

Age, Perceptions, and Neighborhood Quality: An Empirical Test

Michael Greenberg

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Policy
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1958
USA

Abstract

Research has shown that adult Americans react to their neighborhoods and the attributes of their neighborhoods in predictable ways. A survey was made of matched pairs of 15 to 24-year-old and older Americans who resided in the same dwelling unit in order to determine if younger Americans perceive their neighborhoods in the same way as their older counterparts. The survey found almost identical neighborhood quality ratings among the matched pairs of younger and older adults. Crime and other forms of fear-provoking behaviors, blight, and littered buildings and streets were clearly the strongest correlates of neighborhood quality ratings among both the younger and older populations. Neighborhood amenities and resident characteristics were weakly or less strongly associated with neighborhood quality ratings. These results clearly point to the key factors that need to be controlled for good neighborhoods to maintain their status.

Keywords: age, blight, crime, litter, neighborhood quality, race, vandalism

Introduction

The vast majority of Americans like their neighborhoods. Surveys show that about 85 percent rate their neighborhood quality as "excellent" or "good." Only 15 percent rate their neighborhoods as "fair" or "poor" quality. In fact, the majority of Americans do not identify a single serious problem in their neighborhood. U.S. Department of Commerce data from the early 1980s through the early 1990s show that these generally positive perceptions of neighborhood quality have not changed much (Greenberg and Schneider 1996; U.S. Department of Commerce 1983-1995). These data suggest that if we understand factors that drive neighborhood quality ratings and make sure that they continue to exist in neighborhoods, then we can expect people to like their neighborhoods.

This may be a naive and false assumption. The next generation of home owners and renters may assess neighborhood conditions differently than previous ones. We know that tastes for music, types of automobiles, vacations, and many other consumer products change (Halberstam 1993). Putnam (1996) reports that civic engagement has been declining and attributes much of the decline to television watching. Perhaps, younger Americans are less interested in the health of the neighborhoods than their older counterparts. Third, as a whole younger people have different perceptions of hazards and risks (Bogner 1998; Buttel 1987; Ostman and Parker 1987; Van Liere and Dunlap 1980; Strunin 1991). Recent studies suggest the young population has been exposed to the environmentalism of the 1970s and 1980s and has continued to support environmental protection (Jones and Dunlap 1992; Kanagy, Humphrey and Firebaugh 1994).

To the best of my knowledge there is no literature about the relationship between neighborhood satisfaction, and neighborhood and resident characteristics among those who, in 10 to 20 years, will be making key choices about neighborhood quality when they choose where to live. I constructed a hypothesis-testing research project to answer the following questions:

1. How do 15 to 24-year-old Americans rate their neighborhood environments compared to older Americans living in the same environments?
2. When 15 to 24-year old Americans rate their neighborhoods, do they focus on the same set of neighborhood environmental problems and amenities as their older counterparts?

The 15 to 24-year-old population, which is sometimes called "young" in this paper, comprised almost 14 percent of the United States population in 1995 and this cohort (today's 15 to 24-year-old population) is expected to slightly increase as a proportion of the American population during the first decade of the next century (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1996, 17). During the next two decades, this cohort will be key players in deciding the quality and economic value of individual dwelling units and neighborhoods, as its earning power and financial influence increases.

If young people's reactions to neighborhoods are the same as those of older Americans, then their survey results should reflect findings of previous studies of older Americans (Greenberg and Schneider 1996, 1997; Greenberg, Schneider and Choi 1994). The following findings serve as working hypotheses tested in this research:

1. *Neighborhood quality*: About one-third of respondents should rate their neighborhood as "excellent" quality, and another 50 to 55 percent should rate their neighborhood as "good" quality. Only 15 to 20 percent will rate it as "fair" or "poor" quality (see also Table 1).

Regarding the second research question, I would expect the following results.

2. *Environmental Conditions*: Crime and physical deterioration of neighborhoods are the most important correlates of neighborhood quality. Bothersome industrial and commercial land uses, pollution, poor schools and recreational opportunities often lower neighborhood quality ratings, but are less important than crime and blight. Amenities, such as good restaurants, schools, shopping areas, and recreational sites are much less important. Respondents' comparative rating of their present and previous neighborhood quality is consistently important.
3. *Resident Characteristics*: Demographic and personality characteristics of respondents, such as education, age, housing tenure, length of stay in the neighborhood, sense of personal efficacy, methods of coping with stress, and extent of personal optimism are less important, when compared to environmental conditions.

Data and Methods

Since, to the best of my knowledge, this is the first effort to compare neighborhood quality and its correlates among younger and older populations, it was important to try to prevent location from confounding the results. That is, I did not want the results of the different studies to be potentially explained by the fact that the neighborhoods sampled in the present study were somehow different from those sampled in previous studies. In fact, I did not want small variations within the same neighborhoods to possibly explain any differences. To avoid these potential problems, the sampling design specified sampling a young person and a person at least 15 years older who were living in the same dwelling unit.

Two pilot studies showed that standard methods of collecting data, using the telephone and mailing the instrument, were ineffective. For example, regarding random digit dial-

ing procedures, we found that it took about an hour of phone calling to find a dwelling unit that had the requisite pair of respondents who were both willing to participate and could be presented with the questions in such a way that they did not communicate their responses to each other.

The design became feasible with a convenience sampling approach. Five Rutgers University students were identified who lived in New Jersey communities that, from personal experience, the author believed would be representative of neighborhood quality conditions in New Jersey as a whole. These five places are Camden, Lincroft, Maywood, Montclair, and Pompton Lakes. The average median family income of these five is within 4 percent of New Jersey's as a whole. The percent of the population that is black was 26 percent higher, and the percent Hispanic origin was 4 percent lower. In other words, the sample communities are likely to yield relatively more black Americans. Furthermore, by using only 5 communities and 5 students, I expected the respondents not to be representative of NJ residents as a whole in some demographic characteristics. For example, college students are likely to interview other well educated people who are employed as professionals and own homes.

The five students were asked to gather between 20 and 50 pairs of surveys from their neighborhoods. Each was taught how to administer the survey. A key element of the survey methodology was verbalizing the contents of a letter that accompanied each survey pack to potential respondents. This letter asked respondents to fill out the survey in private and not to share responses with the other respondent or the surveyor. Respondents were asked to place their surveys in an envelope and seal that envelope before returning it to the surveyor, and to not place any identifiers on the survey instrument.

In statistics, "power" is the probability that a test rejects the null hypothesis at a specified significance level. I wanted a sample size with a power of at least 75 percent and a two-tailed alpha error of 0.05 to distinguish an "excellent" neighborhood quality proportion of 35 percent from one of 50 percent or as low as 20 percent — in other words, 15 percent on either side of 35 percent. A sample of 150 has a power of 75 percent of detecting the targeted differences (Cohen 1977). The goal of the survey was to obtain at least 150 matched pairs of surveys (300 in total) from respondents whose aggregate responses would be representative of the State of New Jersey as a whole.

Survey Instrument

The questions in the survey instrument were based on survey items used in previous research on neighborhood quality among adults (Greenberg and Schneider 1996, 1997).

The survey began by listing 35 potentially distressing neighborhood characteristics. Respondents were asked if these conditions exist in their neighborhood. If the answer was yes, they were asked if the characteristic bothers them. The 35 potential problems included behavioral ones such as crime, unfriendly neighborhoods, dogs and other uncontrolled animals; industrial hazards such as incinerators, chemical plants, and hazardous waste sites; and indicators of physical deterioration such as abandoned houses, streets and roads in disrepair. It also asked if high taxes, poor quality schools, libraries, and absence of recreation, shopping, or restaurants were bothersome.

The second section asked 23 questions that measured resident trust, desire for control of neighborhood activities, optimism-pessimism, sense of personal mastery, and coping skills (Flynn, Burns, Mertz and Slovic 1992; Scheier and Carver 1985, Flynn, Slovic and Mertz 1994; Stone and Neale 1984). Each of these questions was scaled 1 to 5, where 1 indicated "strong disagreement" with the statement, 3 was "neutral," and 5 indicated "strong agreement" with the statement.

The third set of questions focused on respondent characteristics: age, sex, status as a home owner or renter, length of residence in the neighborhood, race, and educational achievement (Campbell, Converse and Rodgers 1976; Flynn, Slovic and Mertz 1994). I also asked the extent to which they engaged in activities in the neighborhood such as phoning the police and contacting an elected official, and their attention to their own personal health measured by visits to have their eyes examined, teeth cleaned or blood pressure taken.

The fourth section of the instrument asked how respondents rated their neighborhood quality on a four-point scale, where 1 indicated "excellent," 2 was "good," 3 was "fair" and 4 indicated "poor." That question was immediately followed by one which asked that they compare the quality of their present and previous neighborhoods. The last part asked about 11 neighborhood amenities. Residents were asked if they live in the neighborhood because of convenience to friends/relatives, leisure activities, good schools, inexpensive housing, job location, and five other potential attributes.

Statistical Analysis

To evaluate the first research question (How do young Americans rate their neighborhoods compared to older Americans?) I calculated the proportion of younger and older respondents who rated their neighborhoods as excellent, good, fair or poor, and compared them with each other. For context, I also compared their aggregate responses to the residents of New Jersey as a whole and the United States as a whole.

I used multivariate stepwise discriminant analysis to answer the second question (What factors do young Americans focus on when they rate their neighborhoods?) because the method can simultaneously examine the relationship of perceived neighborhood quality with multiple neighborhood characteristics and respondent characteristics. As a screening method, each potential discriminating variable's relationship with neighborhood quality was examined separately with chi-square tests of cross-tabulations or one-way analysis of variance of means. For example, the average optimism scores of respondents who rated their neighborhoods as excellent, good, fair, or poor were compared. Potential discriminators that were found to be weakly associated with neighborhood quality in these bivariate tests were not included in the discriminant analyses.

Results

A total of 324 responses, or 162 pairs of valid responses, were collected. The average age of the young respondents was 19.7 years, compared to 38.6 for their older counterparts. It is difficult to precisely compare the demographic characteristics of respondents to the State of New Jersey as a whole because the only comparable data for the state are drawn from the U.S. census taken in 1989 and 1990. With that caveat in mind, 61 percent of the young respondents were female, compared to 67 percent of their older counterparts. The respondents as a group were more highly educated than the 1990 New Jersey population, as a group. Almost 60 percent of the young respondents were in college or had graduated. Forty-six percent of the older respondents had graduated college. These two proportions compare with 25 percent of the New Jersey population in the year 1990. Almost 80 percent of older respondents were home owners compared to 65 percent of New Jersey residents in 1990. Lastly, 25 percent of respondents self-identified as Black and 4 percent as Hispanic compared to 13 and 10 percent of New Jersey residents, respectively. In short, the older respondents were more likely to be female, have more formal education, be Black, and be home owners than residents of the State of New Jersey as measured by 1990 U.S. Census (1993).

More importantly, columns 3 and 4 of Table 1 show that the neighborhood quality ratings of the older respondents closely parallels residents of New Jersey and the United States as a whole, which is what I had hoped to find when the five sample communities were chosen. The older respondents in the sample have a slightly higher proportion of good, and lower proportion of excellent, neighborhood quality ratings than the residents of New Jersey and the United States. The fair and poor neighborhood quality proportions are almost identical to New Jersey and the United States. In

other words, judged by the neighborhood quality responses of the older population, the sample is representative of the State of New Jersey (U.S. Department of Commerce 1989, 1993).

Regarding the 15- to 24-year-old population, 22 percent of them rated their neighborhood as excellent compared to 27 percent of older respondents. The vast majority, 65 percent of younger and 57 percent of older, rated their neighborhoods as good quality. Far fewer, 10 percent of younger and 13 percent of older respondents, rated their neighborhood as fair quality. Three percent of both groups rated their neighborhoods as poor quality.

Table 1. Neighborhood Quality Among Study Populations

Neighborhood Quality Rating*	Younger population		Older population		New Jersey 1987, 1991	United States 1993
	#	%	#	%	%	%
Excellent	36	22.2	44	27.2	35.0	35.0
Good	105	64.8	93	57.4	52.7	50.1
Fair	16	9.9	21	13.0	9.7	12.5
Poor	5	3.1	4	2.5	2.6	2.4
Total	162	100.0	162	100.1	100.0	100.0

*The U.S. Bureau of the Census currently categorizes neighborhood quality from 1 to 10. It previously had an "excellent," "good," "fair," and "poor" neighborhood quality scale. After pilot-testing the 1 to 10 scale, I wanted a simpler scale because respondents had difficulty with the 1 to 10 scale. I used the historical record when the two scales were most proximate in time to convert the data so that "excellent" was 10, "good" was 6-9, "fair" was 3-5, and "poor" was 1-2. This transformation from a 1 to 10 point scale to a 4-point scale was done in 1993 using data from 1985 to 1991. See Greenberg, Schneider and Choi (1994) and Greenberg and Schneider (1996).

The younger and older population neighborhood quality results are associated (Table 2). Table 2 shows the paired neighborhood quality ratings. The correlation between them is 0.53 (Kendall's tau-b, $p < .001$). Notably, there are no instances where a young respondent rated the neighborhood as excellent while the older respondent rated it as fair/poor or the other way around. In other words, there are no instances of strong disagreement in neighborhood quality ratings among the matched pairs of respondents. Yet, there is imperfect matching of the ratings. Kappa, a statistic that measures exact agreement among pairs of responses, was also used. A Kappa of $> .60$ is considered substantial agreement; a Kappa of $> .4$ to $.59$ is considered fair agreement. The Kappa of younger and older populations was .42.

Table 2: Comparison of Paired Neighborhood Quality Ratings by Younger and Older Populations

Younger / Older	Excellent	Good	Fair/Poor	Total
Excellent	20	16	0	36
Good	24	73	8	105
Fair/Poor	0	4	17	21
Total	44	93	25	162

Discriminant analysis is a systematic way to capture associations among multiple neighborhood characteristics, respondent characteristics and neighborhood quality. The method chooses the characteristics that most strongly differentiate among the categorical variable neighborhood quality. The fair and poor quality responses were merged for this analysis because there were only five ratings of poor quality among the young respondents and four among their older counterparts. The neighborhood quality variable we analyzed had three categories: excellent, good, and fair/poor.

Initial analyses using cross-tabulations and one-way analysis of variance reduced the number of potential discriminating variables to a more manageable number. Additional variables were eliminated after the initial set of discriminant analyses showed that they did not make a statistically significant contribution to explaining variation in neighborhood quality. The ability of potential discriminating variables to make a contribution is judged by the F statistic. A high F-value means that the among-group variance is greater than the within-group variance, which means that the independent variable discriminates among one or more groups (e.g., excellent, good, fair/poor). Overall, 16 of the 47 neighborhood environmental indicators and 8 of the 42 resident characteristic variables contributed to the discriminant analysis model of the relationships between neighborhood quality, neighborhood environmental conditions, and respondent characteristics.

In addition to the environmental and respondent variables, 5 variables were created to capture any unique explanatory power associated with the 5 communities (1 = reside in Pompton Lakes, 0 = do not reside in Pompton Lakes, etc.). If any of these neighborhood location variables could help explain neighborhood quality beyond the statistical associations of environmental and resident characteristics, then we would know that the neighborhoods have one or more unique characteristics that differentiate them from the other neighborhoods that are not captured by the independent variables. None made a unique significant contribution to the model, so they were eliminated.

Appendix A displays the discriminant analysis run and the average values for young respondents who rated their neighborhood quality as excellent, good, and fair/poor. A discriminant analysis produces discriminant functions that are linear combinations of the original independent variables. The method produces one less discriminant function than the number of categories of the dependent variables, in this case, three neighborhood quality categories and two discriminant functions.

There are two ways of assessing the statistical success of a discriminant analysis. One is to examine the canonical correlations of each function with the dependent variable. The

canonical correlation of function one was 0.858 and of function two was 0.562 ($p < .001$). That is, the two multivariate functions, or variables created by the statistical method, were both strongly correlated with the neighborhood quality dependent variable. The second way of assessing the strength of the results is to use the discriminant model to predict a neighborhood quality category for each respondent and to compare that predicted rating with the actual rating. The mathematical model created by discriminant analysis accurately classified 92 percent of the respondents' ratings of their neighborhoods. More specifically, 89 percent (32 of 36) of excellent neighborhood quality ratings were correctly classified, as were 92 percent (97 of 105) of good and 95 percent (20 of 21) of the fair/poor quality ratings. In short, the independent variables were extremely effective at capturing underlying correlates of neighborhood quality.

Discriminant functions are named in two ways. One is by examining the strength of F-values and correlations between the discriminant function and the independent variables. The second is to examine which function most strongly identifies with which neighborhood quality group. The first analysis presented here uses younger population's judgments about neighborhood characteristics and the younger peoples' personal characteristics to try to predict their neighborhood quality ratings. This is referred to as the "youth by youth" analysis.

The first function of the youth by youth analysis is dominated by neighborhood problems and sharply distinguishes between those who rate their neighborhood excellent versus fair/poor. Those who rated their neighborhood as fair/poor were bothered by a high crime rate ($r = .675$), and abandoned housing, factories, and other buildings ($r = .515$), vandalism ($r = .489$), homeless persons and panhandling ($r = .520$), and 10 other neighborhood problems. These respondents also felt that their previous neighborhood was of poorer quality than their present one ($r = .311$).

Those who rated their neighborhood as excellent quality had precisely the opposite observations about their neighborhood. They were bothered by few, if any, of these problems and considered their present neighborhoods an improvement. The group means displayed in Appendix A show the striking differences. For example, 76 percent of those who rated their neighborhoods as fair or poor were bothered by crime and 57 percent were bothered by abandoned houses, factories and buildings. None of the respondents who rated their neighborhoods as excellent were bothered by dangerous conditions or physical blight. If they were bothered by anything it tended to be high taxes, a lack of parking, and too much automobile traffic. A good way of summarizing the difference is to note that the average person who rated their neighborhood quality as fair or poor was bothered by 14.7 problems com-

pared to 2.2 among those who rated their neighborhood quality as excellent.

The second discriminant function distinguishes between those who rated their neighborhood as good versus those who rated it as excellent. Respondents who rated their neighborhood quality as good were more likely to feel that their neighborhood was worse than their previous neighborhood ($r = .389$), did not trust elected officials to represent their neighborhood in the state legislature ($r = .288$ with mistrust), and feel that local residents should have the authority to close hazardous facilities ($r = .369$). They also felt less of sense of mastery over their environment ($r = -.255$), tended not to think about solutions to problems ($r = -.430$), and engaged in fewer neighborhood activities than those who rated their neighborhoods as excellent quality ($r = -.287$). In other words, those 15-to 24-year-old respondents who rated their neighborhoods as good quality were less trusting of local legislators than those who rated their neighborhood as excellent. They wanted local residents to have the authority to deal with environmental threats, yet they personally felt less efficacious to influence their environments, and took fewer actions in the neighborhood than those who rated their neighborhood as excellent quality. Function two of the youth by youth analysis, in short, is about respondent characteristics not neighborhood ones.

Another way of demonstrating that the younger population's perceptions of neighborhood quality are similar to those of their older counterparts is to determine the extent to which the younger respondents' neighborhood quality ratings can be predicted from the older respondents' personal characteristics and neighborhood perceptions. That is, the dependent variable is the young population's neighborhood quality rating. The independent variables are the education, optimism-pessimism, and other resident characteristics, as well as their assessments of crime, abandoned housing, amenities, and so on, of the matched older respondents. Appendix B presents the results of this "youth by older" analysis.

The results are similar to those in Appendix A. The first function distinguishes among respondents who rated their neighborhoods as fair/poor versus excellent and the second distinguishes good from excellent quality. Three of the five most discriminating variables in function one are the same as in function one of the youth by youth analysis: high crime rate ($r = .639$), abandoned houses, factories, or buildings ($r = .553$), and total number of bothersome problems ($r = .525$). Fourteen of the 15 neighborhood problems that appeared in the first discriminant analysis also appeared in this second one.

The two differences in function one make sense. The youth by youth analysis identified lack of parks and sports facilities in the neighborhood as bothersome. The older pop-

ulation analysis did not. The youth by older analysis included traffic as a problem but not a lack of parks and sports facilities as bothersome. It is reasonable to expect that younger respondents would be more bothered than older respondents by a lack of immediate recreation opportunities and that older respondents would be more bothered by traffic congestion and associated noise.

The canonical correlation of function one of youth by older was 0.806 and of function two was 0.534 ($p < .001$). These results compare to 0.858 and 0.562 for the youth by youth analysis, respectively. The model created by discriminant analysis accurately classified 86 percent of the respondents' ratings of their neighborhoods. More specifically, 86 percent (31 of 36) of excellent neighborhood quality ratings were correctly classified as were 86 percent (90 of 105) of good and 86 percent (18 of 21) of the fair/poor quality ratings. In short, the independent variables of the older respondents were able to accurately classify almost every one of their matches. Remarkably, the older population's neighborhood and personal data are almost as good at predicting the youth neighborhood quality ratings as the younger population's data.

Another good way of seeing the underlying power of crime and physical deterioration in these results is by examining the Kappa statistic, which is a measure of inter-rater agreement. Kappa matches the degree to which paired sets of respondents agree exactly in their assessment. A Kappa statistic of $\geq .80$ is considered excellent, a Kappa statistic of $\geq .60$ to $.79$ is considered substantial agreement and Kappa of $\geq .40$ to $.59$ is considered fair agreement. Regarding the 162 matched pairs collected for this study, Kappa for abandoned houses, factories and other buildings was .811; and it was .781 for crime. Blight and crime, in short, were judged almost identically by the pairs of respondents. In contrast, the Kappa values for poor grooming of streets, train noise, and inadequate public transportation were much lower .453, .413, and .265, respectively. In other words, younger and older populations strongly agree about threatening behaviors and physical blight in their neighborhoods, but not about other less threatening neighborhood characteristics.

Discussion

Before discussing the implications of the results, caveats are in order. The convenience sample of 324 people was representative of neighborhood quality ratings but not of demographic characteristics. For this reason, I view this as an exploratory analysis of the young population. Clearly additional studies are required of more young people to make sure that these findings are representative.

There is one overriding and policy-important finding from this research. The presence of fear-provoking behaviors

and physical deterioration drive down neighborhood quality for both 15- to 24-year-old as well as older populations. The powerful influence of this pair of dominant neighborhood forces is slightly adjusted by respondents' previous neighborhood characteristics. Those who feel that their previous neighborhood was higher quality than their present one are likely to rate their present neighborhood lower quality than those who think their previous neighborhood was worse than their present one. Respondents' demographic and personality characteristics also slightly modulate respondents' judgments about the quality of their neighborhoods. Lastly, neighborhood amenities are not strongly associated with neighborhood quality ratings. These findings for the young population are consistent with those made for older populations in this study and other studies.

These observations imply that we do have the ability to control neighborhood quality in neighborhoods currently rated as good and excellent. If our society is willing to provide the resources to control vandalism, drug-related and other forms of crime, and make sure that buildings, streets and infrastructure are maintained, then neighborhood quality will not sink to fair or poor quality. The data do not permit us to assert that these actions will improve neighborhood quality in places that already are fair and poor quality. However, neighborhood quality cannot improve unless this is done.

In the near future I intend to try to isolate the role of communication of information within the neighborhood as a mechanism by which the different age groups pass information and feelings about neighborhoods to each other concerning neighborhood quality and conditions. For now, there is some initial evidence that factors that have driven neighborhood quality ratings during the last two decades are likely to continue for the near future.

References

- Bogner, F. 1998. Environmental perceptions of Irish and Bavarian pupils: An empirical study. *The Environmentalist* 18, 27-38.
- Buttel, F. 1987. New directions in environmental sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology* 13, 465-498.
- Campbell, A., P. Converse and W. Rodgers. 1976. *The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, Evaluations, and Satisfaction*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Cohen, J. 1977. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Academic Press.
- Flynn, J., P. Slovic and C. Mertz. 1994. Gender, race and perception of environmental health risks. *Risk Analysis* 14, 1101-1108.
- Flynn, J., W. Burns, C. Mertz and P. Slovic. 1992. Trust as a determinant of opposition to a high-level radioactive waste depository: An analysis of a structural model. *Risk Analysis* 12, 417-429.
- Greenberg, M. and D. Schneider. 1997. Neighborhood quality, environmental hazards, personality traits, and resident actions. *Risk Analysis* 17, 169-175.

- Greenberg, M. and D. Schneider. 1996. *Environmentally Devastated Neighborhoods: Perceptions, Policies and Realities*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Greenberg, M., D. Schneider and D. Choi. 1994. Neighborhood quality. *Geographical Review* 84, 1-15.
- Halberstam, D. 1993. *The Fifties*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jones, R. and R. Dunlap. 1992. The social bases of environmental concern: Have they changed over time. *Rural Sociology* 57, 28-47.
- Kanagy, C., C. Humphrey and G. Firebaugh. 1994. Surging environmentalism: Changing public opinion or changing publics. *Social Science Quarterly* 75, 804-819.
- Ostman, R. and J. Parker. 1987. Impact of education, age, newspapers, and television on environmental knowledge, concerns, and behaviors. *Journal of Environmental Education* 19, 3-9.
- Putnam, R. 1996. The strange disappearance of civic America. *The American Prospect* Winter, 24, 34-48.
- Scheier, M. and C. Carver. 1985. Optimism, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology* 4, 219-247.
- Stone, A. and J. Neale. 1984. New measure of daily coping: Development and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 46, 892-906.
- Strunin, L. 1991. Adolescents' perceptions of risk for HIV infection: Implications for future research. *Social Science & Medicine* 32, 221-228.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1996. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1996*, 116th Edition, 17. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1993. *1990 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics, New Jersey, Section 1*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. 1983 to 1995. *American Housing Survey for the United States*. Volumes for the years 1981, 1983, 1985, 1987, 1989, 1991, and 1993. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. 1989, 1993. *American Housing Survey for Northern New Jersey*. Volumes for the years 1987 and 1991, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Van Liere, K. and R. Dunlap. 1980. The social bases of environmental concern: A review of hypotheses, explanations and empirical evidence. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 44, 181-197.

Appendix A. Discriminant Analysis of Younger Population Results

Discriminating Variable (Value for an individual respondent)	Average Value of Group			F-value statistical sign	Correlation with Function 1: Poor/Fair vs. Excellent quality	Correlation with Function 2: Good vs. Excellent quality
	Excellent quality	Good quality	Fair or Poor quality			
High crime rate (0,1)	0.0	0.038	0.762	102.5*	.675	
Total number of bothersome problems(0,1,.....35)	2.2	3.5	14.7	59.5*	.515	
Abandoned houses, factories, or buildings (0,1)	0.0	0.029	0.571	54.8*	.515	
Vandalism (0,1)	0.028	0.067	0.714	53.6*	.489	
Homeless persons/panhandling (0,1)	0.0	0.019	0.524	52.5*	.520	
Drug/alcohol-related problems (0,1)	0.028	0.076	0.667	40.9*	.428	
Trash or litter in empty lots, streets, or properties (0,1)	0.028	0.029	0.524	39.1*	.412	
Poor quality schools (0,1)	0.0	0.057	0.571	38.2*	.415	
Impoverished areas (0,1)	0.0	0.019	0.429	35.3*	.478	
Water pollution (0,1)	0.028	0.105	0.667	32.6*	.382	
Poor police response (0,1)	0.0	0.029	0.429	30.1*	.367	
Lack of quality of parks, sports facilities (0,1)	0.028	0.076	0.571	28.1*	.347	
Present neighborhood is worse than previous neighborhood (0,1)***	0.028	0.076	0.333	27.1*	.311	.389
Poor grooming of streets/parks (0,1)	0.028	0.076	0.524	23.0*	.321	
Junkyards, gasoline stations, and other non-residential (0,1)	0.0	0.029	0.286	14.4*	.254	
Do not trust elected officials to represent this neighborhood in our state legislature (1,2,3,4,5)	2.4	3.3	2.9	9.3*		.288
Think about solutions to my problems, gather information about them, and/or do something to try to solve them (1,2,3,4,5)	4.0	3.7	4.2	7.0*		-.430
Personal sense of mastery (0,1,.....35)	16.8	14.3	15.5	6.7*		-.255
Local residents should have authority to close a nuclear power station or hazardous waste site should they feel it is not run properly (1,2,3,4,5)	3.5	4.1	3.8	5.0**		.369
Local activities of respondent (1,2,3,...9)	2.1	1.1	1.8	4.8**		-.287

Variables with a correlation of $> .25$ with at least one function and a statistical significance of $p < .05$ are shown.

*Predictor is significant discriminator at $p < .01$; **Predictor is significant discriminator at $p < .05$. ***Original variable choices were 1 = better, 2 = same, and 3 = worse.

Appendix B. Discriminant Analysis of Younger Population Results Predicted by Older Population Indicators

Average Value of Group

Discriminating Variable (Value for an individual respondent)	Excellent quality	Good quality	Fair or Poor quality	F-value statistical sign	Correlation with Function 1: Poor/Fair vs. Excellent quality	Correlation with Function 2: Good vs. Excellent quality
High crime rate (0,1)	0.00	0.067	0.714	60.2*	.639	
Trash or litter in empty lots, streets, or properties (0,1)	0.028	0.048	0.619	45.3*	.576	
Abandoned houses, factories, or buildings (0,1)	0.0	0.029	0.524	45.2*	.553	
Total number of bothersome problems (0,1,...,35)	2.2	4.4	13.7	41.2*	.525	
Drug/alcohol-related problems (0,1)	0.028	0.057	0.619	40.8*	.525	
Poor grooming of streets/parks (0,1)	0.056	0.067	0.619	33.5*	.474	
Vandalism (0,1)	0.0	0.124	0.667	31.9*	.462	
Impoverished areas (0,1)	0.0	0.048	0.429	30.1*	.456	
Poor police response (0,1)	0.0	0.048	0.476	28.7*	.440	
Junkyards, gasoline stations, and other non-residential (0,1)	0.0	0.0	0.289	27.7*	.429	
Present neighborhood is worse than previous one (0,1)***	0.0	0.019	0.286	24.7*	.381	-.320
White population (0,1)	0.200	0.731	0.750	13.7*	-.292	
Water pollution (0,1)	0.0	0.143	0.476	13.4*	.288	
Respondent attended college (0,1)****	0.333	0.681	0.851	11.5*		-.342
Homeless/panhandling (0,1)	0.0	0.029	0.238	10.4*	.266	
Poor quality schools (0,1)	0.028	0.124	0.381	7.8*	.278	
Respondents > 50 years old (0,1)	0.524	0.181	0.389	7.0*		-.271
Too much traffic (0,1)	0.167	0.457	0.524	5.7*		.369
Personal sense of mastery (0,1,...,35)	14.3	15.5	15.2	3.6**		.334
Local residents should have authority to close a nuclear power station or hazardous waste site should they feel it is not run properly (1,2,3,4,5)	3.6	4.1	4.0	3.5**		.330

Variables with a correlation of $> .25$ with at least one function and a statistical significance of $p < .05$ are shown.

*Predictor is significant discriminator at $p < .01$; **Predictor is significant discriminator at $p < .05$. ***Original variable choices were 1 = better, 2 = same, and 3 = worse.

****Educational achievement categories where 1 is grades 1-11, 4 is some college, 5 is college graduate, and 6 is masters and/or doctorate degree.