | | 284 | 6 | 60 | 370 | 22 | 6 | 16 | 70 | 20 | 854 |
| | | 33.3 | 0.7 | 7.0 | 43.3 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 8.2 | 2.3 | 64.2 |
| | | 71.4 | 75.0 | 39.7 | 63.5 | 57.9 | 60.0 | 69.6 | 73.7 | 80.0 | |
| | | 21.3 | 0.5 | 4.5 | 27.8 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 5.3 | 1.5 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | | 114 | 2 | 91 | 213 | 16 | 4 | 7 | 25 | 5 | 477 |
| | | 23.9 | 0.4 | 19.1 | 44.7 | 3.4 | 0.8 | 1.5 | 5.2 | 1.0 | 35.8 |
| | | 28.6 | 25.0 | 60.3 | 36.5 | 42.1 | 40.0 | 30.4 | 26.3 | 20.0 | |
| | | 8.6 | 0.2 | 6.8 | 16.0 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 0.4 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 398 | 8 | 151 | 583 | 38 | 10 | 23 | 95 | 25 | 1331 |
| | | 29.9 | 0.6 | 11.3 | 43.8 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 7.1 | 1.9 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 56.16411 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 36

TABLE 71. NATIONAL MEDIA USE BY SES

| SES | NTLMEDIA COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | 1. NEWSPAPERS | 2. MAGAZINES | 3. RADIO | 4. TELEVISION | 5. FRIENDS | 6. OTHER | 7. RADIO AND TV | 8. NEWSPAPER & TV | 9. NO RESPONSE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 70 | 9 | 59 | 188 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 20 | 6 | 361 |
| | | 19.4 | 2.5 | 16.3 | 52.1 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 5.5 | 1.7 | 27.4 |
| | | 24.6 | 15.5 | 55.7 | 26.3 | 15.4 | 50.0 | 9.5 | 23.5 | 24.0 | |
| | | 5.3 | 0.7 | 8.5 | 14.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.5 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 120 | 13 | 28 | 322 | 5 | 0 | 18 | 43 | 9 | 558 |
| | | 21.5 | 2.3 | 5.0 | 57.7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 7.7 | 1.6 | 42.4 |
| | | 42.3 | 22.4 | 26.4 | 45.1 | 38.5 | 0.0 | 85.7 | 50.6 | 36.0 | |
| | | 9.1 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 24.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 3.3 | 0.7 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 94 | 36 | 19 | 204 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 22 | 10 | 397 |
| | | 23.7 | 9.1 | 4.8 | 51.4 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 5.5 | 2.5 | 30.2 |
| | | 33.1 | 62.1 | 17.9 | 28.6 | 46.2 | 50.0 | 4.8 | 25.9 | 40.0 | |
| | | 7.1 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 15.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 0.8 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 284 | 58 | 106 | 714 | 13 | 10 | 21 | 85 | 25 | 1316 |
| | | 21.6 | 4.4 | 8.1 | 54.3 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 6.5 | 1.9 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 103.19561 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 53

TABLE 72. STATE MEDIA USE BY SES

| SES | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | MEDIA: NEWSPAPERS 1. | MAGAZINES 2. | RADIO 3. | TELEVISION 4. | FRIENDS 5. | OTHER 6. | RADIO AND TV 7. | NEWSPAPER & TV 8. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 84 | 6 | 54 | 180 | 6 | 4 | 2 | [illegible] | 8 | 362 |
| | | 23.2 | 1.7 | 14.9 | 49.7 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 5.0 | 2.2 | 27.2 |
| | | 21.2 | 30.0 | 44.6 | 28.8 | 40.0 | 33.3 | 8.0 | [illegible].2 | 26.7 | |
| | | 6.3 | 0.5 | 4.1 | 13.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.6 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 166 | 5 | 43 | 268 | 6 | 4 | 20 | 44 | 8 | 564 |
| | | 29.4 | 0.9 | 7.6 | 47.5 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 3.5 | 7.8 | 1.4 | 42.3 |
| | | 41.9 | 25.0 | 35.5 | 42.9 | 40.0 | 33.3 | 80.0 | 49.4 | 26.7 | |
| | | 12.5 | 0.4 | 3.2 | 20.1 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 0.6 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 146 | 9 | 24 | 177 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 27 | 14 | 407 |
| | | 35.9 | 2.2 | 5.9 | 43.5 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 6.6 | 3.4 | 30.5 |
| | | 36.9 | 45.0 | 19.8 | 28.3 | 20.0 | 33.3 | 12.0 | 30.3 | 46.7 | |
| | | 11.0 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 13.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 1.1 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 396 | 20 | 121 | 625 | 15 | 12 | 25 | 89 | 30 | 1333 |
| | | 29.7 | 1.5 | 9.1 | 46.9 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 6.7 | 2.3 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 57.76782 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 36

TABLE 73. LOCAL MEDIA USE BY SES

| SES | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | LMEDIA NEWSPAPERS 1. | MAGAZINES 2. | RADIO 3. | TELEVISION 4. | FRIENDS 5. | OTHER 6. | RADIO AND TV 7. | NEWSPAPER & TV 8. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 90 | 4 | 75 | 146 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 24 | 8 | 360 |
| | | 25.0 | 1.1 | 20.8 | 40.6 | 2.8 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 6.7 | 2.2 | 27.0 |
| | | 22.6 | 50.0 | 49.7 | 25.0 | 26.3 | 20.0 | 4.3 | 25.3 | 32.0 | |
| | | 6.8 | 0.3 | 5.6 | 11.0 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.6 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 167 | 0 | 52 | 268 | 9 | 3 | 15 | 46 | 7 | 567 |
| | | 29.5 | 0.0 | 9.2 | 47.3 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 2.6 | 8.1 | 1.2 | 42.6 |
| | | 42.0 | 0.0 | 34.4 | 46.0 | 23.7 | 30.0 | 65.2 | 48.4 | 28.0 | |
| | | 12.5 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 20.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 3.5 | 0.5 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 141 | 4 | 24 | 169 | 19 | 5 | 7 | 25 | 10 | 404 |
| | | 34.9 | 1.0 | 5.9 | 41.8 | 4.7 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 6.2 | 2.5 | 30.4 |
| | | 35.4 | 50.0 | 15.9 | 29.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 30.4 | 26.3 | 40.0 | |
| | | 10.6 | 0.3 | 1.8 | 12.7 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 0.8 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 398 | 8 | 151 | 583 | 38 | 10 | 23 | 95 | 25 | 1331 |
| | | 29.9 | 0.6 | 11.3 | 43.8 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 7.1 | 1.9 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 77.02519 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS [illegible] 38

TABLE 74. MEDIA ACCURACY BY AREA

| AREA | ACCINFO COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | NEWSPAPERS 1. | MAGAZINES 2. | RADIO 3. | TV 4. | OTHER 5. | NONE 6. | NEWSPAPER&TV 7. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0. | 29 | 12 | 14 | 55 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 4 | 142 |
| | | 20.4 | 8.5 | 9.9 | 38.7 | 0.7 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 10.8 |
| | | 10.8 | 12.8 | 10.1 | 9.8 | 5.6 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 9.3 | |
| | | 2.2 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 | |
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 177 | 56 | 84 | 358 | 12 | 118 | 2 | 24 | 831 |
| | | 21.3 | 6.7 | 10.1 | 43.1 | 1.4 | 14.2 | 0.2 | 2.9 | 63.1 |
| | | 65.8 | 59.6 | 60.9 | 64.0 | 66.7 | 61.1 | 66.7 | 55.8 | |
| | | 13.4 | 4.3 | 6.4 | 27.2 | 0.9 | 9.0 | 0.2 | 1.8 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 18 | 14 | 10 | 41 | 2 | 26 | 0 | 2 | 111 |
| | | 16.2 | 12.6 | 9.0 | 36.9 | 0.7 | 23.4 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 8.4 |
| | | 6.7 | 14.9 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 4.7 | |
| | | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 45 | 12 | 30 | 105 | 3 | 22 | 1 | 13 | 233 |
| | | 19.3 | 5.2 | 12.9 | 45.1 | 2.1 | 9.4 | 0.4 | 5.6 | 17.7 |
| | | 16.7 | 12.8 | 21.7 | 18.8 | 27.8 | 11.4 | 33.3 | 30.2 | |
| | | 3.4 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 8.0 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 1.0 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 269 | 94 | 138 | 559 | 18 | 193 | 3 | 43 | 1317 |
| | | 20.4 | 7.1 | 10.5 | 42.4 | 1.4 | 14.7 | 0.2 | 3.3 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 32.41253 WITH 21 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0531

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 52

TABLE 15. MEDIA ACCURACY BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | ACCINFO COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | NEWSPAPERS 1. | MAGAZINES 2. | RADIO 3. | TV 4. | OTHER 5. | NONE 6. | NEWSPAPER&TV 7. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 176 | 72 | 76 | 354 | 16 | 170 | 2 | 18 | 878 |
| | | 20.3 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 40.3 | 1.8 | 19.4 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 64.2 |
| | | 63.3 | 74.2 | 52.8 | 60.8 | 52.0 | 85.4 | 66.7 | 40.9 | |
| | | 12.9 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 25.9 | 1.2 | 12.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 102 | 25 | 68 | 228 | 10 | 29 | 1 | 26 | 489 |
| | | 20.9 | 5.1 | 13.9 | 46.6 | 2.0 | 5.9 | 0.2 | 5.3 | 35.8 |
| | | 36.7 | 25.8 | 47.2 | 39.2 | 50.0 | 14.6 | 33.3 | 59.1 | |
| | | 7.5 | 1.8 | 5.0 | 16.7 | 0.7 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 1.9 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 278 | 97 | 144 | 582 | 20 | 199 | 3 | 44 | 1367 |
| | | 20.3 | 7.1 | 10.5 | 42.6 | 1.5 | 14.6 | 0.2 | 3.2 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 66.58218 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 76. MEDIA ACCURACY BY SES

| SES | ACCINFO COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | NEWSPAPERS 1. | MAGAZINES 2. | RADIO 3. | TV 4. | OTHER 5. | NONE 6. | NEWSPAPER&TV 7. | NO RESPONSE 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 79 | 13 | 48 | 176 | 6 | 27 | 3 | 20 | 372 |
| | | 21.2 | 3.5 | 12.9 | 47.3 | 1.6 | 7.3 | 0.8 | 5.4 | 27.2 |
| | | 28.4 | 13.4 | 33.3 | 30.2 | 30.0 | 13.6 | 100.0 | 45.5 | |
| | | 5.8 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 12.9 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 1.5 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 125 | 35 | 62 | 271 | 6 | 67 | 0 | 16 | 582 |
| | | 21.5 | 6.0 | 10.7 | 46.6 | 1.0 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 42.6 |
| | | 45.0 | 36.1 | 43.1 | 46.6 | 30.0 | 33.7 | 0.0 | 36.4 | |
| | | 9.1 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 19.8 | 0.4 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 1.2 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 74 | 49 | 34 | 135 | 8 | 105 | 0 | 8 | 413 |
| | | 17.9 | 11.9 | 8.2 | 32.7 | 1.9 | 25.4 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 30.2 |
| | | 26.6 | 50.5 | 23.6 | 23.2 | 40.0 | 52.8 | 0.0 | 18.2 | |
| | | 5.4 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 9.9 | 0.6 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 278 | 97 | 144 | 582 | 20 | 199 | 3 | 44 | 1367 |
| | | 20.3 | 7.1 | 10.5 | 42.6 | 1.5 | 14.6 | 0.2 | 3.2 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 108.55575 WITH 14 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 77. READ ENVIRONMENTAL STORY BY AREA.

| AREA | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | READST: REA -TAK ES PAPER 1. | READ-DOE SN'T TAK 2. | TAKES-DI DN'T REA 3. | DNT-DID NOT READ 4. | E RESP 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0. | 77 | 39 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 142 |
| | | 54.2 | 27.5 | 15.5 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 10.8 |
| | | 14.7 | 34.8 | 5.2 | 1.7 | 0.0 | |
| | | 5.8 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 | |
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 320 | 43 | 297 | 155 | 16 | 831 |
| | | 38.5 | 5.2 | 35.7 | 18.7 | 1.9 | 63.1 |
| | | 61.0 | 38.4 | 69.6 | 66.8 | 76.2 | |
| | | 24.3 | 3.3 | 22.6 | 11.8 | 1.2 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 58 | 22 | 25 | 6 | 0 | 111 |
| | | 52.3 | 19.8 | 22.5 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 8.4 |
| | | 11.0 | 19.6 | 5.9 | 2.6 | 0.0 | |
| | | 4.4 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 70 | 8 | 83 | 67 | 5 | 233 |
| | | 30.0 | 3.4 | 35.6 | 28.8 | 2.1 | 17.7 |
| | | 13.3 | 7.1 | 19.4 | 28.9 | 23.8 | |
| | | 5.3 | 0.6 | 6.3 | 5.1 | 0.4 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 525 | 112 | 427 | 232 | 21 | 1317 |
| | | 39.9 | 8.5 | 32.4 | 17.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 180.74382 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 52

TABLE 78. SAW TV ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT BY AREA

| AREA | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | TVSTO SAW STORY 1. | DIDN'T SEE 2. | 3. | 4. | NO RESP 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0. | 61 | 67 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 142 |
| | | 43.0 | 47.2 | 9.2 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 10.8 |
| | | 10.1 | 10.3 | 36.1 | 0.0 | 4.2 | |
| | | 4.6 | 5.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | |
| CENTER CITY | 1. | 394 | 409 | 10 | 0 | 18 | 831 |
| | | 47.4 | 49.2 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 63.1 |
| | | 65.2 | 62.7 | 27.8 | 0.0 | 75.0 | |
| | | 29.9 | 31.1 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | |
| SUBURBAN | 3. | 62 | 38 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| | | 55.9 | 34.2 | 9.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 |
| | | 10.3 | 5.8 | 30.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 4.7 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| RURAL | 4. | 87 | 138 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 233 |
| | | 37.3 | 59.2 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 17.7 |
| | | 14.4 | 21.2 | 5.6 | 100.0 | 20.8 | |
| | | 6.6 | 10.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 604 | 652 | 36 | 1 | 24 | 1317 |
| | | 45.9 | 49.5 | 2.7 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 77.42144 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = -0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 52

TABLE 79. READ ENVIRONMENTAL STORY BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | READST COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | 1. READ-TAKES PAPER | 2. READ-DOES SN'T TAK | 3. TAKES-DI DN'T REA | 4. DNT-DID NOT.READ | 9. NO RESP | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 388 | 96 | 286 | 96 | 2 | 868 |
| | | 44.2 | 10.9 | 32.6 | 10.9 | 1.4 | 64.2 |
| | | 71.2 | 83.5 | 64.0 | 40.2 | 57.1 | |
| | | 28.4 | 7.0 | 20.9 | 7.0 | 0.1 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 157 | 19 | 161 | 143 | 9 | 489 |
| | | 32.1 | 3.9 | 32.9 | 29.2 | 1.8 | 35.8 |
| | | 28.8 | 16.5 | 36.0 | 59.8 | 42.9 | |
| | | 11.5 | 1.4 | 11.8 | 10.5 | 0.7 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 545 | 115 | 447 | 239 | 21 | 1367 |
| | | 39.9 | 8.4 | 32.7 | 17.5 | 1.5 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 90.74576 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 80. SAW TV ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT BY ETHNICITY

| ETHNIC | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | SAW STORY 1. | DIDN'T SEE 2. | 3. | 4. | NO RESP 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ANGLO | 1. | 410 | 422 | 30 | 0 | 20 | 878 |
| | | 46.7 | 48.1 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 64.2 |
| | | 65.8 | 61.9 | 63.3 | 0.0 | 64.0 | |
| | | 30.0 | 30.9 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 | |
| MEX-AMERICAN | 2. | 213 | 260 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 489 |
| | | 43.6 | 53.2 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 35.8 |
| | | 34.2 | 38.1 | 16.7 | 100.0 | 36.0 | |
| | | 15.6 | 19.0 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.7 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 623 | 682 | 36 | 1 | 25 | 1367 |
| | | 45.6 | 49.9 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.83544 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0433

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 81. READ ENVIRONMENTAL STORY BY SES.

| SES | READST<br>COUNT<br>ROW %<br>COL %<br>TOTAL % | READ-TAK ES PAPER 1. | READ-DOE SN'T TAK 2. | TAKES-DI ONT-DID REA 3. | NOT READ 4. | NO RESP. 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 95<br>25.5<br>17.4<br>6.9 | 20<br>5.4<br>17.4<br>1.5 | 116<br>31.2<br>26.0<br>8.5 | 133<br>35.8<br>55.6<br>9.7 | 8<br>2.2<br>38.1<br>2.6 | 372<br>27.2 |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 243<br>41.8<br>44.6<br>17.8 | 53<br>9.1<br>46.4<br>3.9 | 214<br>36.8<br>47.9<br>15.7 | 66<br>11.3<br>27.6<br>4.8 | 6<br>1.2<br>28.6<br>2.4 | 582<br>42.6 |
| HIGH | 3. | 207<br>50.1<br>38.0<br>15.1 | 42<br>10.2<br>36.5<br>3.1 | 117<br>28.3<br>26.2<br>8.6 | 40<br>9.7<br>16.7<br>2.9 | 7<br>1.7<br>33.3<br>2.5 | 413<br>30.2 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 545<br>39.9 | 115<br>8.4 | 447<br>32.7 | 239<br>17.5 | 21<br>1.5 | 1367<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 1'2.01025 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 82. SAW TV ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT BY SES

| SES | COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL % | TVSTO: SAW STOR DIDN'T SEE 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | NO RESP 9. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOW | 1. | 143 | 216 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 372 |
| | | 38.4 | 58.1 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 27.2 |
| | | 23.0 | 31.7 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 24.0 | |
| | | 10.5 | 15.8 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.4 | |
| MIDDLE | 2. | 257 | 303 | 11 | 1 | 10 | 582 |
| | | 44.2 | 52.1 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 42.6 |
| | | 41.3 | 44.4 | 30.6 | 100.0 | 40.0 | |
| | | 18.8 | 22.2 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.7 | |
| HIGH | 3. | 223 | 163 | 18 | 0 | 9 | 413 |
| | | 54.0 | 39.5 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 30.2 |
| | | 35.8 | 23.9 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 36.0 | |
| | | 16.3 | 11.9 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.7 | |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 623 | 682 | 36 | 1 | 25 | 1367 |
| | | 45.6 | 49.9 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 33.80672 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

## SECTION 8

## MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

In one sense, the ultimate goal of this research project is to understand the why's and who's of environmental attitudes. The previous sections have attempted to identify these attitudes from survey data. In this section, we turn to a different, and more powerful technique of analysis: multivariate analysis--specifically regression and factor analysis.

Multiple regression attempts to "predict" the dependent variable. In this case, we set variable IMPTPBSI (rating environmental problems as the most important) as the dependent variable. We then include the following list of independent variables:

INCOME
AREA (Center city/non-center city)
SES (Socioeconomic status)
WORKING (Employment status)
CARS (Ownership of automobiles)
HEALTH (State of respondents' health)
WCHORG (Membership in environmental organization)
MSTCONT (Industry as most contributing to pollution)
ATTMEET (Having attended environmental meeting)
AUTOEX (Willingness to spend above average to reduce auto emissions)
CNTH2O (Willingness to spend above average to reduce water pollution)
RNOISE (Willingness to spend above average to reduce noise)
TSH (Willingness to spend above average to reduce trash problems)
INCWREC (Willingness to spend above average to provide more recreation)

The data were dichotomized into presence/absence of the variable where necessary to allow us to treat them as interval data, suitable for use in multivariate analysis.

### REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Our first analysis consisted of a stepwise multiple regression with IMPTPBSI set as the dependent variable. The results are given in the following summary table (Table 83). The most important aspect of Table 83 is the column noted R SQUARE. This noted the amount of variance in the dependent variable (IMPTPBSI) accounted for by each succeeding step in the regression equation. As can be noted, willingness to spend above average in investing in additional recreational facilities entered the equation first and accounts for almost 9% of the variance in the dependent variable. No other variable

accounted for as much as 4% additional explanation of variance. The total amount of variance explained by the 16 steps in the regression equation is approximately 35%.

The column named BETA in Table 83 is also significant. BETA indicates the relationship between the dependent variable and the named independent variable. As can be seen, the BETA's for the first independent variable is both negative and fairly large. This indicates that there is a fairly strong inverse relationship between this variable (INEWREC) and the dependent variable (IMPTPBSI). In other words, as the willingness to spend above average to invest in additional recreational water facilities increases, ranking of environmental problems as the most important problem declines.

The expected high relationship between income and high SES on the one hand and willingness to rate environmental problems as the most important is not borne out by this data. INCOME enters the equation on step 14 and only explains an additional 0.1%, a very small figure. SES adds even less. The BETA's for both income and SES are quite small, and income is positive, while SES is negative.

FACTOR ANALYSIS

This section presents the results of an additional multivariative technique--factor analysis. One of the best uses of this technique is the identification of an underlying pattern or factor which is related to the variables under study. Factor analysis manipulates the variables so as to disclose patterns of relationships, if any, extant among them. In essence, a variable's factor loading can be taken as the correlation between that variable and the underlying factor which underpins the data. We present this analysis as a companion to the regression analysis presented above.

The factoring procedure used in this case is the Principal Factor with Iterations (PA2) for the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The results of the factor analysis are shown in Table 84. Using an eigenvalue of 1.0 as a criterion level, we see four factors emerge, accounting for 74.7% of the variance.

Factor One accounts for 29% of the variance, and is distinguished by high loadings of four of the willingness to spend above average for environmental quality variables. As a result, we have identified this factor as Environmental Quality. The only item of expenditures which does not load on this factor is INEWREC, willingness to spend above average on new recreational facilities. Additionally, there is a relatively high loading of the variable CARS, ownership of an automobile (.43 loading).

Factor Two accounts for an additional 20% of the variance. It is characterized by very high loadings of the SES and INCOME variables. Accordingly, it has been identified as the "high status" factor. There are modest negative loadings of ETHNIC (Mexican-American ethnicity) and willingness to spend for new recreational facilities (INEWREC). The negative loading of INEWREC) on this factor aids in confirming the pattern of data reported earlier.

Factor Three accounts for an additional 13.3% of the variance and is characterized by a high loading of the variable AREA (non-center city). A slight negative loading of unemployment (WORKING) is also featured on this factor. The ATTMEET variable loads at a moderate negative level on this factor. We have characterized this factor as "Suburban/Rural."

The final factor which emerges accounts for an additional 12.4% of the variance. We have entitled Factor Four as the anti-industry variable from its high loading of MSTCONT variable. Also loading very high on this factor is the SEX variable (female).

The factor analysis thus helps to confirm the general patterning of data reported earlier. The most significant finding of the factor analysis is the large relatively consistent loading that four of the willingness to spend for environmental quality variables have on the first factor. The major exception was spending for new recreational facilities.

TABLE 83. SUMMARY TABLE: RESULTS FROM MULTIPLE REGRESSION

THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, SPSS-10, RELEASE 7.01 (24-NOV-7?)                14-MAY-78        PAGE 17
FILE  NONAME - (CREATION DATE = 14 MAY-78)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * M U L T I P L E   R E G R E S S I O N * * * * * * * * * * * * * *   VARIABLE LIS
REGRESSION LIS

DEPENDENT VARIABLE   MPTPBS1

SUMMARY TABLE

| VARIABLE | MULTIPLE R | R SQUARE | RSQ CHANGE | SIMPLE R | B | BETA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ETHNIC | 0.41344 | 0.17093 | 0.17093 | -0.41344 | -0.32175180+01 | -0.46795 |
| TSH? | 0.54077 | 0.29238 | 0.12145 | -0.34058 | -0.63055600+00 | -0.2 666 |
| HCHOHS | 0.58368 | 0.34069 | 0.04831 | 0.29085 | 0.24384300+00 | 0.17426 |
| HSTCONT | 0.61269 | 0.37534 | 0.03465 | 0.27460 | 0.14754640+00 | 0.15007 |
| NEWREC | 0.63263 | 0.40022 | 0.02468 | 0.11100 | 0.47764220+00 | 0.15470 |
| ATTMEET | 0.64677 | 0.41831 | 0.01809 | 0.21116 | 0.53092340+00 | 0.15159 |
| CARS | 0.65716 | 0.43186 | 0.01355 | 0.02030 | 0.27746270+00 | 0.1?393 |
| AUTOEX | 0.66975 | 0.44858 | 0.01672 | -0.18224 | -0.34366780+00 | -0.1?471 |
| CNTH2? | 0.67794 | 0.45962 | 0.01104 | -0.22627 | -0.26532490+00 | -0.1?327 |
| INCOME | 0.67863 | 0.46054 | 0.00092 | 0.02761 | 0.18185930+00 | 0.14304 |
| SES | 0.68227 | 0.46277 | 0.00222 | 0.09049 | -0.48725740+00 | -0.1 112 |
| HNOISE | 0.68153 | 0.46444 | 0.00167 | -0.15575 | -0.15539750+00 | -0.0?448 |
| HEALTH | 0.68195 | 0.46505 | 0.00062 | 0.08825 | -0.52507410-01 | -0.0?755 |
| AREA? | 0.68232 | 0.46553 | 0.00047 | -0.21539 | 0.65411950-01 | 0.02598 |
| SEX | 0.68235 | 0.46559 | 0.00007 | -0.08651 | -0.55156210-01 | -0.0?957 |
| (CONSTANT) | | | | | 0.65596420+01 | |

TABLE 84. SUMMARY TABLE: RESULTS FROM FACTOR ANALYSIS

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

| | FACTOR 1 | FACTOR 2 | FACTOR 3 | FACTOR 4 | FACTOR 5 | FACTOR 6 | FACTOR 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IMPTPBS1 | 0.04589 | 0.45242 | 0.72965 | -0.07075 | -0.14225 | -0.03879 | -0.09719 |
| INCOME | 0.93852 | 0.04117 | -0.01392 | 0.05142 | 0.09061 | -0.02646 | 0.09194 |
| AREA | -0.01647 | 0.12200 | -0.42253 | 0.15542 | 0.02043 | 0.62770 | 0.00884 |
| SES | 0.91726 | -0.10584 | 0.21384 | 0.00687 | 0.10354 | 0.05315 | 0.03305 |
| ETHNIC | -0.24042 | 0.18842 | -0.78753 | -0.07622 | -0.00625 | 0.12682 | -0.04616 |
| HEALTH | -0.22891 | 0.42976 | -0.03696 | -0.34027 | 0.37665 | -0.16515 | 0.37839 |
| WCHORG | -0.27429 | 0.13954 | 0.48773 | -0.26135 | 0.42875 | -0.17633 | 0.01058 |
| MSTCONT | 0.01787 | 0.63205 | 0.07006 | -0.22277 | -0.01960 | 0.14766 | 0.10739 |
| ATTMEET | -0.03368 | 0.22245 | 0.07427 | 0.16872 | -0.02460 | -0.73292 | 0.19554 |
| AUTOEX | 0.04181 | -0.06364 | -0.10042 | 0.89114 | 0.02063 | -0.01742 | 0.09342 |
| CNTH2O | 0.09591 | -0.71030 | 0.07382 | -0.06898 | 0.00621 | 0.21220 | 0.18030 |
| RNOISE | 0.01117 | -0.24124 | 0.12239 | 0.54273 | 0.51467 | 0.05544 | -0.16469 |
| WORKNG | -0.26901 | 0.03533 | 0.04855 | -0.06712 | -0.67577 | -0.00427 | -0.00966 |
| CARS | 0.01218 | 0.06291 | 0.14551 | 0.28088 | -0.13119 | 0.53277 | 0.52998 |
| TSH | -0.02705 | -0.58411 | -0.11266 | 0.02609 | 0.50901 | 0.05719 | -0.02720 |
| INEWREC | -0.13204 | 0.07445 | 0.05931 | 0.01707 | 0.00296 | 0.14053 | -0.87859 |

TRANSFORMATION MATRIX

| | FACTOR 1 | FACTOR 2 | FACTOR 3 | FACTOR 4 | FACTOR 5 | FACTOR 6 | FACTOR 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FACTOR 1 | 0.49125 | -0.63906 | -0.18660 | 0.44197 | 0.21910 | 0.26818 | 0.01422 |
| FACTOR 2 | 0.62276 | 0.14122 | 0.66876 | -0.07075 | 0.12928 | -0.32196 | 0.13571 |
| FACTOR 3 | 0.42634 | 0.42390 | -0.27377 | 0.00346 | -0.48860 | 0.41123 | 0.39464 |
| FACTOR 4 | -0.12200 | 0.03812 | -0.26693 | -0.05958 | 0.50779 | -0.22912 | 0.77364 |
| FACTOR 5 | -0.26619 | 0.11406 | 0.22027 | 0.83021 | -0.28202 | -0.23617 | 0.20750 |
| FACTOR 6 | 0.24150 | 0.55813 | -0.39148 | 0.29765 | 0.41176 | -0.18904 | -0.42782 |
| FACTOR 7 | -0.21219 | 0.25691 | 0.41226 | 0.13059 | 0.43545 | 0.71506 | 0.03214 |

## SECTION 9

## CONCLUSIONS

What does all this mean? We noted in our introductory remarks that previous studies have provided us with information relating to environmental attitudes (see above, p. 2). These studies have indicated that a significant portion of the American community are aware of and concerned about the problems of a deteriorating environment, but the most recent studies (Dunlap, 1976; Buttel, 1974) have noted a decline in this public concern. Studies have indicated generally that people with higher SES levels are more sensitive to environmental problems and are more willing to act, or support action, to improve environmental conditions. Other studies have contended that: Americans believe the environment is deteriorating; Americans view environmental problems primarily in terms of water and air pollution; and most Americans rely on television and radio for information relating to environmental quality.

Our data support some of the above findings and do not support some of them. We do find, as recent studies have reported, much less interest in environmental problems than evidenced in 1960's and early 1970's. Fewer than three hundred respondents listed the environment among the three most important problems facing the nation.

We find also a relationship between SES and concern with the environment. The percentage of respondents in the high SES level who ranked environmental problems as most important is over twice that of the low SES respondents. Upper and middle level SES respondents generally were more aware of organizations dealing with environmental problems and had contacted public officials more frequently about environmental issues.

Our data support the belief that Americans view the environment as deteriorating. While about half of the respondents characterized present environmental conditions as "above average" and only one-fifth characterized it as "below average," when asked to predict environmental conditions five years hence, almost half believed the environment would be "below average" and only one-third believed it would be "above average."

Previous studies indicate that we view environmental problems primarily in terms of air and water pollution. Our study takes issue with the former contention. We found that our respondents identified the environment overwhelmingly in terms of both physical and social characteristics. It is noteworthy that the one environmental issue which stimulated the greatest cost response was the need for recreational areas (this response cut across

areas, ethnic, and SES groupings), a problem area related to both physical and social concepts. We also found strong responses to water pollution, but not to air pollution.

Previous studies also have noted that Americans derive most of their information relating to environmental issues from television and radio. Our research supports those studies which cite television as a major source. Not only did our respondents indicate that television was the primary news source, they also believed it to be the most accurate and unbiased news source. We found, however, that newspapers rather than radio, were the second most frequently cited information source.

In addition to these data which can be compared to existing studies, we have findings which themselves need to be tested by further inquiry.

We have suggestions of significant relationships between environmental attitudes and area, ethnicity, and SES. Our research indicates that concern with environmental problems decreases slightly as one moves away from the center city to the rural areas. Suburban residents also viewed the condition of the environment, both present and future, in more optimistic terms than respondents residing in the center city or rural areas. Rural residents are more pessimistic than center city and suburban residents about the future. This is somewhat of a surprise as one might hypothesize that those living closest to a deteriorating environment (i.e., inner city) would be more pessimistic about its future rather than those living in the areas (i.e., rural) where there is less pollution. In general, we found suburban respondents to be more actively involved with the environment than the other two area respondents.

Environmental studies often seemed to be a function of ethnicity. Mexican-Americans ranked environmental concerns slightly higher than Anglos. Mexican-Americans also perceived present and future environmental conditions in more pessimistic terms than Anglos. This concern and pessimism did not translate into political activism; more than twice as many Anglos as Mexican-Americans are members of organizations with an environmental orientation, and Anglos evidenced more knowledge of and activism in both public and private groups focusing on the environment.

Environmental attitudes also were influenced by the SES of respondents. While higher SES respondents seemed to be more aware of environmental problems, they also were more positive about present and future environmental conditions. Lower SES respondents were more pessimistic about the environmental conditions. Higher SES respondents seemed more interested in water pollution and less interested in recreation than the other groups. As has been indicated by various studies of political socialization, higher SES respondents were more knowledgeable about organizations which were involved with environmental problems and were more active than other respondents in dealing with these problems.

We have attempted in this study to add to the growing literature of environmental attitudes. The attitudes of our San Antonio sample indicate that concern for the environment is not a highly salient feature of their

attitudinal environment. Economic concerns, either unemployment or the state of the economy, virtually dominated the rankings of important public problems.

Of course, policy preferences of the public are not divorced from external influence. Our survey was conducted during a period of relative calm where environmental issues are concerned. The energy crisis of the early 1970's had dimmed and San Antonioans would not be immersed in their conflict over fuel supply for several months. Had our study been conducted a few months earlier or a few months later, our data might have generated different conclusions. However, this is a caveat which must accompany any study attempting to ascertain public opinion on a popular issue.

In sum, the environmental movement, as suggested by both Dunlap and Downs (Dunlap, 1975; Downs, 1972), seems to have gone aground on the rocky shoals of more immediate, pressing concerns--economic. While Buttel and Flynn may well be correct in their assessment that there is no inherent gross incompatibility between economic growth and environmental quality, it is apparent from our data that environmental concern is being pushed aside. As Springer and Costantini noted, "Currently, environmental concern appears more as a national wish than a hard political commitment. The growth and extent of this commitment, and the lines of political combat, will become clearer as the costs and benefits of environmental policy become more evident to decision-makers and the public." (Springer and Costantini, 1974: 217). Our data leads us to suggest that the "hard political commitment" is not likely to be forthcoming.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Banfield, Edward. 1970. The Unheavenly City. (Boston: Little Brown).

Bartell, Ted. 1973. "Political Orientations and Public Response to the Energy Crisis." Social Science Quarterly 57 (September).

Buttel, Frederick. 1976. "Social Science and the Environment: Competing Theories." Social Science Quarterly 57 (September).

Council on Environmental Quality. 1975. Environmental Quality, 1975. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office).

Crenson, Matthew. 1971. The Un-Politics of Air Pollution: A Study of Non-Decisionmaking in the Cities. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins).

Davies, J. Clarence, and Davies, Barbara S. 1975. The Politics of Pollution (2d ed.). Indianapolis: Pegusus.

Downs, Anthony. 1972. "Up and Down with Ecology." The Public Interest 28 (Summer).

Dunlap, Riley. 1976. "Decline in Public Support for Environmental Protection: Evidence from a 1970-74 Panel Study." Rural Sociology.

Gallup Organization, Inc. 1972. "The U.S. Public Considers Its Environment: Survey II." Poll conducted for the National Wildlife Federation (January).

Garvey, Gerald. 1972. Energy, Ecology, Economy. (New York: Norton).

Harris, Louis and Associates, Inc. 1970. The Public View of Environmental Problems in the State of Washington.

Jones, Charles O. 1975. Clean Air: The Politics and Policies of Pollution Control. (Pittsburgh: U. of Pittsburgh Press).

Kneese, Allen V. and Schultze, Charles L. 1975. Pollution, Prices and Public Policy. (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution).

McEvoy, James III. 1971. The American Public's Concern With the Environment: A Study of Public Opinion. (Davis, California: U. of California, Davis).

Rosenbaum, Walter. 1973. The Politics of Environmental Concern. (New York: Praeger).

Simon, Rita. 1971. "Public Attitudes Toward Population and Pollution." Public Opinion Quarterly 35 (Spring).

Springer, J. Fred and Constantini, Edward. 1974. "Public Opinion and the Environment: An Issue in Search of a Home," in Stuart Nagel, ed., Environmental Politics. (New York: Praeger).

Straayer, John A. 1974. "A Note of Environmental Caution," unpublished manuscript, Colorado State University.

Tognacci, L.N., et al. 1972. "Environmental Quality: How Universal is Public Concern?" Environment and Behavior 4 (March).

Viladas, J.M. 1973. The American People and Their Environment. (Greenwich, Conn.: J.M. Viladas Co.).

_____. 1973. "The American Public Considers Its Environment," report prepared for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

_____. 1974. "The Impact of the Fuel Shortage on Public Attitudes Toward the Environment," report for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Wenner, Lettie. 1976. One Environment Under Law: A Public Policy Dilemma (Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear).

# TECHNICAL REPORT DATA

(Please read Instructions on the reverse before completing)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 REPORT NO<br>EPA-600/5-79-004 | 2 | 3 RECIPIENT'S ACCESSION NO |
| 4 TITLE AND SUBTITLE<br>ATTITUDES TOWARD ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY: AREA, ETHNICITY AND SES | | 5 REPORT DATE<br>February 1979 (issuing date)<br>6 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE |
| 7 AUTHOR(S)<br>Jerry L. Polinard | | 8 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO |
| 9 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS<br>Pan American University<br>Edinburg, Texas 78539 | | 10 PROGRAM ELEMENT NO<br>1RW103<br>11 CONTRACT/GRANT<br>68-01-2683 |
| 12 SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS<br>Office of Monitoring and Technical Support<br>Office of Research and Development<br>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency<br>Washington, D.C. 20460 | | 13 TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED<br>Final<br>14 SPONSORING AGENCY CODE<br>EPA/600/14 |

15 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

16 ABSTRACT


In a study of the San Antonio, Texas, SMSA, this report indicates that, while respondents believe the environment is deteriorating, they do not believe environmental problems are among the most important faced by the Nation. Analysis of the data shows that:

1) there is a significant relationship between environmental attitude and area, ethnicity and SES;

2) concern with environmental quality and problems is greater among inner-city respondents than suburban respondents;

3) Mexican-Americans rank environmental concerns higher than Anglos no matter where they live although Anglos are more aware of and active in organizations that focus on the environment; and

4) high SES respondents were more aware of environmental problems and more actively involved in environmental organizations than middle or low SES respondents.


17 KEY WORDS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

| a DESCRIPTORS | b IDENTIFIERS/OPEN ENDED TERMS | c COSATI Field/Group |
|---|---|---|
| Pollution<br>Attitudes | Environmental Surveys | 05A<br>13B |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 18 DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT<br>Release to public<br>Unlimited | 19 SECURITY CLASS (This Report)<br>Unclassified<br>20 SECURITY CLASS (This page)<br>Unclassified | 21 NO. OF PAGES<br>127<br>22 PRICE |

Form 2220-1 (Rev. 4-77)