



RESEARCH REPORT

FIELD

RESEARCH

CORPORATION

MARKETING AND PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

**A SURVEY OF CALIFORNIA
CONSUMERS ON WASTE MANAGEMENT
AND PREVENTION ISSUES**

conducted for
**California Integrated Waste Management
Board and DDB Needham Advertising**

Post-Advertising Wave Report

FIELD

RESEARCH

CORPORATION

MARKETING AND PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Table of Contents

Introduction	i
Survey Highlights	ii
Main Findings	
1. Top-of-Mind Types of Trash Causing Problems for the Environment	1
2. Ratings of 17 Types of Garbage as Causes of Trash Problems in California	3
3. Perceived Importance of Reducing the Amount of Household Garbage	5
4. Specific Ways of Reducing One’s Own Household Garbage	7
5. Satisfaction with Community Efforts to Reduce Residential Garbage Produced	9
6. Things Communities are Doing to Encourage Residential Garbage Reduction Efforts	11
7. Things Consumers Dislike About their Community’s Efforts to Encourage Residential Garbage Production	13
8. Awareness of Advertising and News Stories About Garbage or Trash Problems	15
9. Perceived Impact that Shopping, Personal Habits Have on the Environment	17
10. Regularity of Doing Activities that Can Impact the Environment	19
11. Factors Considered when Deciding Which Grocery Products to Buy	21
12. Familiarity With, Expense of Products Made from Recycled Materials	23
13. Perceptions about Quality of Recyclables and Reasons for Feeling this Way	25
14. Perceived Impact that Buying Recyclable Products and Products with Less Packaging Has on Amount of Trash Produced	27
15. Likelihood of Buying Products Billed as “Environmentally Safe or Friendly”	29
16. Reliability of Information Sources About Environmental Safety Claims	31
Appendices	
Survey Methodology	A-1
Survey Materials	following

Introduction

This report presents the findings from a statewide survey of California consumers regarding waste management and prevention issues. This is the second wave of a pre-post set of surveys conducted for the California Integrated Waste Management Board and its agency, DDB Needham.

Both surveys were conducted by Field Research Corporation, an independent marketing and public opinion research organization. Interviewing for the post-wave survey was conducted by means of computer-assisted telephone interviewing among a random sample of 1,108 California adults age 18 or older who reported that they do most of the grocery shopping for their household. Interviews were completed in English or Spanish between May 20 and June 18, 1996 by professionally trained interviewers working from Field Research's central location telephone interviewing facilities located in San Francisco.

The consumer sample was drawn using a random digit dialing methodology, so that all telephone households within the telephone operating prefixes of California were given an equal chance of being selected for the survey. All contact attempts were made during the late afternoon and evening hours on weekdays and throughout the day on weekends.

A more detailed description of the survey methodology and a hardcopy version of the survey questionnaire are included in the appendix section of this report.

Survey Highlights

Types of Garbage Causing Greatest Environmental Problems

- When asked which types of garbage or trash are causing the greatest problems for the environment, over a third (35%) of California consumers cite plastics or plastic containers. Other frequently mentioned items include paper products (17%), non-recyclable products (16%), and disposable diapers (11%).
- Slightly smaller proportions in the post-wave survey volunteer plastics/plastic packages (Δ -8), cans (Δ -6) and disposable diapers (Δ -4) as things that cause environmental problems.
- When asked to individually assess different types of garbage as causes of trash problems for the state, nearly two thirds (63%) of consumers rate disposable diapers as causing highly serious problems. Another 57% say that junk mail or catalogs pose a serious threat, and about four in ten say that various plastic products cause serious garbage problems in California.
- The proportions rating disposable diapers and junk mail catalogs as highly serious was slightly smaller in the post-wave survey.

Efforts to Reduce the Amount of Household Garbage

- Two-thirds (66%) of California consumers believe that it is very important to reduce the amount of garbage that their own household produces, while about a quarter (24%) feel this is moderately important. Just 8% say this is only slightly or not at all important.
- Over half (54%) of California consumers mention recycling when asked to volunteer things that they could do to reduce garbage levels in their own households.
- When asked about their level of satisfaction with local efforts to encourage reduction of the amount of garbage produced, about a quarter (23%) of consumers feel very satisfied, while 44% are moderately satisfied, and 26% are either not too or not at all satisfied with such efforts. Among those who are at least moderately satisfied, curbside recycling and provision of recycling bins are the most frequently cited reasons for feeling this way. Those dissatisfied with local garbage reduction efforts mention a lack of recycling programs and lack of public awareness most frequently.

- The proportion of customers satisfied with local efforts to encourage residential garbage reduction who mention recycling bins or containers as something their city or community does has decreased ($\Delta-7$) since the pre-wave study, while the proportion volunteering regular garbage pickup has increased ($\Delta+5$). Dissatisfied consumers were somewhat less likely in the post-wave survey to say that they feel this way because people do not care ($\Delta-7$).

Awareness of Advertising and News Stories about garbage problems

- Six in ten (59%) consumers report having seen or heard news articles or stories relating to garbage or trash problems in the past year, with 42% recalling accounts of specific educational information about garbage reduction.
- Half of the post-wave respondents (50%) had seen or heard garbage or trash-related advertising in the past year, while about one in three (34%) recalled ads containing information on ways to reduce garbage/trash problems.
- Awareness of garbage/trash centered stories, articles, and advertising decreased slightly since the pre-wave survey.

Individual actions that can impact the environment

- Nearly three quarters of consumers believe that separating plastics, metals, and paper products for recycling can have a major impact on the environment. About two in three also feel that buying products in packages that can be recycled, removing one's name from unwanted mailing lists, reusing plastic or paper bags, and using a reusable coffee cup would have a high impact.
- About three-quarters of consumers say they regularly perform environmentally-friendly activities such as reusing coffee cups, plastic or paper bags, and separating out tin, steel and aluminum containers from their garbage.
- Other activities regularly undertaken by large majorities of consumers include separating glass and plastic containers, reusing food storage containers, being efficient when using paper and reusing gift bags, boxes and wrapping paper.
- The proportion of consumers who feel that using paper efficiently has a high impact on the environment has increased ($\Delta+4$) since the pre-wave survey. In addition, the proportion of consumers who say they regularly remove their names from unwanted mailing lists (a method of reducing paper waste) has

increased ($\Delta+4$), although a slightly smaller proportion reports using a reusable coffee cup ($\Delta-5$).

Perceptions about products made from recycled materials

- Just 15% of consumers say they are very familiar with products made from recycled materials, while 53% are moderately familiar, and 32% are only slightly or not familiar with such products.
- Most (44%) consumers feel that recyclable products cost about the same as other comparable products. The proportions who say that recyclable products cost more (22%) is about equal to those who feel they cost less (23%).
- There has been a significant increase ($\Delta+5$) in the proportion of those who believe that recyclable products are less expensive than others since the pre-wave survey was conducted.
- The large majority of consumers (78%) believes the quality of products made from recycled materials is about the same as other products. Most who feel this way say this is because they observe no real differences when using them. However, the proportion who cited this reason in the post wave survey declined slightly ($\Delta-4$) from the pre-wave survey.

Perceived impact of buying recyclable products and products with less packaging on amount of trash produced

- One in four consumers in both the pre and post-wave surveys felt that buying recyclable products could have a major impact on the amount of garbage produced in their community. More than a third (37%) reported that such activities would have a moderate impact, while 34% say it would have little or no impact. These proportions have not changed significantly since the pre-wave survey.

Likelihood of buying “environmentally safe or friendly” products

- More than three quarters of those interviewed (77%) in the post-wave survey claim that, all other things being equal, they would be more likely to buy products advertised as “environmentally safe or friendly”.
- This is similar to what was found in the pre-wave survey.

Reliability of information sources about environmentally safe products

- Non-profit environmental protection agencies and independent scientists from universities or laboratories are seen by eight in ten consumers as being reliable sources of information about environmental product claims.
- About three-quarters feel that local garbage or trash collection agencies (76%) or teachers in the local schools (76%) are reliable sources, while 69% say this in regard to state or local government agencies. Only half of consumers believe that product manufacturers are very or somewhat reliable information sources.
- Since the pre-wave survey the proportion of consumers who feel state or local government agencies are very or somewhat reliable sources of information with regard to environmental safety claims increased five points.

MAIN FINDINGS

1. Top-of-Mind Types of Trash Causing Problems for the Environment

California consumers in the pre and post-wave surveys were asked to volunteer specific types of garbage and trash problems they felt were causing the greatest problems for the environment. Comments were recorded verbatim during the interview and later coded into general categories of purpose.

- Garbage from plastics or plastic containers is by far the most frequently cited (35%) as causing the greatest problems for the California environment, a finding similar to results of the pre-wave study.
- Paper products including cardboard packaging (17%) and unspecified non-recyclable materials (16%) were mentioned next most often.
- Other products that were volunteered less frequently in the post-wave survey include disposable diapers (11%), metal containers such as aerosol or aluminum cans (9%), motor oil (9%), chemicals and paints (8%), and litter (8%).
- While none of the specific garbage products were mentioned more frequently in the post-wave survey, there is greater overall variation in the types of responses volunteered and in the comments which receive less than 2% mention. Slightly smaller proportions of consumers in the post-wave survey mention plastics/plastic packages (Δ -8), cans (Δ -6) and disposable diapers (Δ -4).

Table 1
Types of Trash Causing
Greatest Problems to California Environment
(top-of-mind volunteered comments)

	<u>Pre-Wave Survey</u> %	<u>Post-Wave Survey</u> %
Plastics/plastic packages	43	35
Paper products/cardboard packaging	20	17
Cans (aluminum, tin, metal, aerosol, etc.)	15	9
Disposable diapers	15	11
Non-recyclables (unspecified)	14	16
Toxic wastes	10	7
Motor oil	10	9
Chemicals/paints	9	8
Styrofoam	8	9
Litter	7	8
Glass products/glass bottles	6	3
Food scraps	5	6
Newspapers/magazines	3	3
Containers (unspecified)	3	4
Grass clippings/yard waste	2	1
Tires	2	1
Furniture/household appliances	2	1
Junk mail/catalogs	2	1
Other mentions (less than 2% each)	9	15
Don't know/no answer	10	14
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

(Adds to more than 100% due to multiple mentions)

2. Ratings of 17 Types of Garbage as Causes of Trash Problems in California

Respondents in both surveys were read a list of 17 different types of garbage and asked to rate on a 10-point scale the seriousness of these items as a cause of trash problems in California. Table 2 opposite shows the ranking of these items by those who gave a highly serious score of 8, 9, or 10.

- In the post-wave survey, nearly two-thirds (63%) of California consumers rate disposable diapers as a highly serious cause of trash problems in the state. More than half of all respondents also said that junk mail or catalogs (57%) and plastic packaging (51%) were highly serious causes.
- Large pluralities of consumers reported that plastic wraps (43%), plastic cups and utensils (43%), single serving containers (40%) and plastic bottles (37%) are highly serious causes, and about a third (33%) rated household items such as furniture and appliances as a highly serious cause of trash problems in California.
- Nearly three in ten respondents rated items such as magazines (29%), tin cans (29%), and paper and cardboard packaging (29%) as highly serious causes of trash problems. About a quarter rated paper plates and napkins (25%), newspapers (24%) and glass bottles (24%) this high.
- Less frequently rated as a highly serious cause of trash problems were food scraps (19%), aluminum cans or containers (18%), and grass clippings such as yard waste (15%). The proportions of consumers giving highly serious ratings to disposable diapers (Δ -4) and junk mail or catalogs (Δ -4) were slightly lower in the post-wave survey than in the pre-wave survey. None of the other types of garbage shows statistically significant changes in the post-wave survey.

Table 2
Perceived Seriousness of 17 Items as
Causes of Garbage or Trash Problems in California
(% rating each as highly serious causes*)

	<u>Pre-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u> %	<u>Post-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u> %
Disposable diapers	67	63
Junk mail or catalogs	61	57
Plastic packaging	51	51
Plastic wraps	45	43
Plastic cups, utensils	45	43
Individual, single serving containers	40	40
Plastic bottles	39	37
Furniture, appliances, household items	36	33
Magazines	32	29
Tin cans	31	29
Paper and cardboard packaging	28	29
Newspapers	27	24
Glass bottles	27	24
Paper plates, paper napkins	24	25
Aluminum cans, containers	21	18
Food scraps	17	19
Grass clippings, yard waste	15	15
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

* highly serious defined as those rating each item as an 8, 9, or 10 on a 10-point scale

3. Perceived Importance of Reducing the Amount of Household Garbage

- A large majority of two-thirds (66%) of all California consumers surveyed believe that reducing the amount of garbage that their own household produces is very important.
- About a quarter (24%) said reducing their garbage output is moderately important, and 5% felt it was only slightly important. Just 3% said that reducing the amount of garbage their household produces is not important.
- These proportions have not changed significantly since the pre-wave survey.

Item	(a)	(b)
Glass, plastic, paper, metal	66	66
Food scraps	24	24
Aluminum cans, containers	5	5
Paper plates, paper napkins	3	3
Glass bottles	24	24
Newspapers	24	24
Paper and cardboard packaging	28	28
The cans	31	31
Magazines	32	32
Furniture, appliances, household items	36	36
Plastic bottles	39	39
Individual, single serving containers	40	40
Plastic cups, utensils	42	42
Plastic packaging	51	51
Stark meat or catalogs	61	61
Disposable diapers	65	65

* Right column shows the proportion of consumers who rate each item as an 8, 9, or 10 on a 10-point scale.

Table 3

Perceived Importance of Reducing the Amount of Household Garbage

	<u>Pre-Wave Survey</u>	<u>Post-Wave Survey</u>
	%	%
Very important	68	66
Moderately important	22	24
Slightly important	4	5
Not important	3	3
No opinion	2	1
	(n)	
	(1111)	(1108)

4. Specific Ways of Reducing One's Own Household Garbage

Consumers were asked to state in their own words specific things they felt they could do to reduce the amount of garbage that their household produces. Comments were recorded verbatim and then coded into general categories of response.

- Recycling was mentioned by more than half (54%) of all consumers and is by far the most frequently mentioned activity that they feel can reduce the amount of garbage and trash produced by their own households.
- Two other activities mentioned by significant proportions of consumers were purchasing items based on their packaging content (17%) and reusing items or using refills more often (14%).
- Other mentions volunteered by at least 5% of consumers included purchasing items based on their recyclability (9%), consuming less overall (5%), and composting waste materials (5%). Slightly more than one in twenty consumers (6%) said they were already doing all they can.
- There were no large changes in the proportion of volunteered comments regarding their activities since the pre-wave survey, although a slightly smaller proportion in the post-wave volunteered the items “purchase items based on their packaging content” (Δ -4) and “use a trash compactor” (Δ -4).

Table 4
Specific Ways of Reducing One's Own Household Garbage
(top-of-mind volunteered comments)

	<u>Pre-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u> %	<u>Post-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u> %
Recycle	56	54
Purchase items based on their packaging content	21	17
Reuse items/use refills	15	14
Purchase items based on their recyclability	9	9
Already doing all I can	9	6
Separate cans, bottles, garbage at curb	6	4
Cut down on use of plastics, non-biodegradables	6	4
Consume less	6	5
Use a trash compactor	6	2
Compost	5	5
Avoid wasting food	4	2
Use garbage disposal	3	2
Substitute cloth or products for paper	3	3
Burn our trash	3	1
Reduce junk mail, catalogs received	2	2
Take out trash more often/more frequent trash pick-ups	2	2
Get manufacturers to change packaging methods	2	2
Other mentions (less than 2% each)	3	8
No answer	8	10
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

Adds to more than 100% due to multiple mentions

5. Satisfaction with Community Efforts to Reduce Residential Garbage Produced

- Nearly a quarter (23%) of consumers say they are very satisfied with the efforts their city or community is making to encourage residents to reduce the amount of garbage or trash they produce.
- The largest plurality (44%) are moderately satisfied, while 15% are not too satisfied. About one in ten (11%) consumers reported that they were not satisfied with local efforts to reduce the amount of residential garbage produced.
- The distribution of responses to this question has not changed significantly since the pre-wave survey.

Table 5
Satisfaction with Your City or Community's Efforts to
Reduce Residential Garbage Produced

	<u>Pre-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u>	<u>Post-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u>
	%	%
Very satisfied	24	23
Moderately satisfied	43	44
Not too satisfied	18	15
Not satisfied	10	11
No opinion	6	6
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

6. Things Communities are Doing to Encourage Residential Garbage Reduction Efforts

Consumers very or moderately satisfied with local efforts to encourage the reduction of residential garbage produced were asked to state in their own words what particular things they liked about their community's programs. Comments were recorded verbatim during the interview and were later coded into more general categories of response.

- Curbside recycling is the activity most frequently cited (39%) by consumers as something their city or community is doing to reduce residential garbage.
- Two other programs frequently mentioned by respondents in the post-wave survey were the provision of recycling bins or containers (27%) and the regular picking up of garbage (20%).
- Other efforts mentioned by at least 5% of consumers included advertising or public mailouts (10%), encouraging residents to separate garbage (10%), community recycling centers (8%), pick-ups for toxic and other dangerous household materials (7%), getting the word out about recycling (5%) and encouraging composting (5%).
- Since the pre-wave study, the proportion of consumers who volunteer that their community provides recycling bins or containers has decreased ($\Delta-7$), while the proportion mentioning regular garbage pick-up has increased slightly ($\Delta+5$).

Table 6
Specific Things Your City or Community is Doing to
Encourage Residential Garbage Reduction Efforts
(among those "very" or "moderately" satisfied with their community's efforts)

	<u>Pre-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u> %	<u>Post-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u> %
Recycling at curbside	37	39
Provides recycling bins, containers	34	27
Pick up garbage regularly	15	20
Advertising, mailouts to public	13	10
Encourage residents to separate garbage	10	10
They have a community recycling center	9	8
Special pick-ups for toxics, household items	7	7
Getting the word out about recycling	6	5
Give discounts, incentives for conserving, recycling	3	4
Encourage composting	3	5
Teaching about recycling in schools	2	2
Discourage litter	1	3
Other positive comments (less than 1% each)	6	6
Nothing/no answer	17	45
(n)	(739)	(756)

Adds to more than 100% due to multiple mentions

7. Things Consumers Dislike About Their Community's Efforts to Encourage Residential Garbage Production

Consumers who were not too or not at all satisfied with their community's efforts at encouraging residents to reduce the amount of garbage produced were asked why they felt this way, and again their verbatim answers were coded into general categories of response.

- The absence of recycling programs is the most frequently cited (27%) reason consumers gave for not being satisfied with local garbage reduction efforts. A slightly smaller group (22%) reported lack of public awareness and information as the reason for their dissatisfaction.
- Less frequently mentioned reasons include a desire to make it easier for people to recycle (12%), that people don't care (8%), don't have curbside recycling (7%), costs (7%), trash left in the street/not doing a good job picking up trash (7%), the need for more recycling centers (6%), lack of places to take certain items (5%), and no regulation or enforcement (3%).
- The proportion of consumers who say they are dissatisfied with their community's garbage reduction efforts because people do not care has declined significantly (Δ -7) since the pre-wave survey was conducted.

Table 7
Things Consumers Dislike About City or Community's
Efforts to Encourage Residential Garbage Reduction Efforts
(among those "not too" or "not at all satisfied" with their community's efforts)

	<u>Pre-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u> %	<u>Post-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u> %
Needs to be more public awareness/don't inform people enough	26	22
There aren't any recycling programs in place	23	27
People don't care	15	8
Should make it easier for people to recycle	12	12
Don't have curbside recycling	8	7
Need more recycling centers	7	6
No mandatory recycling, no regulation or enforcement	5	3
Because of the costs	5	7
Don't do a good job picking up trash/leave trash in streets	5	7
There aren't places to take certain items	4	5
Other mentions (less than 2% each)	8	15
No answer	5	3
(n)	(305)	(287)

Adds to more than 100% due to multiple mentions

8. Awareness of Advertising and News Stories About Garbage or Trash Problem

- Nearly six in ten (59%) consumers report having seen or heard news articles or stories in the past year about garbage/trash problems, and 42% recall stories with specific educational information about reducing such problems.
- Half (50%) of the respondents interviewed in the post-wave survey had seen or heard advertising in the past year about garbage/trash problems, and about a third (34%) said they recalled ads with specific information on ways to reduce garbage/trash problems.
- Awareness of news articles or stories as well as advertising awareness declined slightly (Δ -7 and Δ -6, respectively) since the pre-wave survey.

Table 8
Awareness of Advertising and News Stories
About Garbage or Trash Problems

	<u>Pre-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u>	<u>Post-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u>
	%	%
Have seen or heard NEWS ARTICLES OR STORIES in past year about garbage/trash problems	<u>66</u>	<u>59</u>
Recall news stories with specific educational information about ways to reduce garbage/trash problems	47	42
Have seen or heard ADVERTISING in past year about garbage/trash problems	<u>56</u>	<u>50</u>
Recall ads with specific educational information about ways to reduce garbage/trash problems	41	34
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

9. Perceived Impact that Shopping, Personal Habits Have on Environment

Consumers were asked to assess the impact that sixteen different shopping and personal activities can potentially have on the environment in California. Respondents were asked to rate on a 10-point scale how much of an impact they felt each action had on the environment, where 10 meant that it had a major impact and 1 signified no impact at all. The results are summarized in Table 9 and are ranked according to the proportions rating each item as having a high impact score of 8, 9, or 10.

In general, majorities of the public appear quite confident that most of the activities would have a high impact on the California environment.

- Greater than seven in ten consumers report that separating different types of trash, specifically glass or plastic containers (73%), tin, steel, aluminum containers (73%), and newspapers, magazines or other paper (73%) for the purpose of recycling, would have a high impact if undertaken.
- About two-thirds of respondents feel that the environment would be highly impacted if people bought products in packages that could be recycled (69%), contacted companies to get their name removed from unwanted mailing lists (65%), reuse plastic or paper bags (65%), or use a reusable coffee cup (65%).
- Large majorities of consumers also say that buying products made from recycled materials (63%), with less packaging (63%), or in packages that can be refilled (63%) would have a high impact on the environment.
- There has not been any large changes in the proportions of respondents rating these activities with high impact scores, except for the proportion who believe being efficient when using paper would have an impact, which has increased slightly ($\Delta+4$) since the pre-wave survey.

Table 9
 Perceived Impact that Shopping, Personal Habits
 Have on California Environment
 (% giving each a high impact score*)

	<u>Pre-Wave Survey</u>	<u>Post-Wave Survey</u>
	%	%
Separating out glass, plastic containers for recycling	74	73
Separating out tin, steel, aluminum containers for recycling	72	73
Separating out newspapers, magazines, other paper for recycling	72	73
Buying products in packages that can be recycled	70	69
Contacting companies to get name removed from unwanted mailing lists	67	65
Buying products made from recycled materials	65	63
Reusing plastic or paper bags	65	65
Using a reusable coffee cup	64	65
Buying products with less packaging	63	63
Using reusable food storage containers	61	61
Buying products in packages that can be refilled	60	63
Being efficient when using paper	57	61
Reusing gift bags, boxes or wrapping paper	53	54
Refusing shopping bags when they are not needed	51	53
Buying products in larger sizes or in bulk	49	50
Sharing or swapping magazines or newspapers with others	46	47
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

* high impact defined as those rating each item as an 8, 9, or 10 on a 10-point scale.

10. Regularity of Doing Activities that can Impact the Environment

Respondents were then asked how often they themselves do each of these sixteen activities. Results in Table 10 are reported and ranked according to the proportions who say they regularly do each activity.

- The three activities regularly undertaken by the largest proportion of respondents are reusing plastic or paper bags (76%), using a reusable coffee cup (75%), and separating out steel, tin, and aluminum cans for recycling (75%).
- Greater than two-thirds of consumers also say they regularly separate glass or plastic containers (72%) newspapers, magazines, and other paper (71%) for recycling, and/or use reusable food storage containers (67%).
- Over half of consumers report being efficient when using paper (61%), reusing gift bags, boxes or wrapping paper (60%), or refusing shopping bags when they are not needed (51%) on a regular basis. Slightly smaller proportions of consumers say they regularly buy products in bulk (49%), buy products in packages that can be recycled (49%) or with less packaging (42%), buy products made from recycled materials (40%), buy products in packages that can be refilled (34%), and share or swap magazines or newspapers with friends (30%).
- While only 14% report regularly contacting companies in order to have their name removed from mailing lists, this proportion is up four points from the pre-wave survey. On the other hand, a slightly smaller proportion in the post-wave survey than the pre-wave survey reports using a reusable coffee cup (Δ -5).

Table 10
 Regularity of Doing Activities that Can
 Impact the California Environment
 (% reporting that they "regularly" do this activity)

	<u>Pre-Wave Survey</u>	<u>Post-Wave Survey</u>
	%	%
Using a reusable coffee cup	80	75
Reusing plastic or paper bags	76	76
Separating out tin, steel, aluminum containers for recycling	74	75
Separating out glass, plastic containers for recycling	71	72
Separating out newspapers, magazines, other paper for recycling	69	71
Using reusable food storage containers	65	67
Being efficient when using paper	64	61
Reusing gift bags, boxes or wrapping paper	63	60
Refusing shopping bags when they are not needed	51	51
Buying products in larger sizes or in bulk	48	49
Buying products in packages that can be recycled	47	49
Buying products made from recycled materials	40	40
Buying products with less packaging	39	42
Buying products in packages that can be refilled	34	34
Sharing or swapping magazines or newspapers with others	27	30
Contacting companies to get name removed from unwanted mailing lists	10	14
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

11. Factors Considered when Deciding Which Grocery Products to Buy

Consumers were asked to volunteer the main factors they consider when deciding which grocery products they will buy within a particular product category.

- Price is by far the most frequently mentioned (77%) factor people consider when deciding which products to purchase.
- Over a third (36%) of consumers report that the quality of the product is an important factor. About one in five say that the ingredients (20%) or past experience with a product (19%) are the main factors taken into consideration when making a purchase.
- Smaller proportions of consumers mentioned quantity (9%), personal/family preference (9%), brand name (6%), appearance (5%), and advertising claims (3%) as the main factors they think about when deciding which product to buy.
- These proportions have not changed significantly since the pre-wave study, with the exception of people who check the ingredients, which declined slightly (Δ -4).

Table 11
Factors Considered when Deciding Which Grocery
Products to Buy Within a Particular Product Category
(top-of-mind volunteered comments)

	<u>Pre-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u> %	<u>Post-Wave</u> <u>Survey</u> %
Price/specials/cents off coupons	76	77
Product quality	37	36
Ingredients	24	20
Familiarity, past experience	20	19
Quantity, size	9	9
Personal or family preferences	9	9
Brand name	7	6
Appearance, attractiveness	6	5
Advertising claims	3	3
Taste	2	2
Recyclability of product/reduced packaging	2	1
Other mentions (less than 2% each)	6	8
No answer	2	4
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

Adds to more than 100% due to multiple mentions

12. Familiarity with Expense of Products Made from Recycled Materials

- Most (53%) consumers are moderately familiar with products made from recycled material, while 15% claim to be very familiar with such products. About a quarter (26%) are slightly familiar, and 6% report that they are not familiar with recycled products.
- With regard to the expense of recyclable products relative to other non-recyclables, the largest proportion (44%) of consumers feels that recyclable products cost about the same as others. Slightly more than one in five (22%) believe they are more expensive than other products, and a nearly equal proportion (23%) says they are less expensive than products that are not recyclable.
- Since the pre-wave survey, there has been a significant increase ($\Delta+5$) in the proportion of those who believe that recyclable products are less expensive than others.

Table 12
 Familiarity with Expense of Products
 Made from Recycled Materials

	<u>Pre-Wave Survey</u>	<u>Post-Wave Survey</u>
	%	%
<u>Familiarity with products made from recyclables</u>		
Very familiar	17	15
Moderately familiar	52	53
Slightly familiar	25	26
Not familiar	5	6
No opinion	1	1
<u>Expense of recyclable products</u>		
More expensive than other products	24	22
About the same	49	44
Less expensive than other products	18	23
Don't know	10	11
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

13. Perceptions of the quality of Recyclables and Reasons for Feeling this Way

- The large majority (78%) of consumers believes the quality of products made from recycled materials as about the same as other products. About one in ten (11%) say that such products are of lower quality, while 8% feel that products made from recycled materials are better quality than others.
- Most of those who feel that recycled products are about the same quality say that the reason they feel this way is because they observe no real differences when using them. However, the proportion of people who cite this as a reason has declined slightly ($\Delta-4$) since the pre-wave survey was conducted. No other significant differences are noted between the pre and post-wave surveys on this question.

Table 13
Perceptions of the Quality of Recyclables
and Reasons for Feeling this Way

	<u>Pre-Wave Survey</u>	<u>Post-Wave Survey</u>
	%	%
<u>Products made from recycled materials are . . .</u>		
<u>Better quality</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
Prefer using recycled products	2	4
It's better for the environment, mankind	2	1
They are sometimes stronger, better	2	1
Other comment (less than 2% each)	5	4
<u>About the same quality</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>78</u>
See no real differences when using them	53	49
They serve their purpose/satisfied with them	14	13
Prefer recycled products/feel better using them	4	5
They are not as good as originals	3	4
More research, effort goes into them	3	2
They are sometimes better, stronger	2	4
Based on my own experience, observations	2	5
Other comments (less than 2% each)	3	7
<u>Lesser quality</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>
Products are not as good as originals	10	8
Other comments (less than 2% each)	3	4
No opinion	4	4
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

14. Perceived Impact of Buying Recyclable Products and Products with Less Packaging on Amount of Trash Produced

- A quarter (25%) of consumers feel that buying recyclable products and products with less packaging would have a major impact on reducing the amount of trash produced in California. The largest proportion of consumers (37%) reported that such activities would have a moderate impact on reducing the amount of garbage produced. Another three in ten (29%) say it would have only a slight impact, and 5% believe that it would have no impact at all.
- These proportions have not changed significantly since the pre-wave survey was conducted.

Table 14

Perceived Impact of Buying Recyclable Products and
Products with Less Packaging on Amount of Trash Produced

	<u>Pre-Wave Survey</u>	<u>Post-Wave Survey</u>
	%	%
Major impact	25	25
Moderate impact	38	37
Slight impact	30	29
No impact	6	5
No opinion	2	4
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

15. Likelihood of Buying Products which Claim to be “Environmental Safe or Friendly”

- Considering all other things equal, more than three quarters (77%) of consumers said they would be more likely to buy products advertised as environmentally safe or friendly, while 16% said it would not influence their purchase decision and 3% said they would be less likely to buy products billed as such.
- These numbers have not changed significantly since the pre-wave survey.

Table 16

Reliability of Information Sources About Product
 Claims About Environmental Safety
 (% describing each as "very" or "somewhat" reliable)

	Pre-Wave Survey	Post-Wave Survey
	%	%
Non-profit environmental protection organizations	82	81
Scientists from universities or independent laboratories	81	81
Local garbage or trash collection agencies	75	76
Teachers in the local schools	73	76
State or local government agencies or officials	64	69
Product manufacturers	53	51
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

Table 15

Likelihood of buying products which claim to be
 "environmental safe or friendly," all other things being equal

	<u>Pre-Wave Survey</u>	<u>Post-Wave Survey</u>
	%	%
More likely to buy	79	77
Neither more nor less likely to buy	16	16
Less likely to buy	3	3
No opinion	2	4
(n)	(1111)	(1108)

16. Reliability of Information Sources About Claims Regarding Environmental Safety

All those interviewed in both the pre and post-wave surveys were asked how reliable they felt each of six different groups and organizations were as information sources about environmental safety of products. The results are ranked opposite in Table 16 according to the proportions of consumers who describe each as being a very or somewhat reliable information source. At least half of the respondents rank all six groups as being very or somewhat reliable as an information source.

- The most trusted two groups with regard to making reliable environmental claims are non-profit environmental protection organizations (81%) and scientists from universities and independent organizations (81%).
- About three-quarters of consumers feel that local garbage or trash collection agencies (76%) or teachers in the local schools (76%) are very or somewhat reliable sources, while 69% say that state or local government agencies or officials are this reliable. A somewhat smaller proportion (51%) of consumers see product manufacturers as very or somewhat reliable sources of information.
- Since the pre-wave survey was conducted there has been an increase ($\Delta+5$) in the proportion of consumers who feel that state or local government agencies are very or somewhat reliable sources of information in regard to environmental safety claims.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

About the Survey

This report presents the findings from a statewide survey of California consumers regarding waste management and prevention issues. This is the second wave of a pre-post set of surveys conducted for the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) and its agency, DDB Needham.

Field Research Corporation, an independent marketing and public opinion research organization, was responsible for questionnaire development (working jointly with the CIWMB staff), sampling, data collection, coding, tabulation and the preparation of this report of the findings of both surveys.

Survey Approach

The post-wave survey was conducted by means of computer-assisted telephone interviews among a random sample of 1,108 California adults age 18 or older who reported that they do most of the grocery shopping for their household. Interviewing was conducted by telephone in either English or Spanish during the period May 18 - June 20, 1996 by professionally trained interviewers working from Field Research's central location telephone interviewing facilities in San Francisco.

Questionnaire Development

Prior to the pre-wave survey, Field Research professionals initially developed a questionnaire to meet the broad objectives set forth by the CIWMB. This questionnaire was later refined and several early draft versions of the questionnaire were prepared for CIWMB's review. After several further iterations, the questionnaire was pre-tested among a small sample of 10-15 consumers to assess ease of administration, uncover any potential interviewing problems and evaluate interview length.

APPENDICES

After the telephone questionnaire was finalized, it was programmed onto Field Research's in-house computer-assisted telephone interviewing system (CATI). The resulting programmed questionnaire was administered to a random sample of 1,111 California consumers between December 14, 1994 and January 14, 1995 as the pre-wave survey. An identical version of the questionnaire was then administered to a separate random sample of 1,108 California consumers May 18 - June 20, 1996 as the post-wave survey.

Spanish language translation

Because of the large Latino population living in California, the final English-language version of the questionnaire was translated into Spanish for those respondents who preferred to be interviewed in that language. All Spanish-language interviews were conducted by bi-lingual speaking interviewers working from Field Research Corporation's central location telephone interviewing facilities.

Sample selection

The sample was drawn using a random digit dialing methodology, whereby all telephone households within operating prefixes within California are given an equal chance of participating in the survey. The random digit dial method produces randomly generated telephone numbers in the following manner: first, telephone exchanges and working blocks of telephone numbers are randomly selected (the first 5 digits of a 7-digit telephone number) and then, for each exchange and working block, 2-digit numbers are randomly generated and added to the first five digits to produce a 7-digit telephone number. At the end of this process, these numbers are matched against Yellow Page business numbers and non-residential numbers are eliminated to enhance sampling efficiencies.

Data collection

All telephone interviewing for the study was conducted from Field Research's central

location telephone interviewing facilities in San Francisco. These facilities include 80 telephone stations and encompass one of the largest CATI networks on the West Coast. In addition, Field Research's telephone system provides features such as least-cost routing and automatic redial capabilities which minimize telephone toll charges while maximizing interviewing efficiencies.

Trained professional interviewers were employed to conduct the interviewing. Field Research maintains a large corp of highly qualified CATI interviewers who have extensive experience conducting surveys on public policy issues. Before commencing data collection, interviewers assigned to the study participated in a training session led by the project director describing the objectives of the study, reviewing proper interviewing techniques to maximize cooperation rates, and reviewing each question developed for the survey.

After interviewers completed their training session and were comfortable with the questionnaire, interviewing began. During the first few days of interviewing Field Research supervisors conducted debriefing sessions as needed to answer questions and ensure that interviewing procedures were uniform.

To enhance cooperation rates for the telephone interviews and minimize nonresponse bias, up to four attempts were made to complete an interview within each residential household contacted. All contact attempts were made during late afternoon and evening hours on weekdays and through the day on weekends. If no qualified adults was reached at a telephone number, additional call attempts were made on different days during different times of day.

Results of interview attempts

The following is an accounting of the results of all telephone listings dialed at least once during the interviewing process:

Total listings dialed at least once	<u>9,481</u>
Unusable	<u>3,315</u>
Business/gov't/non-residential	1,233
Disconnected/not in service*	1,721
Communication barrier (other than Spanish)	263
Other	191
Usable	<u>6,146</u>
No answer, answering machine after all attempts	1,880
Primary shopper not available	276
Contact made with eligible shopper	<u>3,917</u>
Refused/terminated	2,809
Completed interview	1,108

** includes busy after all attempts*

Data processing

The CATI program developed for the study was designed to ensure that only valid codes and internally consistent data are entered by interviewers into the computer. Thus, with CATI most of the information collected during the telephone interviews are clean and as error-free as possible. However, because interviewing can manually fill out error correction sheets when they inadvertently enter an incorrect code or when a respondent changes his or her response after it has been entered, the survey data are subjected to an additional cleaning

process.

After data collection is completed, verbatim responses to all open-ended questions were reviewed and quantitative code categories were developed and reviewed by the project director. Once these codes were finalized, codes to all open-ended responses are assigned and then keyed into the data file for each respondent. The data file is then subjected to a final cleaning logic check to ensure the consistency and accuracy of the data.

Statistical Weighting

At the conclusion of data processing the data set is subjected to a statistical weighting procedure to “fine tune” the survey results to known parameters of the larger population. Weighting parameters used for this study were derived from census-established distributions of the adult population in California by region.

Tabulations

Detailed statistical tabulations were then developed reporting the distributions to each survey question overall and across a number of demographic and other subgroup variables. Two sets of these detailed statistical tabulations were delivered to CIWMB at this time.

Estimating sampling error

In any survey based on a sample, some degree of error is introduced by the sampling process due to the fact that the results are based on a sample and not a complete census of all adults in the targeted population. If the sample has been drawn by a random process, the range of potential sampling error can be estimated to show the degree of precision which percentages from the survey have as representations of, or projections to, the population of interest.

The table below shows how much sampling error is applicable to any particular statistic of

interest in this report in order to have 95 % confidence that it brackets its population value. The resulting “high” and “low” values show the range within which we can have 95 % confidence that if the entire population had been surveyed using the same questionnaire and methodology, the results would fall between these two figures.

For example, suppose that 50% of all California consumers interviewed (sample size = 1,108) answered “yes” to a given question. From the table below, a statistic such as this would have a sampling error of plus or minus 3.0 percentage points at the 95 % confidence level. This means that there is a 95 % chance that had the entire population of all California consumers been interviewed using the same questionnaire and methodology, the result of such a census would yield a result of between 47.0% and 53.0% (50% plus or minus 3.0 percentage points). The same method can be used to estimate the sampling error ranges of any statistic reported by the survey.

Sampling Error Estimates for Survey Data at the 95 % Confidence Level

<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Percentage Division Of Replies</u>				
	<u>10%</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>90%</u>
100	6.0	9.2	10.0	9.2	6.0
200	4.3	6.5	7.1	6.5	4.3
400	3.0	4.6	5.0	4.6	3.0
600	2.5	3.8	4.1	3.8	2.5
1100	1.8	2.8	3.0	2.8	1.8

SHOPPER SURVEY
- Screener -

Hello. I'm _____ from Field Research Corporation, an independent marketing and opinion research firm. We're conducting a survey about people's shopping and personal habits and I'd like to ask you a few questions.

A. First, are you the adult age 18 or older who does most of the grocery shopping for your household?

YES.....1 (ASK D)
NO.....2 (ASK B)

IF NO, ASK

B. Is that person home now? May I speak with (her) (him)?

YES1 (RE-READ INTRO WHEN THAT PERSON COMES TO PHONE)
NO2 (ASK C)

IF NO, ASK:

C. When would be a good time for me to call back to speak with (her) (him)?

RECORD CALLBACK TIME ON CONTACT SHEET

D. Are you or is anyone in your household employed by an advertising agency or market research company?

YES.....1 (TERMINATE AND RECORD CODE 11)
NO.....2 (CONTINUE WITH Q.1)

4. What specific ways can you think of to reduce your own amount of garbage and trash?
(PROBE) What other ways?

5. How satisfied are you with the efforts made by your city or your community in trying to encourage residents to reduce the amount of garbage or trash they produce -- very satisfied, moderately satisfied, not too satisfied or not at all satisfied?

VERY SATISFIED 1
MODERATELY SATISFIED..... 2
NOT TOO SATISFIED..... 3
NOT SATISFIED 4
NO OPINION..... Y

IF VERY OR MODERATELY SATISFIED, ASK:

6a. What are some of the things your city or your community is doing to encourage residents to reduce the amount of garbage or trash they produce? (PROBE) Anything else?

IF NOT TOO OR NOT AT ALL SATISFIED, ASK:

6b. Why do you feel this way? (PROBE) Anything else?

SHOPPER SURVEY
 - Main Questionnaire -

Time started: _____

1. Think for a moment about when you do your regular shopping at the grocery store. When comparing similar grocery store products in a particular category, what are some of the main factors that you think about when deciding which product to buy? IF ANSWERS "IT DEPENDS" OR SOMETHING COMPARABLE, SAY: "Just generally, what factors do you consider when comparing among similar grocery items?" (PROBE) Any other factors?

(DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. RECORD AS MANY RESPONSES AS MENTIONED)

PRICE/SPECIALS/ COUPONS.....	1
QUALITY	2
QUANTITY/ SIZE/ AMOUNT.....	3
INGREDIENTS/ NUTRITIONAL VALUE.....	4
APPEARANCE/ATTRACTIVENESS	5
RECYCLABLE/REDUCED PACKAGING	6
FAMILIARITY/PAST EXPERIENCE	7
PERSONAL, FAMILY PREFERENCE.....	8
ADVERTISING CLAIMS	9
OTHER _____ (SPECIFY)	X
DON'T KNOW.....	Y

Let's talk for a moment about the subject of garbage and trash that your household and other households in California generate.

2. When you think about garbage and trash problems in California, what types of garbage or trash do you think are causing the greatest problems for the environment? (PROBE) Any others? (DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. RECORD AS MANY RESPONSES AS MENTIONED)

ORGANIC WASTE

FOOD SCRAPS.....	1
GRASS CLIPPINGS/YARD WASTE	2
OTHER ORGANIC WASTE	3

PAPER PRODUCTS

NEWSPAPERS	1
MAGAZINES.....	2
PAPER PACKAGING.....	3
JUNK MAIL, CATALOGS.....	4
OTHER/ UNSPECIFIED PAPER.....	5

BOTTLES/ CONTAINERS

GLASS	1
PLASTIC	2
ALUMINUM	3
TIN	4
AEROSOL SPRAY CANS.....	5
STYROFORM.....	6
OTHER/BOTTLES/CONTAINERS	7

OTHER - INORGANIC

DISPOSABLE DIAPERS.....	1
FURNITURE/APPLIANCES/HOUSEHOLD ITEMS	2
TIRES.....	3
MOTOR OIL.....	4
PAINTS	5
CHEMICALS.....	6
TOXIC WASTES.....	7
OTHER NON-ORGANIC WASTE	8

ALL OTHER _____ (specify)X

DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER Y

3. How important do you think it is that your household reduce the amount of garbage or trash it produces? Do you think it is very important, moderately important, slightly important or not important at all?
- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| VERY IMPORTANT..... | 1 |
| MODERATELY IMPORTANT | 2 |
| SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT | 3 |
| NOT IMPORTANT..... | 4 |
| NO OPINION..... | Y |

7. I am going to read various items and for each please tell me how serious you feel this is as a cause of garbage or trash problems in California. To do this, please use a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 means it is not a cause of garbage or trash problems and 10 means it is an extremely serious cause of garbage or trash problems. Let's start with (READ ITEM CHECKED)

On a scale from 1 to 10, how much do you think (ITEM) (is/are) as a cause of garbage or trash problems in California? (CONTINUE UNTIL ALL ITEMS ARE READ)

- a. newspapers _____
- b. grass clippings or yard waste _____
- c. disposable diapers _____
- d. glass bottles _____
- e. plastic bottles _____
- f. plastic wraps _____
- g. aluminum cans and containers _____
- h. junk mail or catalogs _____
- i. magazines _____
- j. individual or single serving containers _____
- k. tins cans _____
- l. paper and cardboard packaging _____
- m. paper plates, paper napkins _____
- n. furniture, appliances, household items _____
- o. plastic packaging _____
- p. food scraps _____
- q. plastic cups and utensils _____

8. How familiar are you with products made from recycled materials -- very familiar, moderately familiar, slightly familiar or not at all familiar?

VERY FAMILIAR 1
 MODERATELY FAMILIAR..... 2
 SLIGHTLY FAMILIAR..... 3
 NOT FAMILIAR 4
 NO OPINION..... Y

9. All other things being equal, do you think that products made from recycled materials are of better quality, less quality or of about the same quality as products not made from recycled materials?

BETTER QUALITY 1
 LESSER QUALITY 2
 ABOUT THE SAME..... 3
 NO OPINION..... Y

10. Why do you say that? (PROBE) Why else?

11. Compared to those products not made from recycled materials do you think that products made from recycled materials are more expensive, less expensive or about the same in price?

MORE EXPENSIVE..... 1
 LESS EXPENSIVE 2
 ABOUT THE SAME PRICE 3
 NO OPINION..... Y

12. In thinking about the amount of garbage and trash generated in your community, how much of an impact do you think you can make by purchasing products with less packaging per unit, products made from recycled materials or other recyclables? Do you think you can have a major impact, a moderate impact, a slight impact or no impact at all?

MAJOR IMPACT 1
 MODERATE IMPACT..... 2
 SLIGHT IMPACT..... 3
 NO IMPACT 4
 NO OPINION..... Y

13. Now I'd like to ask you about some shopping and personal habits that can have an impact on the environment in California. Please rate them on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 meaning you think this has "no impact at all" on the environment and 10 meaning this has a "major impact" on the environment. Let's start with (BEGIN WITH ITEM CHECKED). On a scale of 1 to 10, how much of an impact do you think (ITEM) has on the environment in California? (CONTINUE IN SEQUENCE UNTIL ALL ARE READ)
14. Next, I am going to read back each of these activities and I'd like you to tell me whether you currently do this regularly, occasionally or not at all. (BEGIN WITH ITEM CHECKED)

Do you currently do this regularly, occasionally or not at all? (CONTINUE IN SEQUENCE UNTIL ALL ARE READ)

	Q.13 IMPACT (1-10 SCALE)	REGU- LARLY	Q.14 OCCASION- ALLY	NOT AT ALL	NO ANS.
[] a. separating tin, steel or aluminum cans from your garbage for recycling	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] b. reusing gift bags, boxes or wrapping paper	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] c. buying products made from or packaged in recycled materials	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] d. buying products in packages that can be refilled	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] e. sharing or swapping magazines or newspapers with others instead of buying separate individual copies	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] f. buying products in packages that can be recycled	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] g. using reusable food storage containers instead of plastic bags or food wraps	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] h. buying products with less packaging	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] i. buying products in larger sizes or in bulk instead of in smaller or single serve packages	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] j. separating out newspapers, magazines and other paper recyclables from your garbage for recycling	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] k. using a reusable coffee cup instead of a disposable cup	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] l. refusing a shopping bag for your purchases when it is not needed	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] m. contacting companies to get your name removed from mailing lists of unwanted junk mail or catalogs	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] n. separating out glass and plastic containers from your garbage for recycling	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] o. being efficient when using paper	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y
[] p. reusing plastic or paper bags	_____	1.....	2.....	3.....	Y

15. Have you seen or heard any advertising in the past year regarding garbage or trash problems? YES 1
 NO 2
 NOT SURE Y

IF YES TO Q. 15, ASK:

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 16. Did any of this advertising provide specific educational information about garbage and trash problems and what you can do to reduce them? | YES 1 |
| | NO 2 |
| | NOT SURE Y |

17. Have you seen or heard any news articles or stories in the past year regarding garbage or trash problems? YES 1
 NO 2
 NOT SURE Y

IF YES TO Q. 17, ASK:

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 18. Did any of these news articles or stories provide specific educational information about garbage or trash problems and what you can do to reduce them? | YES 1 |
| | NO 2 |
| | NOT SURE Y |

19. I am going to read some different groups and organizations and for each please tell me how reliable you think each is as a source of information about how safe or harmful a product is to the environment. (BEGIN WITH ITEM CHECKED) Do you feel they are a very reliable, somewhat reliable, not too reliable or not at all reliable source of information about how safe or harmful a product is to the environment? (REPEAT FOR OTHER ITEMS IN SEQUENCE)

	<u>VERY</u> <u>RELIABLE</u>	<u>SOMEWHAT</u> <u>RELIABLE</u>	<u>NOT TOO</u> <u>RELIABLE</u>	<u>NOT AT ALL</u> <u>RELIABLE</u>	<u>NO</u> <u>OPIN</u>
[] a. scientists from universities or independent laboratories.....	1	2	3	4	Y
[] b. state or local government agencies and officials	1	2	3	4	Y
[] c. product manufacturers	1	2	3	4	Y
[] d. non-profit environmental protection organizations	1	2	3	4	Y
[] e. local garbage or trash collection agencies	1	2	3	4	Y
[] f. teachers in the local schools ..	1	2	3	4	Y

20. All other things being equal, how likely would you be to buy a product that claims to be "environmentally safe or friendly"? Would you be more likely to buy, less likely to buy or neither more nor less likely to buy?
- MORE LIKELY 1
 LESS LIKELY 2
 NEITHER MORE NOR
 LESS LIKELY 3
 NO OPINION Y

Finally, some questions about yourself for classification purposes.

21. What is your age? _____
22. What was the last grade of school you completed? NOT A HIGH SCHOOL GRAD 1
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE 2
SOME COLLEGE/TRADE SCHOOL 3
COLLEGE GRADUATE 4
POST GRADUATE SCHOOL 5
NO ANSWER Y
23. Which of the following best describes your present marital status -- married or living together, separated or divorced, widowed, or never married? MARRIED/LIVING TOGETHER 1
SEPARATE/DIVORCED 2
WIDOWED 3
NEVER MARRIED 4
NO ANSWER Y
24. Including yourself, how many people currently live in your household? _____
- IF MORE THAN ONE, ASK:**
25. Of these, how many are children or teenagers under the age of 18? _____
-
- 26a. Do you happen to be of Hispanic, Spanish or Mexican descent? YES 1
NO 2
REFUSED Y
- IF NO, ASK:**
- 26b. For classification purposes, we'd like to know what your racial background is. Are you white, black, Asian or a member of some other race? WHITE 1
BLACK 2
ASIAN 3
OTHER 4
REFUSED Y
27. Do you own or rent your home? HOMEOWNER 1
RENTER 2
REFUSED 3
28. We don't want to know exactly, but just roughly could you tell me if your annual household income before taxes is under \$20,000, \$20,000 - \$40,000, \$40,000 - \$60,000, \$60,000 - \$80,000 or more than \$80,000? UNDER \$20,000 1
\$20,000 - \$39,999 2
\$40,000 - \$59,999 3
\$60,000 - \$79,999 4
\$80,000 OR MORE 5
NO ANSWER Y
29. SEX: MALE 1
FEMALE 2



30a. In what county do you live?

ALAMEDA..... 01	MARIN..... 21	SAN MATEO..... 41
ALPINE..... 02	MARIPOSA..... 22	SANTA BARBARA..... 42
AMADOR..... 03	MENDOCINO..... 23	SANTA CLARA..... 43
BUTTE..... 04	MERCED..... 24	SANTA CRUZ..... 44
CALAVARES..... 05	MODOC..... 25	SHASTA..... 45
COLUSA..... 06	MONO..... 26	SIERRA..... 46
CONTRA COST..... 07	MONTEREY..... 27	SISKIYOU..... 47
DEL NORTE..... 08	NAPA..... 28	SOLANO..... 48
EL DORADO..... 09	NEVADA..... 29	SONOMA..... 49
FRESNO..... 10	ORANGE..... 30	STANISLAUS..... 50
GLENN..... 11	PLACER..... 31	SUTTER..... 51
HUMBOLDT..... 12	PLUMAS..... 32	TEHAMA..... 52
IMPERIAL..... 13	RIVERSIDE..... 33	TRINITY..... 53
INYO..... 14	SACRAMENTO..... 34	TULARE..... 54
KERN..... 15	SAN BENITO..... 35	TUOLUMNE..... 55
KINGS..... 16	SAN BERNARDINO..... 36	VENTURA..... 56
LAKE..... 17	SAN DIEGO..... 37	YOLO..... 57
LASSEN..... 18	SAN FRANCISCO..... 38	YUBA..... 58
LOS ANGELES..... 19	SAN JOAQUIN..... 39	
MADERA..... 20	SAN LUIS OBISPO..... 40	DON'T KNOW..... 98 (ASK Q.30b)

IF DON'T KNOW COUNTY, ASK:

30b. In what city or town do you live? _____
 (SPECIFY)

31. What is your zip code there?
 (ANSWER MUST BEGIN WITH "9")

--	--	--	--	--

These are all the questions I have. Thank you very much for your cooperation. (HANG UP)
 TRANSFER FROM CONTACT RECORD SHEET

Interview attempt when completed:

FIRST ATTEMPT.....	1
SECOND ATTEMPT.....	2
THIRD ATTEMPT.....	3
FOURTH OR MORE ATTEMPTS.....	4

Language (of interview)

ENGLISH.....	1
SPANISH.....	2

Date of interview: ____/____/____

Telephone number: (____) _____
 AREA CODE

Time Ended: _____

LENGTH OF INTERVIEW
 (IN MINUTES)

--	--

