If the respondent had a yard, is he or she responsible for mowing it?

Yes 76%

No 24%
When mowing, does respondent put materials in a compost pile?

- No effort: 48%
- Medium effort: 28%
- Very strong effort: 24%
Chart 8
Percent More Respondents Would Pay for Environmentally Safe Products

Percentage of People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount More Willing to Pay</th>
<th>Percentage of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Willing</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991
Chart 9
Reasons for Doing Something about the Environment

Reason

Protect generations 4.24
Learn about problems 4.14
Too much pkg. matls. 4.01
Solve env. problems 3.89
Alternatives work ok 3.86
Cheap alternatives 3.59
Many alternatives 3.23
Fault of people 2.96
Family influences 2.83
Social pressure 2.63

*1-5 scale; 5=str. agree & 1=str. disagree
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991
Chart 10
Attitudes about Environmental Claims on Products

Claim

- Substantiate more: 4
- Not specific enough: 3.5
- Not easily believed: 3.2
- Confusing: 3.1

*1-5 scale; 5=str. agree & 1=str. disagree
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991
IV. CONSUMER ECOLOGICAL MARKET SEGMENTS

This section shows the results of the cross tabulations with the demographics and various other questions from the questionnaire. The results will ultimately be used to determine and describe consumer ecological market segments.

A. FACTOR ANALYSIS

Question 5 on the questionnaire was used to determine three different types of consumer market segments. This question concerned reading each respondent a list of behaviors some people were doing about the environment. The respondent was then required to rate each behavior according to the amount of effort his or her household was making on a scale from 1 to 5; where a 5 represented a very strong effort, and a 1 represented no effort.

Each sub-part of question 5 (all seventeen) was then loaded onto one of three factors. Thus, the three factors can be described in terms of consumer environmental behavior, according to which sub-part loaded onto which factor. The description of each factor is as follows:

1. Factor 1-Environmental Product Seekers

Factor 1 includes the behaviors of:

a. buying products in packages that can be refilled with the same product;
b. avoiding restaurants that put take-out food in styrofoam containers;
c. avoiding buying products from companies which one does not feel are environmentally responsible;
d. avoiding purchasing products in aerosol containers;
e. using biodegradable, low phosphate soaps and detergents;
f. reading labels on products to see if the contents are environmentally safe;
g. using cloth diapers or a diaper service compared to using disposable
diapers, if the respondent had a baby; and
h. avoiding purchasing products in plastic containers altogether.
In view of the types of behaviors included in this factor, the most appropriate
consumer ecological market name given to factor 1 was the “environmental
product seeker”.

2. Factor 2 - Recyclers
Factor 2 includes the behaviors of:
a. returning aluminum and/or glass containers of any form to a recycling
drop or center;
b. recycling newspapers;
c. sorting trash at home to separate recyclable material from garbage; and
d. buying products made from recycled material.
In view of the types of behaviors included in this factor, the most appropriate
consumer ecological market name given to factor 2 was the “recyclers”.

3. Factor 3 - Environmental Activists
Factor 3 includes the behaviors of:
a. contributing money to environmental groups, such as Sierra Club, Green
Peace, etc.;
b. cutting down on automobile use by using public transportation, car
pooling, etc.; and
c. writing letters to politicians expressing opinions on environmental issues.
In view of the types of behaviors included in this factor, the most appropriate
consumer ecological market segment name given to factor 3 was the
There were two sub-parts from question 5 which did not load onto any of the three factors. These included sorting trash at work to separate recyclable material from garbage and using biodegradable plastic garbage bags.

B. RESULTS OF THE CROSS TABULATIONS AGAINST THE DEMOGRAPHICS

Each of the demographic questions was cross-tabulated with the three factors in order to determine if any significant relationships existed between the two. In analyzing the cross-tabulations, four significant relationships were found.

1. The first significant relationship concerned the impact having children living at home had on factor 1, the environmental product seekers. It was found that as the propensity to have children living at home increased, so did the effort to seek environmental products.

   Table 1 shows that environmental product seekers were more likely to have children living at home. In other words, those respondents who had children living at home, made more of an effort to seek environmentally safe products than those respondents who did not have children living at home. Of those respondents who had children living at home, 40% of them made a moderate effort to seek environmentally safe products. However, of those respondents who did not have children living at home, only 32% of them made a moderate effort to seek environmentally safe products. It is important to note that the rating scale for factor 1, the environmental product seekers, was recoded from a 5 point scale to a 4 point scale as follows: 1=less than 1.5, 2=1.5-2.49, 3=2.5-3.49, 4=3.5-5.0. See Table 1.
2. The second significant relationship concerned the impact gender had on the environmental product seekers. For this relationship, it was determined that females made more of an effort to seek environmentally safe products than males did.

Table 2 illustrates the fact that females make more of an effort to seek environmentally safe products than males do. 31% of the female respondents made a low effort to seek environmentally safe products; whereas, 42% of the males made a low effort to seek environmentally safe products. Furthermore, 27% of the female respondents made a strong effort as compared to 19% of the male respondents. Once again, the rating scale for factor 1, the environmental product seekers, was recoded as follows: 1=less than 1.5, 2=1.5-2.49, 3=2.5-3.49, 4=3.5-5.0. See Table 2.

3. The next significant relationship pertained to the impact gender had on factor 2, the recyclers. In analyzing this relationship, it was determined that female respondents made more of an effort to recycle than the male respondents.

Table 3 illustrates this correlation. This can be shown in that 45% of the female respondents made a strong effort to recycle, while only 35% of the male respondents made a strong effort to recycle. Moreover, more male respondents, 11%, made no effort to recycle, and a lesser amount, 7%, of the female respondents made no effort to recycle. The rating scale for factor 2, the recyclers, was altered as follows: 1=less than 1.5, 2=1.5-2.49, 3=2.5-3.49, 4=3.5-5.0. See Table 3.

4. The last significant relationship concerned the impact the level of education completed had on factor 3, the environmental activists. According to this relationship, as the level of education completed increased, the effort to be environmentally active increased as well.

Table 4 illustrates the point that the more educated a person is, the more
likely the person is to be environmentally active. For example, 20% of those respondents with a post graduate degree made a strong effort to be environmentally active; whereas, only 6% of those respondents with some high school or less made a strong effort to be environmentally active. The rating scale for factor 3, the environmental activists, was recoded as follows: 1=less than 1.5, 2=1.5-2.49, 3=2.5-5.0. See Table 4.
Table 1
Impact of Having Children Living at Home on Effort to Seek Environmentally Safe Products
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

| Effort* |  
|---------|---------------------|
|         | percent             |
| Children Living at Home | No Effort | Low Effort | Moderate Effort | Strong Effort | Total |
| Yes     | 8                    | 27         | 40            | 25            | 100   |
| No      | 6                    | 38         | 32            | 24            | 100   |

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5-3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0= Strong Effort
Table 2
Impact of Gender on Effort to Seek Environmentally Safe Products
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5 = No Effort
1.5-2.49 = Low Effort
2.5-3.49 = Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0 = Strong Effort
Table 3
Impact of Gender on Effort to Recycle
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5 = No Effort
1.5-2.49 = Low Effort
2.5-3.49 = Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0 = Strong Effort
Table 4
Impact Level of Education Completed on Effort to be Environmentally Active
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education Completed</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School or Less</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Training or Some College</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year College Graduate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Degree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Moderate Effort
2.5- 5.0= Strong Effort
C. RESULTS FROM THE CROSS-TABULATIONS AGAINST THE FAMILIARITY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Question 1 from the questionnaire, concerning the respondents familiarity with environmental issues, was cross-tabulated with the three factors in order to determine if any significant relationships existed. The respondents were asked to rate their familiarity with environmental issues on a scale from 1 to 5. The scale corresponds with the amount of familiarity as follows: 1= not at all familiar, 2= slightly familiar, 3= moderately familiar, 4= familiar, and 5= very familiar. In analyzing the cross-tabulations, the familiarity with environmental issues had a significant impact on each of the three factors.

1. Factor 1-Environmental Product Seekers

According to the cross-tabulations, it was determined that as the familiarity with environmental issues increased, so did the effort to seek environmentally safe products. As found in Table 5, 10% of the respondents, who were not at all familiar with environmental issues, made no effort to seek environmentally safe products. In addition, only 13% of these same respondents made a strong effort to seek environmentally safe products. However, of those respondents who were very familiar with environmental issues, only 6% made no effort at all to seek environmentally safe products, and 46% made a strong effort.

The scale for the environmental product seekers, factor 1, was recoded from a 5 point scale to a 4 point scale as follows: 1= less than 1.5, 2= 1.5-2.49, 3= 2.5-3.49, and 4= 3.5-5.0. See Table 5.

2. Factor 2-Recyclers

According to the cross-tabulations for factor 2, the recyclers, it was determined that as the familiarity with environmental issues increased, so did the effort to
recycle. Consequently, of those respondents not at all familiar with environmental issues, 27% made no effort to recycle, and 20% made a strong effort to recycle. On the other hand, as the respondents became very familiar with environmental issues, a small percentage (3%) made no effort to recycle, and 73% made a strong effort to recycle.

Once again, the rating scale for the recyclers, factor 2, was 1= less than 1.5, 2= 1.5-2.49, 3= 2.5-3.49, and 4= 3.5-5.0. See Table 6.

3. Factor 3-Environmental Activists

According to the cross-tabulations for factor 3, the environmental activists, it was determined that as the familiarity with environmental issues increased, so did the effort to be environmentally active. With this in mind, of those respondents not at all familiar with environmental issues, 62% made no effort to be environmentally active. 27% of those respondents who were familiar with environmental issues, made a strong effort to be environmentally active.

The rating scale for factor 3, the environmental activists, was recoded from a 5 point scale to a 3 point scale as follows: 1= less than 1.5, 2= 1.5-2.49, and 3= 2.5-5.0. See Table 7.
Table 5
Impact of Familiarity with Environmental Issues on Effort to Seek Environmentally Safe Products
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity with Environmental Issues</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Familiar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Familiar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Familiar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Familiar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5-3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0= Strong Effort
Table 6
Impact of Familiarity with Environmental Issues on Effort to Recycle
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity with Environmental Issues</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Familiar</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Familiar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Familiar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Familiar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5-3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0= Strong Effort
Table 7
Impact of Familiarity with Environmental Issues on Effort to be Environmentally Active
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity with Environmental Issues</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Familiar</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Familiar</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Familiar</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Familiar</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Moderate Effort
2.5-5.0= Strong Effort
D. RESULTS FROM THE CROSS-TABULATIONS AGAINST THE IMPORTANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Question 2 on the questionnaire listed five environmental issues, which were solid waste, air pollution, water quality, ozone layer, and recycling. The respondents were asked to tell how important each issue was on a scale from 1 to 5; a 5 being extremely important, and a 1 being not at all important. Each of the issues were cross-tabulated with the three factors to see if any significant relationships existed. Several significant relationships were realized. Also, for the purpose of analyzation, the rating scale was further defined as follows: 2 = slightly important, 3 = moderately important, and 4 = important.

1. Factor 1-Environmental Product Seekers

It was determined that factor 1, the environmental product seekers, had significant relationships with all five issues. As the importance of each issue increased, so did the effort to seek environmentally safe products. Also, the rating scale for factor 1 was recoded from a 5 point scale to a 4 point scale as follows: 1 = less than 1.5, 2 = 1.5-2.49, 3 = 2.5-3.49, and 4 = 3.5-5.0.

a. Of those respondents who felt that solid waste was not at all important, 20% made no effort to seek environmentally safe products; whereas, none of the respondents made a strong effort to seek environmentally safe products. However, 31% of the respondents, who felt solid waste was an extremely important issue, made a very strong effort to seek environmentally safe products. See Table 8.

b. Of those respondents who stated that air pollution was not at all important, 25% made no effort to seek environmentally safe products, and none of the respondents made a strong effort to seek environmentally safe products.
However, 30% of those respondents who felt that air pollution was an extremely important issue, made a strong effort to seek environmentally safe products. See Table 9.

c. Of those respondents who stated that water quality was not an important environmental issue, 22% made no effort to seek environmentally safe products, and 11% made a strong effort. However, 28% of the respondents made a strong effort to seek environmentally safe products when they felt that water quality was an extremely important issue. See Table 10.

d. Of those respondents who stated that the ozone layer was not at all an important environmental issue, 18% made no effort to seek environmentally safe products, and only 12% made a strong effort. On the other hand, 33% of the respondents who felt that the ozone layer was an extremely important issue made a very strong effort to seek environmentally safe products, while only 5% made no effort. See Table 11.

e. Of those respondents who felt that recycling was not at all an important environmental issue, only 11% made a strong effort to seek environmentally safe products; whereas, as the level of importance increases to be extremely important, 34% made a strong effort. See Table 12.
Table 8
Impact of Level of Importance of Solid Waste on Effort to Seek Environmentally Safe Products
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance of Solid Waste</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5-3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0= Strong Effort
Table 9
Impact of Level of Importance of Air Pollution on Effort to Seek Environmentally Safe Products
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance of Air Pollution</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5-3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0= Strong Effort
Table 10
Impact of Level of Importance of Water Quality on Effort to Seek Environmentally Safe Products
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance of Water Quality</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5-3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0= Strong Effort
Table 11
Impact of Level of Importance of Ozone Layer on Effort to Seek Environmentally Safe Products
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance of Ozone Layer</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5-3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0= Strong Effort
### Table 12

Impact of Level of Importance of Recycling on Effort to Seek Environmentally Safe Products

490 Muncie and Anderson Residents

November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance of Recycling</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5-3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0= Strong Effort*
2. **Factor 2-Recyclers**

It was determined that factor 2, the recyclers, has a significant relationship with the environmental issues of solid waste, ozone layer, and recycling, and not with air pollution, and water quality. As the importance of solid waste, the ozone layer, and recycling increased, so did the effort to recycle.

a. 20% of the respondents who felt that solid waste was not at all an important environmental issue made a strong effort to recycle. However, as the level of importance of the environmental issue of solid waste increased to being extremely important, more respondents (49%) made a strong effort to recycle. See Table 13.

b. As far as the importance of the ozone layer as an environmental issue was concerned, 18% of those respondents who felt the issue was not at all important made no effort at all to recycle; whereas, 48% who felt the issue was extremely important made a strong effort to recycle. See Table 14.

c. When respondents considered the environmental issue of recycling to be not at all important, only 11% made a strong effort of recycle. However, more than half of those respondents, 57%, who stated that recycling was an extremely important environmental issue, made a strong effort to recycle. See Table 15.
Table 13
Impact of Level of Importance of Solid Waste on Effort to Recycle
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance of Solid Waste</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5 = No Effort
1.5-2.49 = Low Effort
2.5-3.49 = Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0 = Strong Effort
Table 14
Impact of Level of Importance of Ozone Layer on Effort to Recycle
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance of Ozone Layer</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 2.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5-3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0= Strong Effort
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Table 15
Impact of Level of Importance of Recycling on Effort to Recycle
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance of Recycling</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5-3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0= Strong Effort
3. **Factor 3-Environmental Activists**

It was determined that factor 3, the environmental activists, only had one significant relationship with the environmental issue of recycling. As the importance of the environmental issue of recycling increased, so did the effort to be environmentally active.

a. None of the respondents made a strong effort to be environmentally active as they felt the issue of recycling was not at all important. However, as the importance of recycling increased to be extremely important, 21% of the respondents made a strong effort to be environmentally active. See Table 16.
Table 16
Impact of Level of Importance of Recycling on Effort to be Environmentally Active
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance of Recycling</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Moderate Effort
2.5-5.0= Strong Effort
E. RESULTS FROM THE CROSS-TABULATIONS AGAINST ADEQUATE ENVIRONMENTALLY SAFE ALTERNATIVES AND SELF DIRECTED MOTIVATION

1. Factor Analysis

Before the cross-tabulations were completed, a factor analysis for question 7, motivations, was done. Two factors resulted from the factor analysis. Question 7 listed ten reasons that people may have been doing something about the environment. The respondents were asked to describe how much they agreed with each of the reasons on a scale from 1 to 5; a 5 being strongly agree, and a 1 being strongly disagree.

Each of the ten reasons was loaded onto one of the two factors. The description of each factor is as follows:

a. Factor 1-Adequate Environmentally Safe Alternatives

Factor 1 includes the motivations of:

1. I feel environmentally safe alternatives for many of the products I use are not too expensive;
2. I feel environmentally safe alternatives for many of the products I use do work just as well;
3. I feel environmentally safe alternatives for many of the products I use are easy to find.

In view of the types of motivations included in this factor, the most appropriate name given to factor 1 was “adequate environmentally safe alternatives”.
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b. **Factor 2-Self Directed Motivation**

Factor 2 includes the motivations of:

1. I feel social pressure to make changes in my lifestyle in order to help protect the environment;
2. I feel that people are at fault more than companies for environmental problems.

In view of the types of motivations included in this factor, the most appropriate name given to factor 2 was “self directed motivation”.

There were five motivational reasons which did not load onto either of the two factors. These included: my family asks me to purchase environmentally safe products; I feel that by purchasing environmentally safe products, I can help to solve environmental problems; I feel that by purchasing environmentally safe products, I am helping to protect future generations of our population; I feel it’s important to take time to learn more about problems facing our environment; and too much material is used in packaging products.

2. **Cross-Tabulations**

Each of the two newly determined factors was cross-tabulated with the original three consumer ecological market segment factors in order to determine if any significant relationships existed. All of the cross-tabulations were found to be significant; thus, there were six significant relationships realized.

a. **Factor 1-Adequate Environmentally Safe Alternatives Against Factor 1-Environmental Products Seekers**

This significant relationship concerned the impact how much people agreed that there were adequate environmentally safe alternatives had on the effort to seek environmentally safe products. It was found that as the level of agreement that there were adequate environmentally safe alternatives increased, so did the effort to
seek environmental products.

Table 17 shows this relationship. Of those respondents who strongly disagreed that environmentally safe alternatives were adequate, 16% made no effort to seek environmental products, and only 7% made a strong effort. However, of those respondents who strongly agreed that environmentally safe products were adequate, only 2% made no effort, and 47% made a strong effort. See Table 17.

b. Factor 1-Adequate Environmentally Safe Alternatives Against Factor 2-Recyclers

This significant relationship concerned the impact how much people agreed that there were adequate environmentally safe alternatives had on the effort to recycle. It was determined that as the level of agreement that there were adequate environmentally safe alternatives increased, so did the effort to recycle.

Table 18 shows this correlation. Of those respondents who strongly disagreed that there were adequate environmentally safe alternatives, 17% made no effort to recycle, and 21% made a strong effort. Of those respondents who strongly agreed that there were adequate environmentally safe alternatives, only 4% made no effort to recycle, and 57% made a strong effort. See Table 18.

c. Factor 1-Adequate Environmentally Safe Alternatives Against Factor 3-Environmental Activists

This significant relationship concerned the impact how much people agreed that there were adequate environmentally safe alternatives had on the effort to be environmentally active. It was determined that as the level of agreement that there were adequate environmentally safe alternatives increased, so did the effort to be environmentally active.

Table 19 displays this relationship. Of those respondents who strongly
disagreed that there were adequate environmentally safe alternatives, 62% made no effort to be environmentally active, and only 16% made a strong effort. However, as the respondents strongly agreed that there were adequate environmentally safe alternatives, 36% made no effort to be environmentally active, and 25% made a strong effort. See Table 19. It is important to note that the scale for factor 1-adequate environmentally safe alternatives, was recoded from a 5 point scale to a 4 point scale where 1 = strongly disagree (less than 2.5), 2 = disagree (2.5-3.49), 3 = agree (3.5-4.49), and 4 = strongly agree (4.5-5.0).
d. Factor 2-Self Directed Motivation Against Factor 1-Environmental Product Seekers

This significant relationship concerned the impact which the level of agreement in self directed motivation had on the effort to seek environmentally safe products. It was determined that as the level of agreement in self directed motivation increased, so did the effort to seek environmentally safe products.

Table 21 shows that of those respondents who disagreed with the idea of self directed motivation, 11% made no effort to seek environmentally safe products, and 16% made a strong effort. However, of those respondents who agreed with the idea, only 4% made no effort to seek environmentally safe products, and 35% made a strong effort. See Table 20.

e. Factor 2-Self Directed Motivation Against Factor 2-Recyclers

This significant relationship concerned the impact which the level of agreement in self directed motivation had on the effort to recycle. It was determined that as the level of agreement in self directed motivation increased, so did the effort to recycle.

Table 21 shows that of those respondents who disagreed with the concept of self directed motivation, 10% made no effort to recycle, and 34% made a strong effort. In contrast, of those respondents who agreed with the concept, 8% made no effort to recycle, and 54% made a strong effort effort. See Table 21.

f. Factor 2-Self Directed Motivation Against Factor 3-Environmental Activists

This significant relationship concerned the impact which the level of agreement in self directed motivation had on the effort to be environmentally active. It was determined that as the level of agreement in self directed motivation
increased, so did the effort to be environmentally active.

Table 22 shows that of those respondents who disagreed with the idea of self directed motivation, 57% made no effort to be environmentally active, and 10% made a strong effort. On the other hand, of those respondents who agreed with the idea, 38% made no effort to be environmentally active, and 20% made a strong effort. See Table 22. The scale for factor 2, self directed motivation, was recoded from a 5 point scale to a 3 point scale where 1= disagree (less than 2.5), 2= neither disagree or agree (2.5-3.49), 3= agree (3.5-5.0).
Table 17
Impact Level of Agreement of Adequate Environmentally Safe Alternatives on Effort to Seek Environmental Products
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5-3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0= Strong Effort
Table 18
Impact Level of Agreement of Adequate Environmentally Safe Alternatives on Effort to Recycle
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5 = No Effort
1.5-2.49 = Low Effort
2.5-3.49 = Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0 = Strong Effort
Table 19
Impact Level of Agreement of Adequate Environmentally Safe Alternatives on Effort to be Environmentally Active
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effort*</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5 = No Effort
1.5-2.49 = Moderate Effort
2.5-5.0 = Strong Effort
Table 20
Impact Level of Agreement of Self Directed Motivation on Effort to Seek Environmental Products
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Disagree or Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5- 3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5- 5.0= Strong Effort
Table 21
Impact Level of Agreement of Self Directed Motivation on Effort to Recycle
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Low Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Disagree or Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5= No Effort
1.5-2.49= Low Effort
2.5-3.49= Moderate Effort
3.5-5.0= Strong Effort
Table 22
Impact Level of Agreement of Self Directed Motivation on Effort to be Environmentally Active
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Disagree or Agree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5 = No Effort
1.5-2.49 = Moderate Effort
2.5-5.0 = Strong Effort
F. RESULTS FROM THE CROSS-TABULATIONS AGAINST ATTITUDES

Question 8 from the questionnaire pertained to the opinions respondents had concerning current environmental issues. The respondents were to tell how much they agreed with each issue on a scale from 1 to 5, a 5 being strongly agree, and 1 being strongly disagree. The current environmental issues were as follows:

*I am confused with environmental claims on product packages;
*I have difficulty in believing environmental claims for specific products;
*Environmental claims on products are not specific enough;
*Companies need to substantiate more the environmental claims for their products.

Since the issues are related, they were combined to form one factor which has been termed “skepticism for environmental claims on products”. When this factor was cross-tabulated against the three consumer ecological market segment factors, only one significant relationship resulted.

1. Factor 3-Environmental Activists

It was determined that factor 3, the environmental activists, has a significant relationship with the respondents skepticism for environmental claims on products. As the skepticism increased, so did the effort to be environmentally active.

Table 23 shows that those respondents who strongly disagreed with skepticism for environmental claims, 53% made no effort to be environmentally active, and 11% made a strong effort. Of those respondents who strongly agreed with the skepticism for environmental claims, 41% made no effort, and 27% made a strong effort to be environmentally active. The rating scale for factor 3 was also recoded from a 5 point scale to a 3 point scale where 1= strongly disagree (less than 1.5), 2= disagree (1.5-2.49), 3= agree (2.5-3.49), and 4= strongly agree (3.5-5.0).
Table 23
Impact of Skepticism for Environmental Claims on Products on Effort to be Environmentally Active
490 Muncie and Anderson Residents
November 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>Moderate Effort</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale
Less Than 1.5 = No Effort
1.5-2.49 = Moderate Effort
2.5-5.0 = Strong Effort
V. CONCLUSIONS

This final section of the study summarizes the results from the frequency distribution and the cross tabulations. In addition, a recommended marketing mix for businesses, manufacturers, and marketers is described.

A. SUMMARY OF THE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

The following is a summary of the frequency distribution, which was a collection of all the responses from the questionnaire.

1. Demographics
   a. 75% of the respondents were female and 25% were male.
   b. 27% of the respondents were within the age bracket of 35-49.
   c. More people (23%) made an annual household income before taxes of under $15,000.
   d. Most of the respondents, 35%, were high school graduates, whereas, only 9% of the respondents had obtained a post graduate degree,
   e. The majority, or 60%, of the respondents were married.
   f. Of those respondents who were married, 48% had both spouses working outside of the home, and 52% did not.
   g. More respondents (61%) did not have children living at home

2. Awareness
   a. Most of the respondents, 79%, were somewhat familiar with environmental issues.
   b. The environmental issues of water quality, air pollution,
recycling, solid waste, and ozone layer were of almost equal importance to the respondents.

c. When thinking of an environmentally safe company, 37% did not know of one, and 4% answered McDonald's.

d. 47% of the respondents could not recall seeing any labels on packages which say the product is environmentally safe.

3. Behaviors

a. Respondents made the most effort to return aluminum and/or glass containers of any form to a recycling center. In addition, respondents made the least effort to write letters to politicians expressing opinions on environmental issues.

b. 76% of those respondents who had a yard were responsible for mowing it, and of these people, 48% made no effort to put the materials in a compost pile.

4. Motivations

a. 30% of the respondents were willing to pay an additional 5% for environmentally safe products.

b. Respondents agreed that purchasing environmentally safe products to help protect further generations was the most important reason for doing something about the environment. Social pressure to make changes in lifestyles in order to help protect the environment was the least important reason.

5. Attitudes

Respondents agreed most with the statement that companies need to substantiate the environmental claims for their products more.
B. SUMMARY OF THE CROSS-TABULATIONS

Before the cross-tabulations were done, a factor analysis of question 5 concerning environmental behaviors was computed. Three factors, otherwise known as consumer ecological market segments were determined. These three factors were given names based on the types of behaviors which loaded onto each factor. The three factors are: factor 1-environmental product seekers; factor 2-recyclers; and factor 3-environmental activists. Each of the three factors was then cross tabulated against the demographics, the familiarity with environmental issues, the importance of environmental issues, the two factors from question 7 concerning adequate environmentally safe alternatives and self directed motivation, and the factor from question 8 concerning skepticism for environmental claims in order to further describe the three consumer ecological market segments.

1. Factor 1-Environmental Product Seekers
   a. They are more likely to have children living at home.
   b. Environmental product seekers are usually female.
   c. They are familiar with environmental issues.
   d. They feel the environmental issues of solid waste, air pollution, water quality, the ozone layer, and recycling are important.
   e. As the respondents' level of agreement increases that there are adequate environmentally safe alternatives, they make more of an effort to seek them.
   f. They believe that they have self directed motivation which helps them to seek environmentally safe products.

2. Factor 2-Recyclers
   a. They are more likely to be female.
b. As the recyclers become more familiar with environmental issues, they are more prone to recycle.

c. They feel the environmental issues of solid waste, the ozone layer, and recycling are important.

d. The recyclers strongly agree that there are adequate environmentally safe alternatives more than the environmental product seekers or the environmental activists.

e. They believe they have self directed motivation to recycle.

3. **Factor 3-Environmental Activists**

a. They are well-educated.

b. They are familiar with environmental issues.

c. They feel the environmental issue of recycling is important.

d. As the level of agreement that there are adequate environmentally safe products increases, so does their effort to be environmentally active.

e. They agree there is self directed motivation to be environmentally active.

f. As the environmental activists become more skeptical about environmental claims on products, they tend to become more environmentally active.

C. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The general recommendations for this study pertain to the 4 P’s in the marketing mix, which include product, price, promotion, and place (distribution).
want environmentally safe products. With this in mind, businesses, manufacturers, and marketers need to continue their efforts to make products safe for the environment. For example, they can make product containers recyclable, make them refillable, reduce or delete materials within the products that are harmful to the environment, and reduce product packaging. Along with continuing the present efforts to do the aforementioned items, they should conduct research in order to offer more environmentally safe products or alternatives.

2. **Price**

As determined in the study, consumers are willing to pay an additional 5-10% for environmentally safe products. Consequently, if the businesses, manufacturers, and marketers need to raise the prices of their products in order to be able to offer environmentally safe products, the consumers will be willing to pay the new prices. This will give the businesses, manufacturers, and marketers an incentive to offer environmentally safe products as they will be satisfying consumers’ wants while still maintaining a profit.

3. **Promotion**

Since consumers are slightly skeptical about companies environmental claims, the companies need to do much work in the area of promotion in order to remedy this problem. They need to be honest in their environmental claims. In addition, they need to be able to substantiate their claims. Also, it is imperative that they make their claims specific so as not to confuse or mislead the consumer. Finally, the companies need to make the consumer aware, perhaps through the different forms of media, of their efforts to help improve the environment.
4. **Place (Distribution)**

It is important for the companies to make the environmentally safe products or alternatives available to everyone.

Hopefully, if the consumers, businesses, manufacturers, and marketers work together, a cleaner and safer environment will result.
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Sample No. __________  
Class Time ________ 11:00 (1)  
Team No. __________ 2:00 (2)  
City: __________ Muncie  
Telephone Interview

**Sample:** 506 residents of the Muncie/Anderson community; +/- 3.9% sampling error.

**Date:** November 1991

**Objectives:**
1. Determine awareness of environmental issues/concerns.
2. Determine ecological practices/behaviors.
3. Determine motivations for environmental practices.
4. Determine ecological market segments based upon consumer behavior.

**Screener**

Are you the person responsible for most of the grocery shopping in your household?

___ yes - CONTINUE WITH SURVEY AND COMPLETE.  
___ no - ASK FOR PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR GROCERY SHOPPING.

IF THE PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR MOST OF THE GROCERY SHOPPING IS NOT HOME, ARRANGE A CALL-BACK TIME.

**Meet age quotas:** SEE Q11.

**Awareness**

Q1. ___ To begin with, how familiar are you overall with environmental issues on a scale from 1 to 5, where a 5 is very familiar and a 1 is not at all familiar? IF RESPONDENT SAYS "I DON'T KNOW", CODE 0.

**Behaviors**

Q2. How important do you feel each of the following environmental issues are on a scale from 1 to 5, where a 5 is extremely important and a 1 is not at all important. CODE 0 IF RESPONDENT SAYS "I DON'T KNOW."

A. ___ solid waste  
B. ___ air pollution  
C. ___ water quality  
D. ___ ozone layer  
E. ___ recycling

Q3. When you think of companies being environmentally responsible, what company do you think of first?  

A. Second?  
B. None  
C. Other... IF THE RESPONDENT SAYS "NONE" OR "I DON'T KNOW," RECORD THE WORD(S).

Q4. Do you recall seeing any labels on packages that say the product is environmentally safe within the last two weeks?

___ yes (2)  
___ no (1)  
___ don't recall (0)

IF YES, what was the most recent product?

________________________ BRAND NAME  
________________________ PRODUCT TYPE

Q5. I am going to read you a list of things some people are doing about the environment. After I read each item, tell me how much of an effort your household is making on a scale from 1 to 5. A rating of 5 would be a very strong effort and a 1 would be no effort. IF RESPONDENT SAYS "I DON'T KNOW," CODE 0.

A. Return aluminum and/or glass containers of any form to a recycling drop or center.  
B. Recycle newspapers.  
C. Sort trash at home to separate recyclable material from garbage.  
D. Sort trash at work to separate recyclable material from garbage.  
E. Buy products made from recycled materials.  
F. Buy products in packages that can be refilled with the same product.  
G. Avoid restaurants that put take-out food in styrofoam containers.  
H. Use biodegradable plastic garbage bags.  
I. Avoid buying products from companies which you do not feel are environmentally responsible.  
J. Contribute money to environmental groups such as...
Q6. Motivations

There wouldn't be willing to pay a higher price. (1)

I wouldn't be willing to pay a higher price. (1)

Q7. There are several reasons that you may be doing something about the environment. Please tell me how much you agree with each of these reasons on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 is strongly agree and 1 is strongly disagree. IF RESPONDENT SAYS "I DON'T KNOW." CODE 0 IF THE RESPONDENT SAYS "I DON'T KNOW."

A. My family asks me to purchase environmentally safe products.

B. I feel that by purchasing environmentally safe products I can help to solve environmental problems.

C. I feel social pressure to make changes in my lifestyle in order to help protect the environment.

D. I feel that people are at fault more than companies for environmental problems.

E. I feel by purchasing environmentally safe products, I am helping to protect future generations of our population.

F. I feel environmentally safe alternatives for many of the products I use are not too expensive.

Q8. Attitudes

A. I am confused with environmental claims on product packages.

B. I have difficulty in believing environmental claims for specific products.

C. Environmental claims on product labels are not specific enough.

D. Companies need to substantiate more the environmental claims for their products.

Q9. Demographics

In closing, I have only a few questions to ask you about yourself in order to be sure we have all types of opinions represented in this survey.

Q10. Do you and your spouse both work outside of the home?

Q11. In what age bracket do you fall? READ

Q12. Do you have children living at home?
C. Total number of children.

Q13. Thinking politically, how would you describe your general outlook, as very conservative, moderately conservative, middle-of-the-road, moderately liberal, or very liberal?

- very conservative (1)
- moderately conservative (2)
- middle-of-the-road (3)
- moderately liberal (4)
- very liberal (5)
- undecided (0) DO NOT READ

Q14. What level of education have you completed? READ

- some high school or less (1)
- high school graduate (2)
- vocational training or some college (3)
- four-year college graduate (4)
- post graduate degree (5)

Q15. What is your current total annual household income before taxes? READ

- under $15,000 (1)
- $15,000 - $24,999 (2)
- $25,000 - $34,999 (3)
- $35,000 - $44,999 (4)
- $45,000 - $54,999 (5)
- over $55,000 (6)

Q16. RECORD THE GENDER OF THE RESPONDENT.

- male
- female

Many thanks for your cooperation!!

CALLING LOG

*** MAKE THREE (3) ATTEMPTS IN DIFFERENT TIME PERIODS WITH ORIGINAL TELEPHONE NUMBER BEFORE GOING TO NEXT NUMBER IN THE TELEPHONE DIRECTORY FOR THIS SAMPLE NUMBER. RECORD RESULTS BELOW.

** REPEAT ABOVE PROCESS WITH NEW NUMBER AND RECORD RESULTS BELOW, AND SAME IF NOT INTERESTED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone Number</th>
<th>First Attempt</th>
<th>Second Attempt</th>
<th>Third Attempt</th>
<th>Disconnected</th>
<th>Not Interested</th>
<th>Completed Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Day interview complete
Date interview complete
Time Interview completed morning (9:00 - 11:59) Afternoon Evening (7:00 - 9:00) (12:00 - 5:59)

NO SUNDAY CALLING!

My below signature is to verify the above calling log is correct and that I personally conducted the above indicated telephone interview with the properly selected person. I further understand that falsification of any interview will result in a grade of F for the class.

Signed __________________________

Name (print) ______________________